



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Third Session of the Thirty-First Parliament

March 6-April 20, 1979



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament
Tuesday, March 6, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislature of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and parliamentary assistants, appears as an appendix at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, March 6, 1979, being the first day of the third session of the 31st Parliament of the province of Ontario for the dispatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1979

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. Mrs. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly, we assemble for this, the third session of the 31st Parliament of Ontario, at a time of unprecedented challenge and promise. The circumstances that prevail in our province, in Canada and indeed on the international scene give rise to differing attitudes as to Ontario's prospects and expectations, for it is clear that not all the factors that shape our destiny lie within our control. Nevertheless, my government approaches the future, both immediate and long-term, with faith and confidence, trusting in our abundance of human and natural resources and in the resourcefulness and abilities of our people.

The challenge which our nation holds for all Canadians will not be fully met until firm choices are made about the kind of nation we are to have. Similarly, the economic well-being of our nation will be of paramount importance in determining the opportunity we all share as Canadians.

Le défi qui se pose à tous les Canadiens ne sera pas pleinement relevé tant que l'avenir de notre pays n'aura pas fait l'objet de choix définitifs. De même, c'est de la prospérité économique de notre pays que dépendent essentiellement les chances qui s'offrent à nous en tant que Canadiens.

Honourable members will realize, however, that security and prosperity for Ontario citizens are not pre-ordained, nor is the prescription for an assured future to be found in any known or readily available formula. Rather, we have learned over the years that the ingredients for progress are numerous and complex, encompassing many intangible

factors, including the sense of confidence we possess in ourselves. My government calls on this assembly to provide significant leadership in advancing and shaping that spirit of confidence that is needed in Ontario and among its people.

At the same time, there is every recognition that if the full potential of our talents and resources is to be realized, effective management must be the hallmark of all areas of government operation as well as of the private sector of our economy. The measures to be introduced by my government at this session and other programs relating to the ongoing process of government will be consistent with the requirements of good management.

Some may wish to argue as to whether the primary emphasis of this session should be directed to improving the economic climate of Ontario or to improving the social services available to our people. In truth, extensive attention must be given to both, for it is clear that only if the economic circumstances in our province remain strong will we be able to maintain and develop the programs that contribute to a fair and balanced society.

Ontario's citizens are among the most prosperous in the industrial nations. However, this prosperity, of which we can be justly proud, faces a strong wave of international competition, not only in regard to the sale of goods and services, but also in the location of new and expanded production facilities.

It is the government's view that industry in Ontario will need to be carefully but aggressively supported in future years, as Canada adjusts to the new trading rules that will be established on the conclusion of the international trade talks in Geneva. Ontario will, therefore, be actively engaged in negotiations with the federal government on the outcome of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and would expect that there will be a fair apportionment of federal financial and technical assistance to our province.

While there must be prudent limits to the use of public funds to attract industrial jobs, the social costs of not maintaining our industrial strength cannot be ignored. These social

costs and the risk of losing long-term jobs have motivated the government of Ontario to take firm action to ensure the cost competitiveness of the province in attracting new jobs for our labour force.

Thus, as a matter of first priority, my government will take specific measures that will ensure that the Ontario economy continues to expand in a positive and productive fashion. Such measures will not only bring the obvious benefits of increased employment opportunities and steady incomes, but will also add to the assured tax base of Ontario, thus contributing increased revenues from which important programs can be financed.

Primary among these efforts will be the establishment of an employment development fund to offer appropriate assistance to industry in our province and spur economic activity and employment. The allocation of funds, monitoring of shifting economic priorities, and co-ordination of job-creation programs will be the responsibility of a special board of ministers chaired by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller). A single focus for submission, analysis and development of major proposals will be provided by the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman), as vice-chairman of the board.

But if the Ontario economy is going to grow and bring with it expanded opportunities for our people, it will require more than government assistance. Private sector investors will look for other factors that contribute to effective operations and which ensure that they can remain fully competitive in the marketplace. It is essential, therefore, that we point to a favourable, receptive climate that offers such important features as skilled manpower, harmonious labour/industry relations, price and wage stability, assured energy supplies at competitive prices, fair taxation policies, and government determination to avoid unnecessary controls, regulation, and expenditures.

Progressive measures can be expected during this session in all these areas.

The present education structure does not meet fully today's need for highly skilled persons in the manufacturing and service industries. In answer to this need, my government will implement a comprehensive business and industrial training program, involving our secondary schools, colleges, organized labour and the business community.

This will mean a realignment of secondary school technical programs with post-secondary programs, innovative trade study courses, and an expansion of apprenticed trades as well as of the new employer-sponsored on-the-job training initiatives. Emphasis will be

placed on providing guidance information on job market and training opportunities in the industrial sector. At the same time, efforts will be made to develop a more positive attitude among young people and their parents toward careers in the skilled trades.

Under existing arrangements a number of manpower responsibilities—job creation and retention, training, placement, counselling and the compilation and analysis of essential labour market data—fall within the jurisdiction of several ministries. To ensure that these activities are planned and implemented in the most effective way, both internally and in relation to federal programs, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Elgie) will be designated the Minister of Labour and Manpower, and will be given the appropriate mandate to guide and co-ordinate the government's manpower activities.

Continued high priority will be given to special programs for women in the public and private sectors. In addition to the ongoing programs of the Women's Bureau and the Women's Crown Employees' Office, the Ministry of Labour will establish an Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee, composed of senior labour and management representatives.

As an important step toward better labour/management relations, Ontario established, last fall, the first Quality of Working Life Centre in Canada. This unique co-operative experiment by labour, management and government will embark on a program of pilot projects and educational activities aimed at increasing employee participation in decision-making in the workplace, improving labour relations and enhancing productive performance. The centre will continue to be guided and assisted in its activities by an advisory committee of leading members of the labour and business communities.

At the last session, the Minister of Labour tabled a report of an industrial inquiry commission which identified problems in the process and structure of grievance arbitration. This session, the government will introduce amendments to the Labour Relations Act designed to reduce the costs for arbitration, to provide third-party assistance in resolving grievances prior to arbitration and generally to enable the process to be carried out in the fairest and most expeditious manner.

[3:15]

Despite the over 133,000 new jobs created in Ontario in 1978—a record high since 1974—unemployment levels remain unacceptable as more people are entering the work force than ever before. This creates a particular

burden on the capacity of our economy to expand and embrace the many citizens who seek to earn their place within it. We are encouraged, however, by the fact that almost all of these new jobs were created by the private sector, which can be taken as significant justification for a policy of limiting public sector growth to allow the private sector to expand.

Some 2,000 labour contracts will come due for negotiation in Ontario in 1979. It is important that all parties to these negotiations show reason and moderation, if inflationary pressures on the economy are to be resisted. However, the battle against inflation, if it is to be fair and successful, must be fought at all levels. Prices and incomes, including executive salaries and professional fees, must all be restrained, if we are to break the momentum of self-perpetuating inflation.

The government will seek to set an appropriate example by following the precepts of bargaining in good faith, while insisting on recognition of the dollar value of job security, pensions and other fringe benefits in wage and salary negotiations with its own public servants. Nevertheless, as has been recognized at recent federal-provincial conferences, any successful effort to contain the problem of inflation must be undertaken as a matter of national priority. My government will, therefore, do everything within its power to co-operate with the federal government in combatting unacceptable inflationary trends.

Consistent with this commitment, Ontario will continue the effective steps already taken to manage government spending so that public expenditures do not in themselves contribute to rising inflation. Further, while recognizing the limits imposed on any provincial jurisdiction in controlling the general monetary situation, we are prepared to take further action.

Since food prices are unquestionably a matter of great concern to the average citizen, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations will assist consumers in making informed choices by establishing a program to monitor and report on prices across the province. Significant market trends will be analysed as they develop and periodic reports will address specific problem areas.

Further, because of the particularly sharp price increases in many imported foods, caused primarily by the decline in the value of the Canadian dollar, my government intends to launch a province-wide campaign immediately to advise and assist consumers on ways to reduce their food costs by using

Ontario-grown fresh and processed agricultural products. As well, an extensive campaign will be undertaken in conjunction with the Shop Canadian program to persuade the people of Ontario as to the merits of import substitution through the purchase of a wide variety of Canadian-manufactured goods.

It is clear that a determined move toward self-sufficiency in respect of basic goods and services will not only contribute to effective price stability, but will also increase the prospects of assured supply. In this context, government support of projects, such as that intended to demonstrate the productivity of greenhouse complexes through the use of waste heat from nuclear generating stations, takes on new importance.

Keeping in view the energy needs of industry and the private citizen, the government, through the Ministry of Energy, will continue efforts to ensure that options for Ontario's future supplies are as flexible as possible.

First, the government recognizes the primary importance of electricity as a source of energy for this province. Foreign political instability makes it mandatory that we continue policies and programs that safeguard and enhance Ontario Hydro's production facilities as a future guarantee of domestic supplies. What appears to be an oversupply of electrical energy today may well become essential to our continuing prosperity within a comparatively short period of time.

Transient and essentially unpredictable changes in demand may alter considerations of timing, but it would be highly irresponsible to weaken the province's commitment to the generation of electricity from nuclear power as a safe, secure and efficient means of protecting present and future generations of Ontarians. Energy security now and in the future will not be inexpensive; yet we will be able to finance this security at prices to the consuming public lower than in almost all other jurisdictions.

As part of the continuing search for alternative energy sources, my government hopes to conclude shortly a \$58 million, five-year, bilateral cost-sharing agreement with the government of Canada to demonstrate in co-operation with the private sector new technology in energy conservation and renewable energy.

Through the Ontario Energy Corporation support will be given to energy-related business development, including projects using by-product power and energy from waste. Changes will be made in the financing and organization of the energy corporation

to enable it to take a more active role in the achievement of energy and economic policy objectives in Ontario.

At the national level, the government will ensure that the interests of Ontario's industrial, commercial and residential consumers will be vigorously represented in matters relating to the export, transmission and pricing of natural gas and security of supply of other energy resources.

The driving force of our economic system is private enterprise and initiative. It is entrepreneurs in businesses, big and small, who create new products, new businesses and new jobs through the application of brains and skills, and their willingness to take considerable financial risks. It is vital to our economic future that we maintain a climate of opportunity for innovative and imaginative individuals. My government believes potential rewards must justify the considerable risks. Accordingly, measures will be introduced to encourage the flow of risk capital into new and expanding small businesses.

Likewise, Ontario's tourism industry, which experienced a 16 per cent growth in revenue last year, will be aggressively supported by the government in 1979. There will be a substantial increase in tourist promotional investment.

Phase two of the highly successful hospitality awareness program, "We Treat You Royally," will be launched in May. An important new element of the program will train 25,000 employees of the hospitality industry and make for better service and better business among participating operators.

If private enterprise is to operate effectively, it must be freed from obstacles created by excessive government regulation. Steady progress has been made since the adoption, just under a year ago, of a government-wide policy to improve the regulatory process. There can be, of course, no dispute that a certain measure of government regulation is essential. However, it is equally important that such controls be consistent, effective and administered without undue interference or excessive cost.

A significant share of the problems faced by small business can be traced to government regulation. It is a situation that must be corrected if this vital segment of the community is to thrive. My government will ensure that in implementing recommendations from various sources special attention is paid to items that affect small business.

In other areas of operation, continued efforts will be made to improve existing legislation, regulations, and administrative struc-

tures in an exercise which will affect all levels of government. Various legislative amendments will be proposed to clarify statutory requirements, remove oblique or obsolete references, and simplify procedures. Consumer legislation will be amended to give self-regulatory responsibilities, where appropriate, to industries, associations, or municipalities.

For example, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations will introduce a program of self-regulation for general insurance agents and brokers that will permit them to serve the public as effective advisers and consultants, while continuing to provide the necessary financial and trust account control.

Major emphasis will be placed on the consolidation of regulatory authority for specific programs into single areas of responsibility. This will be one of the features of important new legislative proposals for the Planning Act, the aim of which will be to accelerate and streamline the process of community planning approvals.

The government also recognizes the need to give attention to the manner in which it serves the public, as being consistent with the need for appropriate and adequate legislation. To this end, new programs will be developed to ensure easier access to government by citizens who need information or assistance.

My government would consider these two factors as key to a relationship of mutual trust between people and government. It is important that there be the fullest possible access to government by the people. Government must also try to limit its regulatory function to such uses as are absolutely necessary and for the benefit and protection of those served. The degree to which these elements co-exist is itself a measure of the strength of the democratic process.

Ontarians can take satisfaction and pride from the fact that their productive efforts have made it possible to develop and maintain a large variety of social programs. Full educational opportunity, care and concern for those afflicted by illness and need, necessary representation in legal affairs, as well as many other important protections have become fundamental to our way of life.

By the same token, the high standard and the effectiveness of law enforcement in our province are a testimony to an orderly way of life based on an historical respect for law by the vast majority of our people. If Ontario is to continue to enjoy this high level of protection, there is a real need for full public support of the police function. That function is the protection of our people against all criminal acts by those who are not content to live within the law. The objective, simply

stated, is the protection of society. It is a goal which will be pursued through continued emphasis on efficient management and a professionalism, tempered by compassion, in the administration of justice.

In pursuing efforts to secure full social justice for all members of the community, my government proposes several initiatives, which government alone can take, to assist specific groups of citizens. It is, of course, incumbent on us, particularly in times of fiscal restraint, to ensure that wastefulness, misuse and duplication of services relating to these programs are eliminated. Every effort is being made to achieve this end.

[3:30]

For the past two years, the Ministry of Community and Social Services, together with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, has been providing special transit services for the physically disabled on a pilot project basis in five communities. Building on the success of this program, the government will take steps to make these projects permanent. Introduction of a gradual expansion to other communities will begin without delay. The program will continue to depend on volunteer involvement. At the same time, provision will be made for grants to municipalities through amendments to the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act.

The government will move toward a modest expansion of several pilot projects which were launched recently to provide special accommodation and necessary attendant care for the young physically disabled. These projects have been remarkably successful in enabling these young people to maintain a life in the community—in many cases going to work or school or working towards being self-supporting.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services will develop ways to ensure that social assistance programs provide positive incentives to enable sole-support mothers and disabled persons who wish to become self-supporting to take and maintain full-time employment. Improved part-time work incentives will be introduced to help disabled persons on social assistance.

My government has also been most concerned to ensure that young people are not disadvantaged in the search for work. For this reason, the government proposes to continue the Ontario youth employment program during the summer months.

The government will continue to pursue the reshaping of health care delivery services to ensure both excellence of service and effective management. Citizens may be as-

sured, however, that Ontario's health care programs and other programs which now ensure adequate protection for those who may not always be in the best position to help themselves will remain solidly in place. For example, after careful review, the government has decided that the drug benefit program for senior citizens and other persons in need of assistance should not be altered. The social value to Ontario is too great to allow any diminution in the quality or quantity of such significant social advances.

Home-care services for chronically ill patients who wish to live at home but who require some nursing and other medical assistance to do so will be extended. A significant number of beds will be added to the system for persons needing long-term nursing home or chronic hospital care where need is identified through the health plan process. It is the intention to establish placement co-ordination services to ensure that patients requiring such care are placed in the most appropriate setting.

Outpatient services and day-surgery programs will be expanded in a number of hospitals. The Ministry of Health will work with local boards of health to upgrade their programs by developing standards for such public health services as immunization and family planning.

The government's many programs and policies to preserve and strengthen the vitality of rural and remote parts of Ontario reflect a concern that Ontarians, however far removed from larger or more accessible centres, must be enabled to share the opportunities afforded others of their fellow citizens.

With this aim in view, honourable members will be asked to consider a new local services boards act to address some of the needs of communities in northern Ontario that lack municipal organization. This will be in the form of enabling legislation so that those communities, if they wish, may give elected local bodies the power to raise revenues and provide basic services.

The Ministry of Northern Affairs will also seek ways to provide a greater range of television service for remote areas in order to overcome the sense of isolation that exists for many northern residents.

In the agricultural community, the government proposes to support the foodland guidelines policy adopted at the last session by establishing a modified grants program to maintain and enhance productivity on farms. The grants will be given mainly for water and erosion control projects, as well as to assist in construction of selected farm pro-

duction facilities. Special attention will be given to the need to assure that farmers are protected by minimum farm machinery warranties and contract standards.

Agricrew, a popular pilot project of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food last year, will be expanded to a province-wide program that will provide students an opportunity for new training and employment. The program offers support to farmers during peak harvest periods and for improvements to farmsteads. At the same time, Ontario will press the federal government for continuation of the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Agreement or for a similar program as being of crucial importance to continued growth in northern and eastern Ontario.

A major new fisheries management initiative will be launched by the Ministry of Natural Resources to maintain fisheries resources throughout Ontario and indeed to rebuild some already lost in the southern part of the province. Efforts will be made to improve the stock in the Great Lakes by working more effectively with the International Joint Commission and the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission. The scope of the program calls for significant new policies as an investment in the future. The environmental as well as the economic benefits are paramount.

Over the past two years, the Ministry of Natural Resources has worked with the forest industry on bringing together the harvesting and regeneration phases. As a result of these consultations, the government will introduce amendments to the Crown Timber Act to provide for contractual arrangements with timber harvesting companies for the management of specific forest lands. The effect of these agreements will mean the transfer of much of the forest management work to the private sector, while the responsibility to maintain the productivity of forest land will remain with the government.

My government has taken into account the public comments on proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act concerning spills of toxic substances. Legislation will be reintroduced which will broaden the government's authority to order control, cleanup and restoration, with liability provisions for compensation for damages resulting from spills.

Ontario has made major advances in the water quality of the Great Lakes in cooperation with the federal government and with United States agencies through the International Joint Commission. Now that a

new international agreement is in effect, the Canada-Ontario agreement is being revised with emphasis on the control of toxic substances and on pollution of the Great Lakes from land use and airborne contaminants.

Commitments have been made for research and analysis for better understanding of low-level environmental contaminants which can build up in living tissue. This new knowledge is being incorporated in a thorough revision of water quality programs, guidelines and objectives to be released shortly by the Ministry of the Environment.

Throughout 1979, the observance of the International Year of the Child offers a special opportunity to reinforce the awareness that our children are the single most important assurance for the future. Government initiatives that will be taken include an intensive immunization awareness campaign directed at the public and, particularly, at parents of young children. Specialized services, such as poison control centres, will be established in the children's hospitals.

Following on legislation two years ago giving all children equal status before the law, and recently enacted provisions for children's services, my government will introduce a second phase of the Children's Law Reform Act to recognize the best interests of the child in custody and access cases.

Foster care programs for mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children will be expanded. Increased funding will be allocated to programs to counter child abuse.

These programs for children will be supported throughout the government and in the community by scores of other activities, many of which will be by way of celebration. In this vein, this year's civic holiday on August 6 will be declared Children's Day in all provincial parks.

My government is able to report steady progress in the provision of French-language services in Ontario, and will introduce enabling amendments under the Evidence Act to give appropriate status to Ontario statutes in French. This follows on last year's implementation of a system to prepare such translations.

The multicultural reality of Ontario is characterized by a tradition of fairness and harmony among its citizens. It is, however, a tradition that requires dedicated effort to ensure that multiculturalism remains the positive force that it can be in our society. Through our schools, through other social institutions and through individual example, we must develop attitudes that further the equality and dignity of all people.

My government sees its role in maintaining a harmonious society as one of leadership as well as of responsiveness. To this end, the government intends to restructure the Advisory Council on Multiculturalism to make it a more dynamic force in the promotion of cultural retention and sharing. As well, every effort will be made to enlarge the scope of effective communication between government and the various ethnic communities so they may understand and gain full participation in the Canadian way of life.

My government reaffirms its deeply felt commitment to a strong and unified Canadian nation, and renews its pledge to contribute in a positive and constructive manner to intergovernmental discussions which have as their urgent purpose a renewed constitution for Canada that will be in the best interests of all Canadians.

It is our firm conviction that a renewed constitution is a high priority of this nation, in order to provide a framework in which all citizens and regions can enjoy growth and prosperity within the context of a harmonious and flourishing country.

The general principles governing Ontario's approach in this respect are, we believe, supported by the people of Ontario. They are: preservation of the unity of Canada;

preservation of a strong central government with adequate powers to pursue the national interest, and provincial governments that reflect the regional diversities that are the Canadian heritage;

preservation of a union which ensures free movement and a free flow of goods, services, capital and people from coast to coast;

preservation of an economic union underscored by a commitment of all provinces and regions to contribute to each other's well-being, and, generally, to share each other's endowments, on a privileged basis, as Canadians first;

preservation of the monarch as head of state for Canada;

finally, to bring the constitution home as soon as possible so that Canadians, as proud inheritors of these traditions, can deal as a mature and independent people with their own self-governance.

[3:45]

My government believes that these principles are fundamental to a strong and united nation. In future constitutional discussions we will continue to build on them, sensitive always to the expressed and perceived concerns of our native people and of our partners in the Canadian Confederation.

However, the government places a caution unequivocally before the citizens of this province and of Canada as a whole: namely, that Ontario will not negotiate sovereignty association with the government of Quebec. We wish to work with the province of Quebec within the Canadian framework and we will strive to do so with vigour.

Our two provinces share similar experience and traditions as founding partners in the Canadian nation. We are compatriots and friends. My government has inherent understanding and support for the great French-speaking partner of our Confederation in its efforts to preserve the French identity, language, culture and heritage. Within our own province, we have pursued and accomplished significant measures, and will continue to develop further measures to recognize our mutual duality in language, culture and tradition.

It is the firm conviction of my government that, having full regard to the real and understandable aspirations of the people of Quebec, the interests of all will best be served by retaining the national boundaries that now designate the Canadian nation.

To this end, it is my government's intention to place a resolution before this House, in the hope that it will receive unanimous support and put on record the will of the legislators of this province.

Honourable members, the program presented for your consideration will seek to consolidate Ontario's position within Confederation; to promote efficient and effective management of government programs; to sustain economic stability and opportunity for the people of Ontario, and to advance their social well-being.

May Divine Providence guide your deliberations.

In our sovereign's name, I thank you.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of Her Honour's speech, which I shall now read.

Reading dispensed with.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

QUIETING TITLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Quieting Titles Act.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE SITTINGS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that commencing tomorrow, March 7, this House will not sit in the chamber on Wednesdays unless otherwise ordered.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that, notwithstanding any standing orders of the House, the following be the sequence in which private members' ballot items be listed and called for debate and that a new ballot be held thereafter: Messrs. Grande, Rotenberg, Peterson, Renwick, Johnson, Stong, M. N. Davison, MacBeth, J. Reed, Foulds, Handleman, Gaunt, Bounsall, J. A. Taylor, Van Horne, Makarchuk, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs. Hall, Lupusella, Kerr, T. P. Reid, Lawlor,

Watson, Epp, Charlton, Ramsay, G. I. Miller, Young, Rollins, Ruston and Germa; and that the first day for consideration of private members' public bills and orders be Thursday, March 29.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, this motion does reflect quite honestly what you might call a positive, negotiated settlement—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Within the guidelines.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —to making the new standing orders reconcile with the desire shared by all members of the House to let each willing member have his turn putting forward an item for debate. It also reflects an acceptance of the traditional practice of having each of the three parties represented by every third item. So, in that connection, I do want to sincerely thank my colleagues, the other House leaders and the whips, for helping to resolve this matter within the framework of the new rules. In that connection, may I welcome to that group and wish the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) continued moderate good health in his new responsibilities here.

Motion agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Davis, the House adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

(123 members)

Third Session of the 31st Parliament

Lieutenant Governor: Hon. Pauline M. McGibbon

Speaker: Hon. John E. Stokes

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Member	Constituency	Party
Ashe, G.	Durham West	PC
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.	Leeds	PC
Baetz, Hon. R. C.	Ottawa West	PC
Belanger, J. A.	Prescott and Russell	PC
Bennett, Hon. C.	Ottawa South	PC
Bernier, Hon. L.	Kenora	PC
Birch, Hon. M.	Scarborough East	PC
Blundy, P.	Sarnia	L
Bolan, M.	Nipissing	L
Bounsall, E. J.	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP
Bradley, J.	St. Catharines	L
Breaugh, M.	Oshawa	NDP
Breithaupt, J. R.	Kitchener	L
Brunelle, Hon. R.	Cochrane North	PC
Bryden, M.	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP
Campbell, M.	St. George	L
Cassidy, M.	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Charlton, B.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP
Conway, S.	Renfrew North	L
Cooke, D.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP
Cunningham, E.	Wentworth North	L
Cureatz, S.	Durham East	PC
Davidson, M.	Cambridge	NDP
Davis, Hon. W. G.	Brampton	PC
Davison, M. N.	Hamilton Centre	NDP
di Santo, O.	Downsview	NDP
Drea, Hon. F.	Scarborough Centre	PC
Duksza, J.	Parkdale	NDP
Eakins, J.	Victoria-Haliburton	L
Eaton, R. G.	Middlesex	PC
Edighoffer, H. (Deputy Speaker and Chairman)	Perth	L
Elgie, Hon. R.	York East	PC
Epp, H.	Waterloo North	L
Foulds, J. F.	Port Arthur	NDP
Gaunt, M.	Huron-Bruce	L
Germa, M. C.	Sudbury	NDP
Gigantes, E.	Carleton East	NDP
Grande, A.	Oakwood	NDP
Gregory, M. E. C.	Mississauga East	PC
Grossman, Hon. L.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	PC
Haggerty, R.	Erie	L
Hall, R.	Lincoln	L
Handleman, S. B.	Carleton	PC

Member	Constituency	Party
Havrot, E.	Timiskaming	PC
Henderson, Hon. L. C.	Lambton	PC
Hennessy, M.	Fort William	PC
Hodgson, W.	York North	PC
Johnson, J.	Wellington-Dufferin-Peel	PC
Jones, T.	Mississauga North	PC
Kennedy, R. D.	Mississauga South	PC
Kerr, G. A.	Burlington South	PC
Kerrio, V.	Niagara Falls	L
Lane, J.	Algoma-Manitoulin	PC
Laughren, F.	Nickel Belt	NDP
Lawlor, P. D.	Lakeshore	NDP
Leluk, N. G.	York West	PC
Lupusella, A.	Dovercourt	NDP
MacBeth, J. P.	Humber	PC
MacDonald, D. C.	York South	NDP
Mackenzie, R.	Hamilton East	NDP
Maeck, Hon. L.	Parry Sound	PC
Makarchuk, M.	Brantford	NDP
Mancini, R.	Essex South	L
Martel, E. W.	Sudbury East	NDP
McCaffrey, B.	Armourdale	PC
McCague, Hon. G.	Dufferin-Simcoe	PC
McClellan, R.	Bellwoods	NDP
McEwen, J. E.	Frontenac-Addington	L
McGuigan, J.	Kent-Elgin	L
McKessock, R.	Grey	L
McMurtry, Hon. R.	Eglinton	PC
McNeil, R. K.	Elgin	PC
Miller, Hon. F. S.	Muskoka	PC
Miller, G. I.	Haldimand-Norfolk	L
Newman, B.	Windsor-Walkerville	L
Newman, Hon. W.	Durham-York	PC
Nixon, R. F.	Brant-Oxford-Norfolk	L
Norton, Hon. K.	Kingston and the Islands	PC
O'Neil, H.	Quinte	L
Parrott, Hon. H. C.	Oxford	PC
Peterson, D.	London Centre	L
Philip, E.	Etobicoke	NDP
Pope, A.	Cochrane South	PC
Ramsay, R.	Sault Ste. Marie	PC
Reed, J.	Halton-Burlington	L
Reid, T. P.	Rainy River	L. LAB.
Renwick, J. A.	Riverdale	NDP
Riddell, J.	Huron-Middlesex	L
Rollins, C. T.	Hastings-Peterborough	PC
Rotenberg, D. (Acting Speaker and Deputy Chairman)	Wilson Heights	PC
Rowe, R. D.	Northumberland	PC
Roy, A. J.	Ottawa East	L
Ruston, R. F.	Essex North	L
Samis, G.	Cornwall	NDP
Sargent, E.	Grey-Bruce	L
Scrivener, M.	St David	PC

Member	Constituency	Party
Smith, G. E.	Simcoe East ..	PC
Smith, S.	Hamilton West ..	L
Snow, Hon. J. W.	Oakville ..	PC
Stephenson, Hon. B. M.	York Mills ..	PC
Sterling, N. W.	Carleton-Grenville ..	PC
Stokes, Hon. J. E.	Lake Nipigon ..	NDP
Stong, A.	York Centre ..	L
Swart, M.	Welland-Thorold ..	NDP
Sweeney, J.	Kitchener-Wilmot ..	L
Taylor, G.	Simcoe Centre ..	PC
Taylor, J. A.	Prince Edward-Lennox ..	PC
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.	Don Mills ..	PC
Turner, J.	Peterborough ..	PC
Van Horne, R.	London North ..	L
Villeneuve, O. F.	Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry ..	PC
Walker, Hon. G.	London South ..	PC
Warner, D.	Scarborough-Ellesmere ..	NDP
Watson, A. N.	Chatham-Kent ..	PC
Welch, Hon. R.	Brock ..	PC
Wells, Hon. T. L.	Scarborough North ..	PC
Wildman, B.	Algoma ..	NDP
Williams, J.	Oriole ..	PC
Wiseman, Hon. D. J.	Lanark ..	PC
Worton, H.	Wellington South ..	L
Yakabuski, P. J.	Renfrew South ..	PC
Young, F.	Yorkview ..	NDP
Ziemba, E.	High Park-Swansea ..	NDP

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. W. G. Davis	Premier and President of the Council
Hon. R. Welch	Provincial Secretary for Justice and Deputy Premier
Hon. J. A. C. Auld	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister of Energy
Hon. R. Brunelle	Provincial Secretary for Resources Development
Hon. T. L. Wells	Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. L. Bernier	Minister of Northern Affairs
Hon. J. W. Snow	Minister of Transportation and Communications
Hon. M. Birch	Provincial Secretary for Social Development
Hon. C. Bennett	Minister of Housing
Hon. W. Newman	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Hon. F. S. Miller	Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Hon. D. R. Timbrell	Minister of Health
Hon. H. C. Parrott	Minister of the Environment
Hon. B. M. Stephenson	Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hon. R. McMurtry	Attorney General and Solicitor General
Hon. L. C. Henderson	Minister of Government Services and Chairman of Cabinet
Hon. K. C. Norton	Minister of Community and Social Services
Hon. F. Drea	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hon. L. Grossman	Minister of Industry and Tourism
Hon. G. McCague	Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet
Hon. L. Maeck	Minister of Revenue
Hon. R. C. Baetz	Minister of Culture and Recreation
Hon. D. J. Wiseman	Minister without Portfolio
Hon. R. Elgie	Minister of Labour and Manpower
Hon. G. Walker	Minister of Correctional Services

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. G. Ashe	Assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. R. G. Eaton	Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications
Mr. W. Hodgson	Assistant to the Minister of Housing
Mr. T. Jones	Assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development
Mr. R. D. Kennedy	Assistant to the Minister of Education
Mr. J. Lane	Assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs
Mr. B. McCaffrey	Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation
Mr. R. K. McNeil	Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Mr. G. E. Smith	Assistant to the Minister of Industry and Tourism
Mr. N. W. Sterling	Assistant to the Attorney General
Mr. J. Turner	Assistant to the Minister of Health
Mr. P. J. Yakabuski	Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 6, 1979

Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	3
Quieting Titles Amendment Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading	9
Motion re Private Members' Business, Mr. Welch, agreed to	10
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	10
Appendix: Alphabetical list of members of the Legislature and executive council of Ontario	11



No. 2

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament
Thursday, March 8, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FOR WENTWORTH

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House of a vacancy which has occurred in the membership of the House since the last session by reason of the resignation of Ian Deans, Esquire, as member for the electoral district of Wentworth.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk had received from the chief election officer, and laid upon the table, the certificate of a by-election held on December 14, 1978:

Electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie: R. H. Ramsay.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

This is to certify that in view of a writ of election dated October 30, 1978, issued by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Ontario and addressed to Curtis A. Scott, Esquire, returning officer for the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie in the Legislative Assembly of the province, in the room of John R. Rhodes, Esquire, who, since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, has departed this life, R. H. Ramsay, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated December 27, 1978, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(Signed) Roderick Lewis, Chief Election Officer; Toronto, February 5, 1979.

R. H. Ramsay, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you and to the House Mr. Russell Ramsay, who was successful in the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, who

has taken the oaths, signed the roll and wishes now to take his seat.

Mr. Speaker: Let the honourable member take his seat.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

HURONIA REGIONAL CENTRE

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Provincial Police have completed an investigation into alleged incidents of abuse against residents of the Huronia Regional Centre for the Mentally Retarded in Orillia.

I want to share with members our conclusions about these allegations, and announce an initiative which we are implementing immediately.

In July last year, the administrator of Huronia regional centre reported that he had received letters from two former employees who believed, on the basis of their experience in the facility, that certain retarded residents were being abused by certain members of the staff.

Acting on the instruction of senior staff of the ministry, the administrator requested the police to conduct a full investigation.

Officers of the OPP's criminal investigation branch spent four months investigating the charges and, in the process, they interviewed approximately 120 persons.

The police report concluded that while there was some evidence to suggest resident abuse by, at most, a handful of the 1,400 staff members, there was limited or no corroboration of some allegations and nothing at all to substantiate other allegations. In some instances there was a substantial time lag between the occurrence and the police investigation. Some allegations related back to incidents in 1976 and 1977. In most cases, it became a question of the word of one employee, or former employee, against the word of another employee.

My colleague, the Solicitor General (Mr. McMurtry), advised me of the provincial police decision not to lay criminal charges against any individual. The OPP and the crown attorney in Barrie based this decision in part on the fact that the alleged victims were severely retarded and, therefore, could not themselves serve as crown witnesses.

Also, many of the alleged offences were common assaults and the statutory limitation for such charges had expired.

I received a copy of the final investigation report in late December and I have reviewed it in detail with senior officials of my ministry. Ministry officials undertook a further investigation to find out whether just cause existed for disciplinary action. We have concluded that there are not grounds to warrant disciplinary action against any individuals for basically the same reasons which led the police not to lay criminal charges.

There is limited evidence to suggest that some residents may have been abused by certain staff. There is not enough specific evidence, however, to enable the ministry to proceed with disciplinary measures against any employee.

It is a better course, I believe, to eliminate conditions which may create an environment in which abuse is regarded as acceptable behaviour by some individuals. For example, we must come to grips with the problems of stress which could lead an otherwise good employee to abuse a person in his or her care; and when we recruit and train staff to provide such care, we must accentuate, in all their complexity, the special qualities which it demands.

Accordingly, I am announcing today implementation of a co-operative program to improve the job environment for employees and the living environment for residents in our facilities.

Our network of residential facilities for the mentally retarded in this province had its origin in the natural concern of Ontarians to care compassionately for those with mental handicaps. That system also reflected the popular belief of the time that what the retarded needed most basically was simple sustenance and a secure protection against exploitation by others.

Our experience in working with the retarded over the past generation has taught us that such an evaluation of the retarded person underestimated seriously his or her capacity to learn, to enjoy a rich emotional life and to make a contribution to life in community with others.

Many of the initiatives in service undertaken over the past decade by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, and before us by our colleagues in the Ministry of Health, reflected our increasing appreciation of those abilities. The integration of many retarded people into our communities is a tangible and important example. It is crucial to the evolution of our service that our re-

gional centres for the mentally retarded continue to reflect our concern for the personal and individual growth of their residents. A major component of our progress to that end will be the degree to which we can enable staff members with direct-care responsibilities to make their special contributions to that growth.

An essential part of that contribution is the protection of those in their care. A specific improvement has been made already in the reporting of alleged incidents of abuse, following the establishment last June of formal guidelines which direct the immediate investigation of each allegation. Those guidelines are being followed now in all of our facilities. They represent a crucial element in our efforts to ensure that protection of residents is achieved.

I am confident that all but very few of the 6,000 concerned and competent staff members entrusted with the responsibility of caring for the retarded feel both pride and purpose in what they have helped accomplish. While our principal objective of providing protection, care, comfort and skills training to the retarded must be maintained, we must emphasize an equally important commitment to create an environment wherein employees experience satisfaction in what they do and share a feeling of accomplishment in what they have achieved.

It is in that light that we are initiating a co-operative program to identify and establish improvements in the every-day life in our facilities, starting with Huronia and Oxford regional centre in Woodstock. This program will engage the talents and perspectives of our management officials, direct-care staff and residents to develop a model of sensitive and helping service which will be applied to all our facilities.

Mr. McClellan: What does this mean?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The style of the plan will be based on consultation with and participation of all levels of staff in our facilities. The plan will deal with such issues as internal communications, staff attitudes and behaviour, and management and supervisory practices. It is my belief that this initiative will benefit both staff and residents as well as our future endeavours in the care and development of the mentally retarded.

Mr. Breagh: This has got to be a new tactic to keep this government in power for another three months.

Hon. Mr. Norton: We have a clear responsibility to make whatever contribution we can to nurture and enrich the lives of those who depend upon us for help. The initiative

I have announced is, I believe, a vital aspect of my ministry's commitment to that goal.

Mr. McClellan: What does it mean? Why doesn't the minister tell us what it means?

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would like to enlarge on a statement that was contained in the speech of Her Honour on Tuesday last, a statement which referred to this government's commitment to financially support public transportation services for Ontario's disabled.

To begin with, let me point out that over the past two or three years my ministry has co-operated with Metro Toronto, Ottawa-Carleton, Sault Ste. Marie, Peterborough and Chatham in experimenting with such transportation, using specialized minibuses, vans, passenger cars, et cetera, for individuals physically unable to board conventional transit systems.

The option to experiment with specialized vehicles, rather than attempting to convert conventional transit vehicles now in use, was based on what we believed the most appropriate way to go. The experience gained has confirmed this opinion. Our neighbours to the south who did use modified systems also convinced us we were pursuing the appropriate course of action here in Ontario.

Another plus for the specialized system approach is that mobility can be provided almost immediately, rather than later if we were to modify existing systems. Therefore, because there will be no service limitations, the criticisms levelled during some portions of the experiment should be answered. In fact, the only material limitation will be a minimum fare similar to regular transit fares, which must be charged, and a provincial ceiling which cannot be exceeded.

[2:15]

In brief, the province will help municipalities applying for financial assistance for the kinds of specialized transportation services that I have noted, services which the municipalities operate themselves or contract out on their behalf. Such operators may, of course, include non-profit organizations, et cetera.

As the costs of this type of service are substantial, the province will contribute 50 per cent of the municipal cost incurred in providing services for the physically dis-

abled, up to a limit rated on a per capita basis established as a result of our previous experience. This limit was arrived at by the extensive monitoring and study of the experimental services. We feel it will allow participating municipalities to operate services geared to local demand, or in other words similar to the transit service available to able-bodied individuals.

However, in that the mobility needs of the physically disabled are somewhat greater than those for the able bodied and their choice of transportation means is somewhat restricted, financial assistance will be available to municipalities with or without conventional transit services.

In order, then, to fully realize the potential which exists within Ontario municipalities, funds donated to a municipality for the transportation of the physically disabled may be considered to form all or part of the municipal portion in the expenses shared with the province. In addition, gifts in kind will not be evaluated as contributing towards the funding ceiling.

Provincial support will be available as of July 1 of this year and an explanatory policy summary will be mailed shortly to all municipalities known to have expressed an interest.

If any members who may wish to have further information on this new system of transportation for the handicapped would contact my office, we would be pleased to send them the full information.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. Speaker: Just before we get to oral questions, I want to remind honourable members that we approved and passed the new standing orders on December 14 last. It was a decision taken unanimously by the House, and since we are about to approach the oral questions I want to draw honourable members' attention to a particular section of 27 which says in part: "In the discretion of Mr. Speaker, a reasonable number of supplementary questions arising out of the minister's reply to an oral question may be asked by any members." Similarly, in putting an oral question, "no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same; and in answering any such question, the member"—which includes all ministers—"is not to debate the matter to which it refers."

So with that slight admonition we will go to oral questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HYDRO EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. S. Smith: I take it I have just been read my rights, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The last rites.

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to address a question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Premier explain to the House and to the people why he and his cabinet approved Ontario Hydro's expansion program, project by project, when he knew very well early in 1976 that the Treasury of Ontario had done a careful study which concluded that Hydro's growth forecasts were much too high?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition is perhaps oversimplifying the matter.

Mr. Peterson: Why don't you complicate it?

Mr. Breaugh: Do you want to read that rule again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member for London Centre, it may be a little too complicated for me but it is obviously far too complicated for him, something he will never totally understand. Particularly with his stated objective of world price for oil; I will never understand that.

Mr. Speaker: That was not part of the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, you are quite right.

Mr. Peterson: I am sorry I said anything.

Mr. Speaker: And shouldn't be part of the answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: To try to deal with it as briefly as I can, to say that cabinet in fact dealt with this on a project by project basis, I think the select committee that has been involved in these discussions will understand the complexity of the process that Ontario Hydro has used. I think it is quite evident that taking the historical record of Ontario Hydro with respect to their load forecasts, and not getting into a debate today as to the validity of their forecasts in 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977, this government has given to Hydro certain responsibilities which historically, in the history of their responsibilities in this province, they have discharged extremely well.

I recognize this is a matter of great concern and of great interest to the Leader of the Opposition. I would only say to him that this government has great confidence in the future economic life of this province. We are concerned about the international

instability in terms of energy, the question of oil prices. The Leader of the Opposition may have greater confidence in what the Ayatollah may do in Iran; I don't. I'm prepared to put my confidence in an indigenous resource making available to the people of this province electricity in abundant supply so we can be competitive—

Mr. J. Reed: You don't even understand the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —so that we can provide the economic base so we can have jobs for the people of this province. I'm not minimizing the difficulty but I say to the opposition, please don't try to simplistically put it on the government that we approved or disapproved of individual projects. We are in support of Hydro doing its job to the best of its ability.

An hon. member: It's ability isn't very good.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You can quarrel with its ability. You can quarrel with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something else now that I have been provoked. It's great to second guess. We all have 20-20 hindsight. The Leader of the Opposition has this in abundance. But I would say to him that in spite of any overcapacity, the fact is the residential consumers in this province are still obtaining electrical energy at a lower price than in any competing jurisdiction in North America, with the exception of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Van Horne: In spite of that it's 40 per cent higher than it should be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that has to be re-stated time and time again. I look at the distinguished member to the leader's right who is concerned about Atikokan and I understand it.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Is the Premier saying that the cabinet did not deal with this project by project, and does he not recall having to pass an order in council for every single project of Hydro. Did they not even consider it? Was it cabinet's decision to overrule the Treasury's forecast, which was considerably lower than Hydro's forecast at the time? If, when doing this, the reason the cabinet overruled the Treasury itself was because the cabinet anticipated difficulty in the Middle East, can the Premier possibly tell the people of Ontario what form of protection we get against the Iranian oil problem by having excess unused Hydro generation capacity? What type of substitution for oil does he anticipate will take place?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, one thing I'd make obvious to the Leader of the Opposition is that to a certain extent Hydro's generating capacity does relate to the price of oil—to a certain extent, and not Iranian oil, I acknowledge that. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, who has expressed his concern about the overcapacity which means some cents per week for the consumer, under his policy of world price for oil, every time a dollar is put on the barrel it is \$300 million to the consumers of this province. Why doesn't he start putting things in perspective and understand it?

I had no insights into what was going to happen in the Middle East; I don't think anybody did.

Mr. Van Horne: You should, you spent enough time travelling around over there.

Mr. J. Reed: You were there.

Mr. Kerrio: What did you go for?

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I think anybody who for the past four years has not understood that the world supply of energy, whether it's oil or natural gas or electricity, is vulnerable and is volatile, and that we should be making every effort to have security of electrical energy related to an indigenous resource available to the people of this province, I would say with respect to the Leader of the Opposition, is not discharging his responsibility in an appropriate fashion.

I'd say something else. We've had forecasts from Treasury; we've had forecasts from Hydro. It is the easiest thing in the world to start second guessing those people who have responsibility. It was not a question of overruling or disregarding the forecasts of Treasury at all. We take all of the information that is available to us, but under the existing situation, which was approved by the members of this House—

Mr. Warner: Hydro's out of control. Why don't you bring Hydro under public control?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I recall some of the debates in this House when the Power Corporation Act was passed, that responsibility ultimately lies with Ontario Hydro.

Mr. J. Reed: Guess who voted against it.

Mr. Warner: If you can't do that, you should resign; get out of here. Put it under public control.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, they have on balance, historically, traditionally, done it very well. And please, when the member goes to Scarborough West the next time, when he talks about rates, please tell the residents there the truth. Tell them that they are paying less than in Detroit,

that they are paying less than they are in Cleveland, New York City; any competing jurisdiction in North America.

Mr. Makarchuk: But those are private enterprises.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the Premier saying that cents per day, per person in the province of Ontario are insignificant; because if that's the case, has he read the speech by his own Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) just the other day to the municipal electrical utilities, where he estimated that three cents a day was equal to overcharging by Hydro by \$100 million a year because of misestimates in the past? Is the Premier saying there is nothing to be made of \$100 million that people are paying in excess charges by Hydro today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will say this for the leader of the New Democratic Party and his party, at least there is some measure of consistency, unlike the Liberals on this issue.

I am concerned about three cents a day. I am concerned about 21 cents a week. I am concerned about anything the consumer is paying, but I do re-emphasize that the capacity of Hydro, in terms of forecasts, et cetera, one can debate in the House, but the fact remains the consumer in this province is still paying less than in most comparable or competing jurisdictions. Where I have great difficulty in understanding the policies opposite, is where they are prepared to go to world price for oil, which at \$1 a barrel, and in today's market that doesn't seem too difficult to achieve, but in a matter of 48 hours represents \$300 million to the consumers of this province.

Mr. J. Reed: It's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has no conception whatsoever of the technical aspects of transferring, of using electric power—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. J. Reed: —as some kind of hedge against the shortage of oil. Now I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: Please put it.

Mrs. Campbell: I wish you would keep the Premier in order.

Mr. Speaker: It is not the responsibility of the Premier to ask questions. Just answer them.

Mr. J. Reed: Is the Premier not aware that his own ministry has done a forecast for electric power growth in Ontario a full one per cent per year lower than Hydro's forecast, which the Premier seems to accept holus-bolus? Does he not also realize that

this jurisdiction, among all of the jurisdictions in North America, is the highest?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of all of the load forecasts in every jurisdiction in North America. I must confess that to the honourable member.

Mr. J. Reed: He should be aware of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am aware that there is perhaps a differential in terms of the forecast of Ontario Hydro and the Ministry of Energy. I understand that the load forecast for Ontario Hydro is 4.1 and the ministry's is 3.7, something of that nature. I understand from discussions that took place in the committee that the committee itself hasn't really assessed the differential between the two load forecasts. I would say with respect, Mr. Speaker, the members of this House will look forward to being informed by the members of the select committee as to a rationalization.

As I recall the criteria that went into the load forecast of the Ministry of Energy—I can't speak for Hydro—there were some 1,500 assumptions that are made, I would say with respect to the very distinguished member, when you are predicting on the basis of 1,500 assumptions, some of which may not necessarily be right, that one has to be very careful in saying the Ministry of Energy is correct and Ontario Hydro is wrong. I think, with respect Mr. Speaker, surely that's not what the select committee is looking for in any event. Surely we are looking for a reasonable load forecast. For me to get up here and say that I have the exact figure, Mr. Speaker—unlike the distinguished member from Halton hills, I don't pretend to have that ability; and with respect neither does he.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier, since Ontario Hydro now has an excess generating capacity of upwards of 4,000 megawatts and the government has asked it to seek markets in the United States, if possible on a firm contract basis, in order to use this; would the Premier not agree that the government shares with Hydro the responsibility for building that excess generating capacity beyond its necessary reserves, because the government authorized each one of those plants, even in defiance of the lower forecast that TEIGA was presenting?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Davis: What the distinguished member for York South is suggesting is somewhat more understandable and logical than some of the observations I have heard

on this issue to date. What I really think he is saying is, should we, out of general revenues, in order to retain the ongoing growth of Ontario Hydro, with the possibility that we may need it more rapidly than even some of the forecasters say and knowing the vulnerability of this jurisdiction with respect to energy supply, should we offset some of the costs to Hydro through general taxation revenues rather than through rates?

Mr. MacDonald: I didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member was suggesting that. It was implicit in what he said. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we await the select committee's recommendations.

Mr. MacDonald: Could I put my question? That's a good answer to a question I didn't ask.

My question is this: Since Hydro admittedly has a generating capacity of upwards of 4,000 megawatts beyond the reserve they need, and it is scrambling for markets for that in the United States so that the burden can be lessened on the consumers in this province; doesn't the government have to share responsibility for that excess generating capacity, because the government authorized each one of the plants, even though TEIGA's forecast indicated those plants wouldn't all be needed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, let's be very realistic in this chamber. Whether we assume some responsibility or not, there are some members opposite who, for whatever reasons, sometimes politically motivated, will endeavour to give us that responsibility. I am a realist and I know the member for York South, being an objective, fair-minded chairman, would never take that point of view.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, who should be paying?

Mr. MacDonald: That's what I call a snow job.

CO-PAYMENT FEES

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my second question to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health tell us, regarding his chronic care co-payment fees, whether in fact the government has now changed its mind with regard to levying this particular fee against psychiatric patients? What is the status of that plan?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I have recommended to the cabinet, based on a review of the situation and the fact that there is no easy way to deter-

mine a chronic psychiatric patient in one of our psychiatric hospitals since they are all technically active treatment beds, that we drop the plans for this charge. Also, there is, of course, the fact that those who are in homes for special care who are longer-term residents do pay the same co-payment as both nursing home, and as of April 1, active-treatment chronic care.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, welcoming as I do this decision on the part of the minister, can the minister explain why it was he announced this plan in the first place? Did he not study these matters properly before sending all sorts of announcements out to the public of Ontario, frightening the people who are in hospital, frightening their families? Does the minister not take some time to study his plans and the recommendations of his ministry before inflicting them on the public; and then withdrawing them later, tail between his legs?

Mr. Bradley: And did he check with Frank Drea?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I hadn't noticed anything behind me. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought the honourable member would have commended any ministry that, on examination, finding the effect of a plan to be unworkable, did withdraw it. At the outset the purpose was to maintain fairness and equity between active physical care and psychiatric care. It was found to be unworkable without creating a great deal of bureaucratic nonsense in the psychiatric hospitals, so it has been dropped.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister, using the same fine rationale and for the very same reasons, would now get rid of his chronic care deterrent fee as well?

Mr. Speaker: That is not supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: May I answer it? I would love to answer it, Mr. Speaker. I would love to ask them to tell me about the caucus they had last October before their members signed the select committee report on behalf of the party. I would like to ask them what happened in the debate last November in this House on the select committee report. I would like to ask where that member was in the standing committee on social development—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It is the minister's function to answer questions, not ask them.

Mr. Conway: A supplementary on the psychiatric charge to which the Leader of the Opposition directed his attention: Can the minister point to any recommendation for that psychiatric charge that he did introduce?

I am aware of the recommendations that called for the chronic user charge, but where in the ministry or elsewhere was there a specific recommendation for that psychiatric charge that was made part of the package?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would take the recommendation of the select committee, of which the honourable member was a member, to cover all types of care, inasmuch as you did refer to nursing home care, in which in fact special care residents are from time to time housed.

HYDRO LOAD FORECASTS

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Minister of Energy. In view of the fact that the government is now estimating that the cost of overcapacity at Hydro is costing the consumers \$100 million a year; and in view of the fact that Hydro says itself that a one per cent error in forecasting future growth demand will wind up costing the consumers of this province half a billion dollars a year in power charges; will the minister direct Hydro to produce forecasts of future demand which are much more reliable than those we have had revealed in recent weeks before Hydro makes its decisions about future system expansion?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Perhaps I could start off by pointing out—

Mr. Makarchuk: It's hard to stop you once you start.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You have got to rebuild the system.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —that the figures that are being talked about at the moment are not quite the same. That is the Ministry of Energy's forecast, so-called, members of the committee will recall, was not presented to the committee as an energy forecast but as an energy demand model for all kinds of energy in the province. That is being compared to Ontario Hydro's load forecasts for peak demand for the east system. There are a great many suppositions that are involved in those two things which are quite different and they are not comparable prognostications. In fact the energy demand models showed a number of scenarios, in the current jargon.

Moving on from that—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I say, Mr. Speaker, moving right along: I think Ontario Hydro's own forecasters, or main forecaster, has indicated that a forecast for a 20 or 30 year period is a very difficult thing to do.

Mr. Makarchuk: Is that the forecast of the first part or the forecast of the second part?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Start from the beginning, Jim.

Mr. Makarchuk: Start again.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is a great straight line, but I'll avoid it.

In fact, our people and Hydro are looking at the suppositions that were made on which both forecasts—the electrical parts of our forecasts and the Hydro load forecasts—were made. I am sure that since the committee is also doing a forecast, and I see that Dr. Porter is going to be doing a forecast, we will have a variety to look at pretty soon.

Mr. Samis: You make Jim Taylor look like a piker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't you ask a supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: I have listened with care to the obscure comments of the minister, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, he is saying he rejects the forecast prepared by his ministry because it looked at all energy demands in the province, and that he prefers to look at a forecast prepared by Hydro because it only looks at electricity.

I would ask the minister does he, having rejected the advice of his own experts in the ministry, also reject the comments that were made just last week by the distinguished professor of electrical engineering, Dr. Arthur Porter, who was the chairman of the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning, who said that he found Ontario Hydro's submissions on forecasting were inadequate on several grounds, not least because they were extremely difficult to understand.

If even Dr. Porter doesn't know what the devil Hydro is doing, will the minister say why the government is telling Hydro to go full steam ahead, on the basis of forecasts which are extraordinarily suspect and may well be grossly wrong, at a cost of billions of dollars to the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I was not talking about our Hydro load forecast; I was talking about the energy demand model—and they are different.

Secondly, I did not say that I was not accepting the advice of my own ministry's staff; I think it is quite competent.

Thirdly, there is a supposition around—

Mr. J. Reed: Just say you don't know.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and the one set of figures that I haven't got with me is that of the various dates when the various projects which are being discussed were actually approved by cabinet. My recollection, though

—and I'll correct it if I'm wrong—is that all of them were approved in principle prior to 1974.

The honourable members will recall that in the world of building large power plants—like a lot of other large things—from the time you decide that you should do it until the time you have got it finished is anywhere from 10 to 12 years.

In fact, in Hydro's experience, prior to environmental assessment and things such as problems in getting transmission lines built, they used to operate on a basis of about 10 years to start and, after they were down the road about two years to three years, the thing was committed. By that time they were into contracts and so on. In all fairness, we are now looking at decisions that were made at least 10 years ago. That's why I say seriously that the matter of forecasting is by no means an exact science.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Isn't it true that the reason the ministry and the government have not imposed any kind of policy framework on Hydro is in fact that they can't, that the Power Corporation Act does not allow them to impose policy? And isn't it a fact that back in 1974—and I see the Premier shifting in his seat—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not. I haven't moved an inch.

Mr. J. Reed: —he apparently stated in a press release that one of the first priorities of the directorate of Ontario Hydro was to accept government policy, and that, in fact, has never happened; that has not taken place since the inception of the Power Corporation Act; and that the government—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. J. Reed: —and that, because that is not there, the government has simply ignored Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, has he taken account of the testimony of chairman Taylor of Hydro that, by his own admission, we may be into a vicious circle—this was also backed up by the testimony of Mr. Higgins, the load forecaster for Hydro—where we overproject demand for hydro, costs rise because we have excess capacity, then demand is lower because the cost has gone up, and so on and so on?

Has the minister taken a look at that theory of the vicious circle, which I believe we're on, and what is his feeling about that theory?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The honourable member is now really relating the energy demand model

which I think she saw in the select committee—

Ms. Gigantes: No. Talk to Mr. Higgins.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —which looked at a number of the factors that could switch people from one form of energy to another, as well as the use. There are a great many factors; price is certainly one of them.

If I may get off the subject of electricity and use gas as an analogy, every time the price of gas has gone up we find that there are more reserves available because they now are economical to develop. The same thing works in reverse: As the price of one form of energy goes up, people move to another. That has happened in heating oil and gas, for instance. It has certainly happened in a great many fields.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Given that as of January 1, 1979, all the 35 doctors in the Peterborough Medical Clinic have opted out of OHIP, and given that a significant percentage of the remaining doctors in Peterborough are also opted-out has the minister any plans to intervene in that situation?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the Peterborough situation is one that I follow very closely inasmuch as the member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner) is my parliamentary assistant. At this point, I would have to say there is no indication of a need to intervene in any way.

Mr. Breagh: Seventy per cent are opted-out, and there is no need?

Mr. McClellan: What's the limit? Ninety per cent?

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary: Given the fact that about a year ago, on April 14, the minister said that "if the numbers of opted-out physicians begin to threaten the universality of the health system, then we will intervene," does he not consider that the fact that 50 per cent to 70 per cent of physicians in the Peterborough area, overall, are opted-out constitutes a threat to universality and therefore warrants intervention by this government?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me comment on the accuracy of the NDP. If I stray a bit, according to the new House rules, I beg your indulgence, but I am getting a little sick and tired of the distortions coming from that party.

Mr. Mackenzie: We know the minister is sick and tired. He shows it in his actions.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will grant, sir, that the level of opting-out in Peterborough county is higher than in any other area of the province. It is not 50 to 70 per cent. In point of fact, last month it went down a little bit, because a doctor opted back in, strangely enough.

Mr. Cassidy: What is it?

Mr. Foulds: What is it for the province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I could perhaps talk about the press release that went out today from the member for Hamilton East. We had a call from the controller of the hospital he talked about, refuting what was said in that release. I could perhaps refer to the press release last week about the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, alleging certain things to have happened which did not happen. I am getting just a little sick and tired of this inaccuracy.

Mr. Samis: That is not in the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let me just refer the member to his party's green paper on health care; this perhaps explains the whole thing. His party's green paper on health care says: "Notions of health must reflect human and political values." Clearly, all these distortions of fact that are coming from that party are reflecting his party's political values.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I would ask the minister either to substantiate any comments like that or to withdraw that language, which is unparliamentary and should not belong here.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted. Where would the member like me to start? Shall we start with the press release today on Hamilton? Shall we start with Hamilton?

Mr. MacDonald: With Peterborough.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Differences of opinion do not constitute points of privilege or points of order.

A new question.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: No. A new question.

Mr. Cassidy: That was only my first supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A new question.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health regarding the

health cost restraint program and, more particularly, the hospital bed reduction part of his program; and I am pleased that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) shares our concern, according to a CFRB report this morning.

In arriving at his formula of 3.5 beds per 1,000 population, why did he not take into consideration such matters as the operational efficiency of those hospitals which have already trimmed any fat to the bone and the makeup of the population in the various areas of Ontario, firstly taking into consideration the higher percentage of senior citizens in areas such as Huron and Bruce, compared to the provincial average, and, secondly, the tremendous seasonal increase in the population of those areas, which attract thousands of tourists who also require the services of hospitals from time to time?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the honourable member perhaps take a look at the material which I believe was sent to all MPPs—or MLAs, depending upon the point of view—entitled *The Active Treatment Bed Allocation Method*. If he will look at that—I believe it was sent to his office—he will find that we do take into account, in the referral population compilations, age factors and, of course, the actual utilization of a given hospital from whatever municipalities surround it. With respect, if the member takes a look at that, he will see that is covered. So the actual utilization of a hospital is taken into account.

As regards the other part of the question—basically, the member is talking about the peer groupings among hospitals—we did, over the last year to year and a half, try to come up with some means of tying hospital budgets to the peer groupings that compare hospitals in terms of admissions per 1,000, in terms of average length of stay, in terms of staff days per patient and any number of things. Frankly, we weren't able to come up with something that wasn't going to be a bureaucratic nightmare.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What do you think this is?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What we decided to do instead, recognizing, first of all, that the four beds per thousand standard in the south and the four-and-a-half beds per thousand standard in the north has been in place since 1972 and the 3.5 and four beds per thousand standard, in place for a year, was to begin this year to tie the budget to those bed-planning standards based on the referral populations and with reference to beds actually in service last fall and to ask the hospital association and the Association of Teaching Hospital Administrators to work

with us in developing an entirely new budget formula. Again, if the member will refer back to my January 19 statement, we would like to build in more and more incentives to reward efficiency and to provide the incentive to find ways to save money. Clearly, many hospitals have shown and are showing that there are many ingenious ways, where the incentive is there, to save money.

Mr. Warner: While patients suffer.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister sure hasn't convinced the hospital boards, the doctors, and other people in the medical profession that any rationale was used in that formula.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Riddell: Does the minister not have enough faith in the hospital boards to permit them to make the decisions as to how they can operate within their budgets without penalizing them through hospital bed reductions? Is it his policy to prohibit any private financial support for the operation and administration of public hospitals so that beds might remain open and staff retained?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, the whole system depends on the volunteer hospital boards. Unlike the people to the member's left, we believe in—and I hope the member does too—the worth of the volunteer hospital board for each of the hospitals. In point of fact, the decision is left to each hospital board to determine how it will live within this year's budget.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Or die.

Mr. Nixon: Starve or die, one of the two.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: When we decided to tie it to the bed-planning standards, it was on the basis of taking off the top the incremental cost per bed—not the full cost per bed, because if we did that it would be somewhere in the order of \$20,000 to \$30,000, and in some hospitals \$35,000, a year. We took it off the average incremental cost.

The decision as to how to operate the hospital and apportion it within the hospital is, in fact, with the individual hospital board.

I think it would be folly for any hospital to think it can plan to use private funds on a long-term basis. Clearly, the intent of the budget formula is to treat all hospitals in the province equally and equitably to maintain a high level of service.

Let me just say one other thing that bears repeating: In tying the budget formula to the bed allocation formulas, one point seems to be missed quite often by the media and by the rest of us. That is that we're talking

about moving towards a reduced number of treatment beds, but making provision, as was mentioned in Her Honour's remarks on Tuesday, for expansion of chronic and/or extended care facilities where they are needed.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That's not taking place.

Mrs. Campbell: That doesn't happen.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That work is already under way in most parts of the province.

LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. To quote the Reverend Frank Drea, "Enough is enough."

An hon. member: The irreverent.

Mr. Lawlor: "Budget cuts to hospitals are beginning to hurt the quality of service and it's time to start easing up."

Mr. Breaugh: We are with you.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that is not what I said.

Mr. Renwick: What did you say?

Mr. Lawlor: Does the Minister of Health disagree with his colleague's statement; and, in view of his own McKinsey report recommending the necessary retention of Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, what justification can there possibly be for his arbitrary decision to close it?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege before the minister answers the question—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You're not a reverend?

Hon. Mr. Drea: —I don't know where the member got that from but I did not say that.

Mr. M. N. Davison: Check the tape.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I spoke in Hamilton last night. I was asked a question which particularly applied to hospitals.

Mr. Foulds: It is too bad you answered it.

Mr. McClellan: You should have kept your mouth shut.

Hon. Mr. Drea: What I said is, if a hospital, large or small, can demonstrate that its quality of service is being affected, then the Minister of Health, as he has done in the past, is prepared to make individual adjustments. That is why I am very proud that this government has the finest-quality health care in the world.

Mr. Warner: You can't wiggle out of this one.

Mr. Mackenzie: You shot from the hip again and you got caught.

Mr. Lawlor: It's a direct quote.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health has the answer to the question from the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I thought that sounded pretty good. Does that mean I can disagree with what the member said the minister said? I guess I can because he didn't say it.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: To go back to the statement I made on January 22, which I think is fairly clear, in outlining the steps which led to that announcement of the government's intention to close the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital on September 1 of this year, I can only say, as I said then, it was not an easy decision clearly. But given the condition of the building, the capacity available in modern—in fact, new facilities—at Queen Street Mental Health Centre, additional capacity available at Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, the fact that capital funds are not likely to be available into the 1980s for more than one hospital to be rebuilt—and both are in bad condition—and the fact that Whitby Psychiatric Hospital serves an area that goes as far east, if I remember correctly, as the Hastings-Peterborough county line and as far north as Victoria and Haliburton—

Mr. Eakins: A great area.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: A great Tory area.

Mr. Nixon: It may be federally.

Mr. Martel: Is there a difference?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —while it was a difficult decision, it seemed to me that the alternatives were not acceptable.

Mr. McClellan: It would have been easier if it was a Tory area, would it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The alternatives were to leave the hospital as it is or to try to continue to patch up what is clearly an unacceptable facility.

Mr. Lawlor: Supplementary: Is the minister totally inflexible about this closing or would he be open to an alternative proposal with respect to a phased or staged replacement, say, over five years, of the facilities at Lakeshore?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Looking ahead to the future, it is difficult to predict what the exact needs are going to be in five to 10 years. If one had asked us, let us say 10 or 12 years back from now, what the needs would be, the chances are any prediction that would have been made would have been quite inaccurate. A decade or more

ago, we had about 16,000 people in psychiatric hospitals in this province. We now have just over 4,000. So any prediction one might have made in 1967, 1968 or 1969 would probably have been dead wrong.

I don't like to seem inflexible, but let me just say that I don't see that the facts have changed. The capacity is still there at Queen Street and at Hamilton. We still have an antiquated building at Lakeshore. I don't intend ever to have another phone call, the likes of which I had last November at the time of the fire, in which a person died in that facility.

The capital funds are not going to be available into the 1980s to build two hospitals. Cabinet has agreed to make them available to build one. I don't see that the facts have changed.

Mr. Foulds: We can build hydro plants.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I just want to say the decision would have to stand.

Mr. Warner: The minister is inflexible.

Mr. Gaunt: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Dealing with the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital?

Mr. Gaunt: Dealing with the initial question of my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: That is what the initial question was. Do you have a supplementary?

Mr. Gaunt: The initial question was with reference to the statement of the minister, the member for Scarborough Centre, in which he stated that individual adjustments would be made.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I did not make it.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to relate my questions to those individual adjustments, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead. Try it.

Hon. Mr. Drea: They have been made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for Huron-Bruce making an adjustment?

Mr. Gaunt: Since the referral population of Bruce county is 13.3 per cent, I believe, constituted of people over 65 years of age, and the same figure in Huron county is 12.9, would the minister, in view of the fact that the chronic bed situation across the province is not being relieved up until this point—

Mr. Speaker: That is not supplementary. That is really stretching it. I would have to disallow that.

[3:00]

Mr. Gaunt: What steps would the minister advise the hospitals to take in order to see that this chronic bed situation is relieved?

Mr. Speaker: No, a new question.

DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION

Mr. Watson: I have a question of the Minister of Housing. In view of the fact that the Ministry of Housing is responsible for the downtown redevelopment policy and programs of the government and in view of the fact that the city of Chatham along with other cities in Ontario has made application to the ministry under this redevelopment program, could the minister advise the House as to the status of this program? Specifically, could the minister advise me as to the status of the application of the city of Chatham with regard to funds for this program?

Mr. Foulds: Darcy McKeough never had to answer questions like that.

Mr. Laughren: He went ahead and did it.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The downtown revitalization program has been one of the most successful programs that we've implemented in assisting municipalities in redeveloping the downtown cores and trying to improve the assessment position.

Mr. Warner: You read that well.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: In the last two or three years we have allocated some 30-odd millions of dollars and, more specifically in the case of Cornwall, \$8½ million in the redevelopment of that particular community.

At the moment, we have about 16 or 17 applications that are on our primary list for review and development. In the case of Chatham, and I might say Sault Ste. Marie, which are likely the two closest to being completed at this time, we hope that with the continuation of the negotiations between our—

An hon. member: That is a pork barrel.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'll tell members, if it's a pork barrel, the opposition ridings have done very well out of it, I can assure them.

My ministry will continue to negotiate with Chatham and the others to try to come to a conclusion. Just today I was in touch with the city of Chatham and the council advising them that we hope they'll continue their negotiations and that the provision of funding will come forward very shortly.

FUNDING OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Sweeney: I have a question of the Premier. Given that the federal government

is going to be transferring to this government \$88 million of new dollars for post-secondary education, how can the Premier explain that his government is only authorizing the transfer of \$55 million of new dollars to the Ontario universities and colleges? Where did the other \$33 million go?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know what the member means by new money. We've been short-changed in our transfers from Ottawa for generations. I don't know that there's any new money.

I think the member should ask a very simple question and should take a position. If he doesn't feel that we're being fair to the universities and colleges in terms of our transfers to them, let him say so. Let him get up and say a Liberal government would give them 10 per cent at the same time as it would deprive others. We are distributing to the universities and colleges of this province an equitable proportion of that which we are spending on all our various programs. I would also say, contrary to the member's point of view, we think it is not only equitable, but it will give the universities and colleges the opportunity to maintain what is an excellent, high-quality, post-secondary system.

Mr. Sweeney: Where's the rest of the money? The Premier never answered my question. He never does. This change in funding mechanism means that the province will now only bear 45 per cent of the cost compared to 51 per cent last year. Since his government has the constitutional responsibility for education, does the Premier think that sharing is appropriate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll just remind the member of a little history in terms of post-secondary education in this province, history that relates to his party.

Mr. Sweeney: Is it appropriate or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: His party was in the process some years ago under certain leadership whereby not only was there a per capita grant for students, but it was involved with the provinces in terms of technical and vocational training for the post-secondary institutions which we now call our community colleges. His good friends in Ottawa opted out and that left this province with the total responsibility for capital funding. We have done this for the past 10 years; we have assumed the total responsibility for all the capital expansion within the post-secondary field.

Mr. Van Horne: And who was the Minister of Education then?

Mr. Sweeney: We're talking about operating funds, not capital funds.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member's friends in Ottawa haven't provided a nickel. I don't know whether there is a surplus in terms of their transfer. All I know is the taxpayers of this province have provided the capital, they have provided the bulk of the operating expenses to the post-secondary institutions and they are receiving in terms of our priorities what we think is an equitable share.

If the member wants to argue with some of his colleagues on the front bench that the universities should get more and the hospitals less, let him do so at his own risk.

HOCKEY VIOLENCE

Mr. Martel: A question of the Attorney General: Because of the continued violence in hockey with fighting still condoned in many leagues and, I believe, the escalation of stick-swinging, cross-checking and slashing since the introduction of helmets and masks, would the minister agree with me that something must be done to reduce violence in hockey and to increase the development of skills?

Hon. Mr. Davis: How about verbal violence in the House?

Mr. Martel: I am never part of that.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I received a fairly lengthy and a very powerfully written letter from the member recently and I must say that I share his concerns completely. Despite the efforts of some minor hockey leagues to improve the situation so far as the removal of mindless violence, unnecessary violence, is concerned, I think there is still some distance to go. I want to say that I welcome the member's concern in this particular area because I believe it touches the lives of many thousands of young people across this country.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Would the Attorney General consider the possibility of a select committee to look into violence and make recommendations which might be introduced to improve the quality of hockey in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are more concerned about violence in the media.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, it is not my position to determine whether or not a select committee would be the appropriate vehicle, but I do believe very strongly, as does the member opposite, that there should be a forum in this Legislature

whereby the concerns of not only members of the Legislature but of many concerned citizens across this province could be expressed.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does the Attorney General recall that a study was done by request of the Legislature arising from questions that I and others asked?

Mr. Nixon: That was the Patrick Reid study.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I forget who actually wrote the thing now; the name slips my mind. But does the Attorney General not think that the situation, far from getting better since that report, has, as my honourable friend says, in fact got worse, that the violence is a part of the very funny things that go on in the hockey system in the province of Ontario with six-year-old children having to have contracts and being traded back and forth and so on and—

Mr. Speaker: That's hardly in keeping with the original question.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Well, it's violence as well, Mr. Speaker. Does he not think it is time that he, perhaps with the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz), did a study at least on their own into the whole system of hockey in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Again, Mr. Speaker, the report that the honourable member is referring to was prepared by one William McMurtry approximately five or six years ago. I commend it to all members of the Legislature as a very excellent report. I do this in the most impartial manner possible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And I want you to be sure no royalties are payable.

Mr. Cunningham: I want to hear from Mickey.

Mr. Hennessy: That's right, you will hear some sense.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: This is really a form of violence against the clock.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: All I can Mr. Speaker, is that I would welcome any initiative that would help alleviate what I do regard as a serious and a continuing problem.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Fort William have a new question?

Mr. Hennessy: I would like to question by what right has this government to get into minor hockey and to have a select committee? There is more violence and hot air that should be investigated right here in this House, never mind about that.

Mr. Speaker: That was a statement, not a question.

GRAND RIVER FLOODING

Mr. Nixon: I don't want to interfere with a possible answer from anybody in the ministry, but under your direction, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources, notice of which I gave him, having to do with the flood situation on the Grand River which caused considerable damage on Tuesday, March 6. Can he explain why the conservation authority was not able to give sufficient warning to the community so that the people and their household effects could be moved out of the way of the flood, and why the conservation authority did not take an initiative or a responsibility to break up the ice jams that caused the flooding?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the honourable member for the notice getting through. Perhaps you might permit me to read a brief report which has come to me through our conservation authorities branch from the conservation authority on the Grand River.

I am informed that the assistant general manager of the authority discussed the removal of the jam with municipal officials, recognizing the possibility of spring flooding in that area over the five-mile stretch between Paris and Brantford. The most recent meeting—there were several meetings I gather—was on Friday, March 2, when the possibility of ice rafting and river flow blockage was discussed and arrangements were made for local municipal police to maintain close surveillance.

Responsibility for issuing a flood warning was left with the municipality because flooding was expected to be local in nature and municipal staff were in a much better position to observe its development.

The January observation of the ice jam led to the conclusion that because of the extent of the jam, it was not feasible to attempt to remove it by dynamiting. Under low flow conditions which existed at that time, dynamiting was seen as merely transferring the problem somewhere downstream. As a matter of policy the authority does not undertake ice jam removal by dynamiting. In this particular instance, conservation authority officials discussed the advisability of this method of removal and left responsibility and liability with the municipality.

From the report I have from my staff, it appears that the municipality did not request assistance to cope with the flood emergency because it did not escalate beyond the

capability of the municipality to deal with it.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Does the minister not agree that it is beyond the capability of a relatively small municipality to undertake the kind of dynamiting that surely would obviously lie with the responsibility of the river authority? It can't be done without their permission. Would he not feel, particularly since this has now happened a few days ago, that we should undertake some direction to see that it does not happen again, if this is possible, and that the government would give every assurance to the community of the kind of financial support that is going to be necessary to assist the people who were injured and had their goods damaged through no fault of their own?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I got this report a few minutes before I came to the House. I must say that in reading it the inference I take is that the authority discussed with the municipality what might be done, and was under the impression that the municipality was going to carry out whatever it was decided was necessary. However, it is not clear, and I had asked for a little further information about this, which I will convey to the honourable members as soon as I get it. If it appears there is something we should be doing in connection with the arrangements we make each year—as the honourable member knows, the minister writes to heads of all municipalities and all the conservation authorities—we give twice-monthly snow moisture content reports and we have a pretty good warning system, but it may well be that there can be some improvements made.

[3:15]

HURONIA REGIONAL CENTRE

Mr. McClellan: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services, arising from his statement. Mr. Speaker, while it is difficult to get the sense of what the minister was saying in the first and sixth paragraphs on the first page, if you remove the subordinate clauses, he stated that the police report concluded that there was evidence to suggest resident abuse and there was limited corroboration of allegation. I want to ask the minister if he will table the police report, making provision, of course, for anonymity; but I want to ask him to table that report so we can understand what in the hell is going on there.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have considered that possibility and, at the present time, I have been advised by the crown law officers that the status of the report is such that it ought

not to be made a public document. I can assure the honourable member that the reference in that paragraph does relate to the fact that there were allegations. There certainly were allegations, as has been indicated for some time.

Mr. McClellan: You said it was evidence.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well, perhaps that was a poor choice of words. But I suppose any allegation is some evidence; the question is, whether there is any corroborating evidence—

Mr. McClellan: What did the police report conclude, then? Was there evidence or not?

Hon. Mr. Norton: —which might have given rise, either to the laying of charges by the police, or to our ministry taking specific disciplinary action against an individual.

The answer to that is no, there was not sufficient evidence of that. There were allegations that would not support that action.

VEHICLE LICENCE FEES

Mr. Blundy: I wish to ask the Premier a question. Given the substantial difference in the cost of automobile licence plate sticker renewals between northern Ontario and southern Ontario, and given the fact that I have with me petitions with the names of over 11,000 people, which will be presented at the appropriate time, is the Premier giving any consideration to rectifying the difference in treatment of the people of southern Ontario and the people of northern Ontario?

Mr. McClellan: Does the Liberal Party support this?

Mr. Martel: I like that.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the end of your party.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Where does your party stand? Where do you stand?

Mr. Conway: It is the national unity plank scaled down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the very distinguished member from Sarnia has indicated to his constituents—

Mr. Foulds: I can understand why they have so few seats up north.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that it would be Liberal Party policy to have licence fees the same across the province. This is the report I get from that great municipality. In that I assume he is speaking for the Liberal Party. That party would, in fact,—

Mr. Eaton: What is the matter, Pat?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —not try to find some way to equalize opportunity in this province; would not try to find some way to recognize

the transportation difficulties and the problems confronting the people in northern Ontario. His party is so oriented obviously, today, to Metro; tomorrow, who knows where, geographically?

I would have to say to the member for Sarnia, no, we are not contemplating it. The rationale is very simple. It is understood, I hope by all of us. We are attempting, as a government, and we are using this vehicle, to recognize that there are certain problems related to northern Ontario, which, unfortunately, your party has failed to recognize. And that's why you have one seat in the House here from the north; and that's probably all you'll ever get.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, two. Sorry. That's all you'll ever get.

Mr. Conway: Merle Dickerson is still in North Bay.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mr. Bounsall: On a point of privilege, I am very concerned about the situation here today. This being International Women's Day, are we not going to revert to "Statements by the Ministry" so that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie) may announce some new legislative initiative in this field, none of which is planned for at all?

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member knows that is not a point of privilege.

PETITION

VEHICLE LICENCE FEES

Mr. Blundy: I have over 10,000 names on a petition addressed to the Premier—including the name of the mayor of Sarnia, who was my competitor in the last election, running for the Tory government—and 400 letters from people on the same topic. I would like to present it on their behalf.

REPORTS

STANDING RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Havrot from the standing resources development committee presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee recommends that the annual report of the Ministry of the Environment for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, be referred again to the committee in order that consideration of this report may be completed by the committee.

Your committee further recommends that the annual report of the Ontario Highway Transport Board for 1977 be referred again to the committee in order that consideration of this report may be completed by the committee.

Report adopted.

STANDING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Philip from the standing administration of justice committee presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill 74, An Act to establish a Code of Procedure for Provincial Offences.

Bill 75, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Report adopted.

Ordered for committee of the whole House.

MOTIONS

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the member for Humber (Mr. MacBeth) be appointed Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole House for this session.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the following standing committees be established for this session with power to examine and inquire into all such matters as may be referred to them by the House, with power to send for persons, papers and things as provided in section 35 of the Legislative Assembly Act:

General government committee: Messrs. Ashe, Charlton, Duszta, Epp, Handleman, Hennessy, Hodgson, Laughren, Mancini, McCaffrey, McEwen, McGuigan and Samis, Mrs. Scrivener, and Messrs. G. E. Smith and Turner;

Resources development committee: Mr. Bolan, Ms. Bryden, Messrs. di Santo, Eaton, Foulds, Havrot, Johnson, Lane, McNeil, J. Reed, Riddell, Van Horne, Villeneuve, Watson, Wildman and Yakabuski;

Administration of justice committee: Mr. Bradley, Mrs. Campbell, Messrs. Cureatz, Kerr, Lupusella, Philip, Renwick, Rotenberg, Roy, Sterling, Stong, Swart, G. Taylor, J. A. Taylor, Williams and Ziemba.

Social development committee: Messrs. Belanger, Blundy, Cooke and Gaunt, Ms. Gigantes, Messrs. Grande, Jones, Kennedy,

Kerrio, Leluk, McClellan, O'Neil, Pope, Ramsay, Rowe and Sweeney;

Public accounts committee: Messrs. Germa, Hall, Handelman, Leluk, Mackenzie, Makarchuk, Peterson, Pope, Ramsay, T. P. Reid, Sargent and G. Taylor.

The report of the provincial auditor for 1977-78 and the public accounts for 1977-78 are referred to the public accounts committee.

The standing statutory instruments committee is appointed for the session, to be the committee provided for by section 12 of the Regulations Act, and has the terms of reference as set out in that section, and the said committee, in addition to those powers, shall review and consider, first, the role of the committee, with particular reference to the recommendations of the select committee on the fourth and fifth reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature, and the practices of the parliaments of Canada and the United Kingdom; and, secondly, the establishment of guidelines to be observed in the delegation by statutes of power to make statutory instruments and the use made of such delegated power.

The said committee is to report its recommendations to the House and, in addition to the normal powers of the standing committees to send for persons, papers and things, it shall have the power to employ counsel and such other staff as the committee considers necessary.

The committee shall be composed of eight members as follows: Messrs. Cureatz, M. N. Davison, Eakins, McCaffrey, McKessock, Rollins, Swart and Williams.

That the standing members' services committee be appointed for the session to examine the services to members from time to time and, without interfering with the statutory responsibility of the Board of Internal Economy in such matters, the committee is empowered to recommend to the consideration of the House matters it wishes to draw to the special attention of the board, and that the committee be empowered to act as an advisory committee to Mr. Speaker and to the Board of Internal Economy on the administration of the House and on the provision of services and facilities to members, and to draw the special attention of the House to such matters as the committee believes require it.

The committee shall be composed of eight members as follows: Mr. Bounsall, Mrs. Campbell, Messrs. Conway, Jones, B. Newman, G. E. Smith, Watson and Young.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved, unless otherwise ordered, that substitution be permitted on all standing committees, provided that notice of substitution is given to the chairman of the committee prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETING

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the procedural affairs committee be authorized to meet concurrently with the House this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX ACT

Hon. Mr. Henderson moved first reading of Bill 2, An Act respecting the County of Middlesex.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Riddell: Is that pertaining to the good old court house, Lorne?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, sir.

Mr. Riddell: That's the way to go.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this section is to vest the title of the lands described in the schedule in the corporation of the county of Middlesex in fee simple. The lands were granted to the county in 1868, subject to a trust that the lands be used for the purpose of a county jail and courthouse. The lands are no longer required for such purpose.

Section 2: this provision will enable the Minister of Government Services to make a grant to the corporation of the county of Middlesex to assist the county in financing the cost of restoring the former county courthouse.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bounsall moved first reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, this bill would establish equal pay for work of equal value and ensure that no discrimination, or differential in pay, can occur on the basis of sex.

The present Employment Standards Act establishes only that there be equal pay for men and women when performing substantially the same work. This bill therefore would eliminate the all-too-common situation

where jobs filled only by women and which are of higher skill, effort and responsibility, have a lower pay rate than jobs filled by men working for the same employer. It would require an employment standards officer to assess the value of the work performed and would allow a differential to pertain between employees on the basis of seniority or quantity of production only.

This legislation is long overdue, Mr. Speaker. Discrimination in pay on the basis of sex must end.

[3:30]

NON-UNIONIZED WORKERS RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill 4, An Act respecting the Rights of Non-Unionized Workers.

Motion agreed to.

An hon. member: Somehow I don't think that will pass.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the explanatory note for this bill is: The purpose of the bill is to provide a low-cost mechanism whereby a non-unionized worker may obtain a review by the Ontario Labour Relations Board where the worker is discharged or otherwise disciplined for cause and the contract of employment is silent on matters of discipline. At the present time, a non-unionized worker who is dismissed or otherwise disciplined for cause may have no right of action against his employer, notwithstanding the fact that the discipline is, having regard to all of the circumstances, unduly harsh.

The bill provides a two-stage process for reviewing complaints involving harsh discipline. Initially, a labour relations officer would be appointed to effect a settlement which would be reduced to writing and which would have to be complied with according to its terms. If no settlement is reached, or where a settlement is not likely, the Ontario Labour Relations Board would inquire into the matter. The board, if satisfied that the complaint is justified, will have the power to make an order substituting such penalty as is just and reasonable in the circumstances.

PITS AND QUARRIES CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Warner moved first reading of Bill 5, An Act to amend the Pits and Quarries Control Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide power to the Minister

of Natural Resources to fill in hazardous abandoned pits and quarries, and thereby redress a serious problem in the province of Ontario.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill 6, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the explanatory note is: The purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism whereby the Lieutenant Governor in Council can order a 60-day suspension of a strike or lockout and order a return to work where the strike or lockout constitutes an immediate and serious danger to life, health or safety, or seriously disrupts the economy of the province or any area of the province.

The bill provides that the Minister of Labour must appoint a conciliation officer where an order suspending a strike or lockout has been made and may subsequently appoint a conciliation board where the efforts of the conciliation officer to effect a collective agreement are unsuccessful. If conciliation efforts are unsuccessful, a strike or lockout may be resumed without a further strike vote. An order made under the bill would be enforceable as an order of the Supreme Court.

MOTION TO SUSPEND NORMAL BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I have received a notice under section 34 of the standing orders from the honourable Leader of the Opposition that he wants to suspend the ordinary business of the House for a matter of urgent public importance.

The Leader of the Opposition, for up to five minutes.

Mr. S. Smith: The Premier has just said that he agrees to the suspension. If all three parties agree, then I don't have to make the speech.

Mr. Foulds: You've got to make your arguments.

Mr. S. Smith: I will continue with my speech.

Mr. Speaker: Under standing order 34, each party has the right to put up a spokesman for up to five minutes, at which time—

Mr. Nixon: The NDP has not agreed.

Mr. Speaker: If there isn't that concurrence, we will hear the Leader of the Opposition for up to five minutes.

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will try to be brief.

The members are undoubtedly aware that the motion of which I gave you notice, sir, says that the matter of urgent public importance is the failure of the province to provide the funds necessary to avert the fare increase of the Toronto Transit Commission. We regard this to be of urgency because of the decline in ridership, which has been noticeable for some time, and the fact that a fare increase is expected to accelerate that decline.

The falling ridership jeopardizes, in our view, the long-term viability of the transit system in Ontario's largest municipality, the decline of which would have serious energy use and financial implications for all citizens of Ontario.

The Metropolitan government has agreed to match the required additional provincial contribution. Toronto is asking, not for special treatment but for equal treatment with other large municipalities of Ontario. And, of course, without the additional funds, the fares will increase on March 12, 1979. That was the substance of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

What I would care to say, in defending the need for this emergency debate on the matter, is basically that the urgency stems from the fact that the fares are to go up imminently.

The fact of the matter is we have not had a chance in this Legislature to debate the question of this particular additional allocation of funds for the TTC. Although we have raised it, as you know, in question period, in press conferences, by newsletter, by open letters to the Premier and so on, we haven't yet had a chance to debate this matter. In view of the imminence of the fare increase, it seems to us an urgent matter to discuss in the House at this time.

During this few minutes while we debate whether or not we are going to have an emergency debate, I want to make clear that this is not just a question of the nickel which everyone has spoken about. Hardship as that may be for certain people in society, that is not the primary problem. The primary problem is that ridership has been declining in the Toronto Transit Commission situation for the last several years.

This declining ridership is not a situation which finds its parallel in some of the other large municipal areas in Ontario. Toronto is in a unique position because of its very size, because of its megalopolis-like character. The fact of the matter is we have experience in other jurisdictions which indicates that, once ridership begins to decline on a steady basis, a fare increase leading to a further decline

in ridership might just be the signal indicating an imminent downward spiral.

What happens is that you increase the fares, ridership further declines and, consequently, the fare box revenue declines. That leads either to further decisions to increase fares or difficulty in maintaining services, or even conscious decisions to decrease services. Little by little, you have a downward spiral affecting mass transit.

Surely, when we are thinking now of problems for the future, when we think of the enormous amount of capital funds already put into the TTC by every taxpayer of Ontario, it does not make sense, in our largest concentration of population, to take the risk that there will, in fact, be such a downward spiral.

One final word before we get into the substance of the debate, should you, in your wisdom, sir, rule that the debate will go forward: I want to make it clear that in the situation before us in Toronto we are not, in fact, saying that the money should be given simply as a remedy for the situation. We know that it will take more than a one-year fare freeze to make any substantial difference in the declining situation in ridership. We know that what is required on the part of Metropolitan Toronto and the TTC is a bold plan, a pro-transit plan, a clear indication of where they are going structurally to make transit more appealing to the citizens in this large metropolitan area.

I would like to say therefore, that the sensible way we can, in fact, achieve this particular end is for the Metropolitan government to put forward the \$6 million that it would be required to put forward, for the fares to be frozen for a period of time—I suggest one year—and for the provincial government to commit itself to its \$6 million subsidy only on condition that there be a proper pro-transit plan brought forward from the Metropolitan government in the next six months. That, it would seem to me, is a sensible and reasonable approach which would accomplish all the goals that surely members of this House must desire. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a spokesman from the New Democratic Party? The member for Riverdale, for up to five minutes.

Mr. Renwick: I would, as always, out of courtesy defer to the government House leader for his five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You know the order is established this way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Go ahead, Jimmy.

Mr. Renwick: Oh, I see, it's this way today.

Mr. Speaker, in order to assist you in making your decision under the new rules as to whether you should be in favour of the proposed motion or not, I have four or five matters that I would like to comment about.

First of all let me say that we will abide by your decision. If you rule in favour of the motion then we will vote for the debate to proceed when that question is put. If you rule against the motion, we shall abide by your decision in any event.

You will have noticed, and I am certain that the other members of the House will have noticed, that on the order paper today standing in the name of the leader of this party is a resolution under standing order 63(a) under Part X of the standing orders relating to private members' public business. That rule, if I may draw your attention to it, Mr. Speaker, states that: "In any session upon proper notice, the official opposition is entitled to not more than three motions of want of confidence in the government; the third party is entitled to not more than two such motions and any other recognized party to one such motion." I rather regret that we're required to use up one of our two motions of no-confidence in the government on this particular issue when the official opposition has three, and I'm quite certain at the end of the session in all likelihood all three of their opportunities will remain available to them.

The third matter that I want to draw to your attention is that there is absolutely—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If you were wise you would keep yours for years.

Mr. Renwick: —that there is, I submit, no conflict whatsoever between the motion standing in the name of the leader of this party and the motion put by the leader of the official opposition. You will note specifically under the new orders that our motion is a substantive motion under standing order 37(a) which is under the heading, part VIII of the standing orders, Substantive Motions. I would like, if I may, to draw to your attention and to the attention of the House specifically the wording of that standing order.

Mr. Nixon: Are you suggesting the debate should not go forward?

Mr. Renwick: "A substantive motion is one which is not incidental to any other business of the House but is a self-contained proposal capable of expressing a decision of the House." I'd like to emphasize that it is a substantive motion and the conclusive words are, "capable of expressing a decision of the House." Of course, the motion put forward by the Liberal Party falls under the heading

of Procedural Motions under part VII of the standing rules and is merely a procedural motion which permits a discussion with no decision. Or if we could use baseball parlance, it's all wind-up and no pitch.

Mr. Martel: It's called bluff.

[3:45]

Mr. Renwick: I simply want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no reason whatsoever why there should be any ruling on your part that there is any conflict between the one motion which we have put, which is one of substance, and the motion of the Liberal Party, which relates merely to procedural matters.

Mr. Nixon: The motion is political posturing.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the question for your consideration is: Does this matter proposed for discussion relate to a genuine emergency call for immediate and urgent consideration? It is such a matter. If it were not so, we would not be moving want of confidence in the government. It is for us a matter of confidence and also, a fortiori or a priori, whichever is the appropriate Latin expression, on a matter of this importance we have no alternative but to support the urgency of this debate. It is an emergency at this time because on Monday next the TTC fares will increase from 42-6/7 cents to 50 cents by ticket or token per ride, an increase of something in the neighbourhood of 17 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I therefore will simply say that I hope my remarks have been of assistance to you and that we will abide by the decision which you will make.

Mr. Nixon: Strike three.

Mr. S. Smith: Are you in favour or against?

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Premier, for up to five minutes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with this very briefly. We are quite prepared to debate this matter. I listened very attentively to the Leader of the Opposition and his rationale, which I guess was relevant. We have a concern, and I will express this during my brief contribution. I wouldn't say for a moment that the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about the by-election in Scarborough West nor would I say this of the New Democratic Party, although I do find it somewhat difficult to understand its motion of no-confidence in terms of the fare increase when several months ago it was prepared to have the transit riders of Metropolitan To-

ronto deprived of service for who knows how long. In fact, if they had had their way, there might not be any service today. I do find that a little bit contradictory.

Mr. Martel: We find your position strange with respect to labour's rights.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, now come on, Elie, come on. Let's be very frank. Let's face it. You people are worried about Scarborough West and I understand that.

Mr. Martel: Don't be foolish.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, Elie, when you were handing out those things to say call my office, and I had some interesting calls—

Mr. Martel: I wasn't here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You weren't here? Who handed them out? Well, listen, whoever handed them out, why didn't you give them another slip of paper saying the province was giving an 8.4 per cent increase and the province put the TTC back in functioning order last fall when we as a party did what you weren't prepared to do? Why didn't you tell them the whole story, so that when I got the phone calls I would have got an objective analysis?

An hon. member: That would be honest.

Mr. Martel: You know Michael Warren.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh come on now, Elie. Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to use up the full five minutes but everybody else did and I think my observations are as relevant as theirs. I would only say to the Leader of the Opposition that I recognize he is put in the position where he has to do something. I would just read to him his communique from Sarasota. This was a transcript of his conversation with the CBC as he was studying public transit in that great community. Well, I doubt it.

Mr. S. Smith: At my expense, unlike your Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry).

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would just say to the Leader of the Opposition in that transcript he was thinking of no-confidence; today it's an emergency. I would only say we have been hard pressed to understand exactly what his position is, and I see some quotation where he suggested he wasn't sure until he consulted with the rural reeves of Ontario, something of that nature. I am looking forward to the contribution from the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), who isn't here, and the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell). I am anxious to hear their contribution in this debate.

An hon. member: And the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson).

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am very anxious. I will have some observations to make on the substance of it, but I don't want this House to feel that we are not prepared to debate this. We are. It's a very difficult problem these days in government to assess the priorities. I heard the Leader of the Opposition being correctly quoted yesterday I believe—well, I won't, I will save that for my 10 minutes a little later on. Mr. Speaker, we agree to the debate. We will leave it up to your good wisdom, your good judgement, to assess whether it is in fact an emergency and to deal with the two sides of the issue as presented by the member for Riverdale, which to me didn't indicate whether he wanted the debate to proceed or not.

Mr. Speaker: I want to thank the honourable members for their contribution, which assists me in making up my mind. I see and I am prepared to state that the notice given by the Leader of the Opposition does in general terms meet the requirements of standing order 34; the only thing for the House to decide now is whether or not the debate should proceed.

Shall the debate proceed?

Motion agreed to.

TTC FARE INCREASE

Mr. S. Smith: I want to be clear that as taxpayers of Ontario throughout the province, we have put an enormous amount of money into the mass transit system in the Toronto area. In fact, the capital costs have been truly staggering. As soon as you have to start building those facilities—which are either above ground level or subways below ground—you run into enormous costs. That is what happens in large metropolitan areas where the density of population is such that these measures are required.

Over the years I believe this province has done its part to support the transit system in the Toronto area. However, despite the best intentions on the part of the province, and despite I think reasonable intentions—although some perhaps questionable decisions in the planning of Metropolitan Toronto—we have come up against a problem.

The problem is not the question of a nickel fare. That is not the problem. Nor is in dispute the question that the extension of services would in itself increase ridership, because most would agree that extensions of services would increase ridership. The problem is that ridership has been declining; it has been declining now for several years consecutively. It is predicted that the fare increase about

to be implemented will further cause a decline in ridership.

Nowhere can anyone guarantee that freezing the fare would stem that decline. It is quite possible the decline will happen anyway. Frankly, it is a very difficult thing to predict. The prediction is that the decline will worsen. The most conservative prediction I have seen is a decline of six million riders. I have seen it as high as 10 million with the fare increase, but even these predictions cannot be taken as gospel. I am the first to admit that.

But we are at a point where we might just find ourselves unfortunately propelled into a downward spiral which will be very difficult to rectify once it gains momentum. We may just be at that knife edge and we are warned by some experts that that could happen. We see cities in the United States where the policing costs of these white elephant transit systems are in many instances worse than the operating costs. People stop using it; people sleep in the suburbs and use their automobiles.

I know that the Premier shares with me the desire to see a healthy mass transit system in Ontario because a lot of money has been put in by his government, and I recognize that. The concern we have—and I hope it is understood to be a very sincere worry—is that the decline in ridership, if permitted to accelerate—

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's not how you expressed it.

Mr. S. Smith: —with this fare increase might lead us into that downward spiral where the fare box would be expected constantly to make up more and more of the lost revenue due to the decline in ridership. The fact that most riders will still continue to ride despite the additional nickel is not the point. Some will not and that decline in ridership will, of course, reduce the revenues. You get into a vicious spiral in which you either have to reduce your services, Mr. Speaker, or you have to increase your fares even further, and ultimately your services eventually start to crumble.

We put it to you, Mr. Speaker, and we put it to the people of Ontario, that we have put an enormous investment into Toronto already. It is by far the largest metropolitan centre we have in Ontario. Its problems are qualitatively different; and yet in terms of its operating subsidy—and I hope the Premier will not confuse operating with capital subsidy here—in terms of its operating subsidy it receives a percentage less than other large municipalities with a population of

over 200,000. Seventeen point five is the percentage subsidy that comes from the province for other large areas, whereas in this instance it is 13.75 per cent plus the Spadina, which brings it to about 15 per cent.

If this could be brought up to the same level as other centres then we might be able to get this one-year fare freeze. Not a panacea, we recognize that, and not a guaranteed solution; but at least giving an opportunity for a proper transit plan to be presented to the people of Toronto and the people of Ontario.

The proper transit plan is a matter of some dispute. For sure, it has to involve new ways of supporting the idea of people riding the TTC rather than taking their automobiles. It is strange: just as we talk about energy crises in oil which we can do nothing about by building electrical generation plants, we can do something about by making sure that people use public transit instead of taking their own automobiles. Under these circumstances, it makes a lot of sense to support mass transit rather than see our tremendous investment in mass transit go down the drain just at the time when the oil crisis finally hits us; that would make the least sense.

The government would have a point, and I must say I have accepted some of them, in saying they want to see a good plan on paper for Metropolitan Toronto before the government's \$6 million goes into that pot. I quote from the letter of Valentine's day in which it says, "A few tough decisions must be made before our government can responsibly consider additional subsidies."

My point would be that that is not an unreasonable position. If Metro is, as it has indicated, willing to put up its \$6 million to begin with, then the government should accept that. It should allow the fares to be frozen and should demand a pro-transit plan from Metro as a condition for which the government would then provide its commitment of \$6 million to make sure that the fares could be frozen. Then we could get under way with a good pro-transit policy, and not just delay it yet another year when it will require even more than a 14.5 per cent increase, because the ridership will have declined yet again and we will be going through this whole exercise all over again but with a smaller chance of eventual success.

I know that politically it is very easy to go around the rest of Ontario and say that the Liberals want to give something to Toronto. First of all, we want Toronto to get

only the same percentage operating subsidy that other large centres get.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are on dangerous ground, Stuart; you are on very dangerous ground.

Mr. S. Smith: Secondly, it should be very clear that most of the other large centres in Ontario do not have this problem of declining ridership, which is now imperilling the system in Toronto. Furthermore, the people from around Ontario have put a tremendous amount of money into the capital structure of this particular metropolitan area. It would not make sense to jeopardize their investment by letting this run down now; which is, of course, what the peril presently is.

What we say in summary—since I see that my time is running out and I don't wish to tax your patience Mr. Speaker—is this—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Whose patience?

Mr. S. Smith: The problem is that we have declining ridership in a very extensive system in Toronto. We must not allow mass transit to fail in Toronto. We must be totally dedicated to it. We need a new structure in Metropolitan Toronto supporting transit and making clear the determination that transit shall be the way of transportation in the future. We require that.

There is a chance that may slip from our grasp if there is a rapid ridership decline. If we can prevent that decline, and at the same time insist that Metro come forward with a good transit plan—which we can then have a chance to look at here in the Legislature—we have an opportunity to turn around a very frightening trend. We shouldn't wait until things hit us in the face. We should be able to anticipate the trends that are occurring and take the action required to remedy the situation.

[4:00]

Once again, it is not a question of the nickel; most people will be able to afford the nickel. It is a question of the health of the TTC, the downtrend in the ridership; and the fact that with the government subsidy coming after the Metropolitan subsidy, and that based upon a good plan of transit coming forward from Metropolitan Toronto, we have the opportunity to achieve both ends at once; that is possibly to stem the declining in ridership and to encourage, shall we say, the TTC and Metro to produce a genuine plan of action which will make sure that mass transit will be there in good shape, in good popular acceptance, when we

will desperately need it—and we all know we're going to need it as the future evolves.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason we believe the Premier should rethink his policy of refusing, under any circumstances, the grant which has been requested by the people of Toronto, by the governments of Toronto. We believe he should rethink this, and we say quite openly—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. S. Smith: We say quite openly that to have a \$30 million election on a \$6 million issue does not strike us as reasonable. The only way this could be an election issue would be if all centres of Ontario became very, very interested in the matter. But ultimately, as years go by, this may well be—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: —because no one is likely to have an election on one local issue in any locality, Toronto or any other. Therefore, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. S. Smith: —we will not support the no-confidence motion, but we put forward the request that the Premier change his view on this matter.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm glad to have the chance to participate in this debate, but sorry that it's only an emergency debate and that we could not go forward to the NDP's motion of no-confidence on this particular issue.

I have to put on record the fact that we asked today and the government refused to agree—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you breathing a sigh of relief?

Mr. Cassidy: —that this motion of no-confidence by the New Democratic Party would in fact be held tomorrow in order that we could test the temper of this Legislature before the TTC's fare increase was due to take effect on Monday. That was the government's fault. It was the resistance of the government House leader that led to that.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You weren't going to put it until the end of March. Talk about posturing.

Mr. Cassidy: I can say that the Liberal Party was not very enthusiastic either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: I thought it was going to be the end of March. You changed your mind.

Mr. Cassidy: This is an issue which does not only affect transit in Toronto, but which

affects transit operations in 58 communities across the province of Ontario. Because of its intransigence the present government is undermining public transit, not just in Toronto but throughout the province of Ontario.

Since the House rose last December, the city of Ottawa raised its transit fares on January 1. In Brampton the fares went up on February 12. In London they go up on March 12—that's next week, in fact. Metropolitan Toronto is raising its fares on March 12 and Thunder Bay is raising its fares in April. Mississauga is cutting its services by 10 per cent.

Ridership is down in Hamilton, Kitchener, Mississauga, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay and 10 other centres across the province right now. We have not been able to contact all of them.

This is not a one-shot affair, as the previous speaker has suggested. Metropolitan Toronto is talking about a steady, inexorable rise of seven per cent or eight per cent a year in TTC fares. The city of Ottawa is saying that with the current subsidy formula from the province of Ontario they're going to have to raise the fares annually in that city.

The chairman of the TTC is talking about TTC fares rising very quickly to \$1 a ride. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how is the ordinary transit rider in this city going to fare then? What are we going to do? When and at what point is the government prepared to step in and change its subsidy formula in order to ensure that adequate, affordable transit is not just the subject of speeches in the Legislature but is a reality in 58 communities in the province of Ontario?

When the Leader of the Opposition suddenly became interested in this issue a few months ago we thought we could use minority government in order to make the present government respond to the needs of the people who depend on transit in so many communities across the province.

On February 12 the minister announced that the government would refuse Metro's request for additional funds for a fare freeze while the TTC developed a pro-transit plan. In fact, what's happening is that the ministry is giving Metropolitan Toronto \$6 million less in 1979 for transit than they gave back in 1977.

The announcement that they would not comply with the request, along with a constant refusal to look at the subsidy formula, showed that this government will do nothing more to deal with the problems of urban transit in Ontario.

When we announced that we would have a no-confidence motion on the transit issue we thought that we would have the support of the Leader of the Opposition and that the government would bow to the wishes of the people of Ontario and provide a new deal for public transit.

Mr. Riddell: Never quit dreaming about it.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as we're concerned, in the Legislature you have to put up or shut up. You cannot wait until the whole province is aflame about absolutely every issue. You have to draw a line and say—

Mr. Eaton: Why don't you?

Mr. Cassidy: —“This is an important issue. We are prepared to go to the wire on this one.” If the other party joined with us then we know that the government would have backed down.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Want us to tell you what choice we would make?

Mr. Eaton: We're prepared to go to the people.

Mr. Cassidy: We know that there would not have been an election on this particular issue. We know that we would have got some sense from the government in order to ensure that transit riders were protected.

Mr. S. Smith: He is a good politician and he would know what to do with that issue, believe me.

Mr. Cassidy: I listened to the Leader of the Opposition as he says that we must be totally dedicated to public transit and we must not allow transit to fail. The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition moves faster than a Yonge subway car in getting off the rails when we are moving towards a motion of no-confidence.

Mr. Eaton: He was smart. You've got to give him credit once in a while.

Mr. Cassidy: He left the NDP to be the only voice for people who depend on public transit throughout Ontario. We regret both the retreat of the Liberals and also the stubbornness of the government.

Mr. Kerrio: Mike, don't you have any material of your own? Why don't you get on with the debate?

Mr. Cassidy: We ask how the government can have the confidence of the population of the province when it can't find \$6 million out of the \$15 billion budget in this province, and it's the same government that hands out hundreds of millions of dollars to corporations like Ford Motor Company, like Denison Mines, like Reed Paper and the companies

which are going to benefit from this new incentive scheme.

As far as we're concerned, public transit benefits everybody in the province of Ontario. It saves energy, it saves capital expenditure on roads and allows more efficient movement of both people and goods. We say that public transit is vital to the health of our municipalities. We say it's about time to look to the transit needs of people living in the north who don't have any at all. It's about time there was transportation in those areas and not just in the major communities of the province.

We say it's not the time for the province to back away from transit. If the government had been willing to put some of the savings it realized from its declining commitment to capital expenditures into the subsidy formula, this debate would be unnecessary.

Throughout Ontario the fares are going up and in many areas the service is being cut back or is being frozen at a level that is less than adequate. We all know the trend. If high fares continue and the service is cut back, you get a decline in ridership.

The present situation is that, because of the lack of provincial leadership, the fares will continue to go up faster than inflation and the life of our cities, not just Metropolitan Toronto, is threatened right now because a commitment that may have existed once to public transit, in the days when Bill Davis was the Transit Man of the Year, is going the way of the dinosaurs in this province and the evidence is plainly before us in the government's failure to come through on this issue.

Mr. Eaton: Going the way of the NDP.

Mr. Cassidy: When working people are forced to put more and more of their income into public transit and the government does nothing about it, it deserves to be brought into account.

At least 40 per cent of the people who ride the TTC earn less than \$15,000 a year and that's the pattern which we find across the rest of the province as well. People in those income brackets can't afford that increase. People in those income brackets also bear the cost of poor service because they're the most dependent upon public transit and often have to live in the areas that are the worst serviced.

Back in January, I sent a brief to the TTC and sent a copy along to the Premier. It registered not just the NDP's opposition to fare increases in Ottawa, in Thunder Bay, in Toronto and other centres, it also urged that there be a new formula for funding public transit that would encourage innovation and

would encourage pro-transit policies in every community of the province. The formula should take account both of population and of the area served. It should take account of operating costs and of the quality and efficiency of the service. It should take account of the innovation of the service, and try to encourage it.

I urge the establishment of a transit ridership improvement plan so that local transit authorities could take action to cut their deficits by getting more people on to public transit. The fact is that many transit authorities cannot do that right now because they are strapped because of the financial situation in which they find themselves. The government has ignored my brief in the same way that they've ignored transit riders throughout Ontario. That's happening. This is all part of a concerted policy by the government of Ontario that extends far beyond transit alone.

How does the government ask a municipality like Hamilton to continue to pay 40 per cent or more of the cost of transit in that area when they are also loading on to that municipality the costs on property tax that are not being met because of provincial cutbacks on grants, because of provincial cutbacks on education, because of provincial cutbacks on social services and because of provincial cutbacks in the area of health care?

Now they are adding transit to the list. The TTC issue is like the tip of an iceberg because this government is dismantling the health care system, abandoning the schools and cutting back on social services. We are committed to fighting those kinds of cutbacks in every area where they are going to occur. We say that the priorities of the Davis government are dead wrong, whether they're applied to transit or to the other areas of services that are essential to people.

They're giving away the public's money to corporations without taking equity on the one hand, and without getting any job guarantees on the other hand, but they haven't got the money to invest in public transit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your friends in the UAW are unhappy with you now.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, you could say that it's extravagant for the New Democrats to use one of our two no-confidence motions on this particular issue, but we have decided that we won't shirk our duty to the people who elected us. We are not going to wait until our list of grievances against the government is this long; we're going to take them as they come one by one and use every device we can in order to bring this government to account.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: I call on the official opposition to change their position once again and say that they will support our motion of no-confidence because if they do that between now and 6 o'clock today, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. S. Smith: Why did you change the date, Michael?

Mr. Eaton: You can be sure they won't on this one.

Mr. Cassidy: —I can tell you that the government will back down, that fare increase will not take effect on the TTC on Monday and we will have a fair deal for transit riders, not just in Metropolitan Toronto but in every part of the province. All it takes is a commitment from one of the other two parties and we'll give transit riders a fair deal. We need that action now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I've got to tell you that I was so overwhelmed by the contribution of the member for Ottawa Centre that I really felt it was unnecessary for me to participate in the debate. He nearly had me convinced that if he carried forward with his no-confidence motion, we would change our minds. I've got news for him. You two fellows can get together, you can have your no-confidence motion, but unlike you people, we stick to those decisions we make. We think we've made the right one and we intend to stick by it. It's just as simple as that.

Ms. Gigantes: What about OHIP?

Mr. Swart: What about market value and reassessment?

Mr. Cassidy: Last April you backed down on OHIP. What about senior citizen's drugs? You've done as many flip-flops as the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to say, after listening to the rather limp—if I can use that terminology—presentation by the Leader of the Opposition for this additional support, that he really didn't do it with enthusiasm today. I don't think he had his heart in it because his mind was slowly telling him that probably the position he was taking wasn't totally logical. I think he has reassessed it since he made those various statements that were more provocative than that today. I won't read them back to him; I had intended to do so but that would be a little unfair—

Mr. S. Smith: Transit man of the year.

Mr. Sweeney: Grandstanding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I wouldn't want to be unfair to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. S. Smith: Sic transit gloria.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to the Leader of the Opposition who presumes himself on occasion to wish he were over here, and that's understandable that yesterday I couldn't have been more impressed by him.

Mr. J. Reed: Have you nothing to say on the subject of transit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We were down signing that petition for unity—this was after he was saying how negligent we are—in the Lieutenant Governor's suite. The Leader of the Opposition came in and was in the far end of the room while the television cameras were there, filming the Premier and the Lieutenant Governor. He came around to the side of the room. I was going to call Forrest Gregg of the Toronto Argonauts to say here was a new middle guard for us, Dr. Smith, who was able to push himself into the front of the cameras to see what was happening, et cetera. I thought it was tremendous. He was getting so close yesterday that I was getting nervous.

Mr. J. Reed: Have you nothing to say at all on transit?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have something to say and, if the member for Halton-Burlington will listen very attentively, I will tell him exactly what it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Now back to the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My reply to the Leader of the Opposition and to the leader of the New Democratic Party is very simple. They obviously don't know what it is like to run a government. They don't know what it's like to attempt to take positions that are responsible. I would say to those same people who raised with us health issues and the question of our hospitals that I have people in my office every day who wish to extract—no, not extract, that's not fair—who wish to have further support for their legitimate requests.

[4:15]

We have given the TTC an 8.4 per cent increase, probably a higher percentage transfer than to many other areas of government activity. We told them today, when they were in to see us, that we would sit down with them. We have staff available to help them, in terms of their study. The study should come first. We will look at the report; we will help participate in it. That's the way government should be run.

If you are going to give in to every—shall we say request—and I think it was you who said: "Any damn fool can give away

money." I think you said that Tuesday night. Were you speaking about yourself?

Mr. S. Smith: Hayes Dana Corporation of New Jersey.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say, we are human on this side of the House. I didn't mind all those telephone calls. It would be much easier for us to say to the general manager of the TTC, who is up here listening to all of these constructive suggestions—I haven't heard any yet—Your suggestion was a wild card "bust"; importation again of American culture from the city of Pittsburgh. We don't have a wild card system in our football league here. Tell your research people that.

Mr. Kerrio: You don't even have a football system, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we don't. I will admit that we don't have a good one. It will improve.

We also said to Metropolitan Toronto, to its chairman and the heads of the boroughs, that we are prepared to sit down and look at the formula when the study is finished; when we have some solutions. This government is more committed to public transit than any jurisdiction in North America.

Mr. Warner: That's baloney and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You have studied it in the state of Florida. So have I. You have seen what has happened in Washington, in the Bay area. I can name you Chicago—you name it.

Mr. S. Smith: You won't land there. I know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean? I go a little further south, that's all.

This government's record in public transit is unparalleled anywhere in North America. You show me another jurisdiction that has done as much. Show me another one.

We are committed to it; but we are saying, simply, to Mr. Warren and others: "You have come up with a good report. It outlines the problem. Now, let's get together and find a solution and let's find the solutions in an intelligent, logical fashion."

We also said to Metro today, because I think it is important, that we are prepared to have a separate agreement with the proposed LRT line into Scarborough. We have said to them that we are prepared to look at it on the basis of density over a period of years, rather than a stated three-year period, when it may or may not reach the densities required to make it viable. We have com-

municated this to them, because we think, as a province, we should—

Mr. S. Smith: You are committed to Scarborough West. You would not be political.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition says he is opposed to it and doesn't agree with it, let him say so. Our job in government—and it is not very easy to say; I am not looking for sympathy; I am not looking for understanding—is we have got to allocate resources.

Mr. J. Reed: When are you going to start?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly we could have given in to the pressure, no question about that. You people might have. But our job is to manage the affairs of this province intelligently, to listen to, and be understanding of, the specific requests that are made.

When you are giving an organization like the TTC an 8.4 per cent increase and you are asked for more, it is pretty hard to justify what you say to Sick Children's, Mount Sinai, Peel Memorial, Hamilton hospitals, or what have you. It is not easy to deal with; to be consistent and to be fair in the process.

Mr. S. Smith: Reed Paper.

Mr. Cunningham: Judy LaMarsh.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say this: in terms of what, obviously, is a political posture on the part of the Leader of the Opposition—I understand: you have to do it.

Mr. J. Reed: You should understand. You are the master.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the members opposite have to understand, as well, that the economy of this province is healthy; it is improving; but it is because we have been able to manage it and make the proper decisions and we will continue to do that.

If it means upsetting some people, I apologize. I don't like getting all these phone calls. Although I have to tell the leader of the New Democratic Party, who helped stimulate the phone campaign, he would be amazed at just how many people phoned and said: "Mr. Premier, you are right. You should say 'No.' You should say 'No?'" He would be amazed at the number. He may even have had a few in his office calling him telling him the same thing.

Mr. Cunningham: You said: "You are right, Frank, thank you for the call."

Mr. Cassidy: Did you ask them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know what every single rural member in your caucus was saying to you, because some of them were saying it to me. They don't agree with what you are doing here this afternoon. But they under-

stand and they will support it. I understand that.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, don't talk nonsense. Put that on the table. Don't talk nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean, "Don't talk nonsense."? I know the views of my colleagues in cabinet. I also understand that they are men and women of intelligence, logic, who understand that the government has to deal in an even-handed way with all of those people who make representations. That is part of our responsibility.

Mr. S. Smith: And so does the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In that my 10 minutes has lapsed and I do have other responsibilities, I reiterate—and I know the general manager of the TTC will take back again what I said this morning—this province is committed to urban transit.

We have had GO in this province, with increasing ridership year after year. I am sure that TTC will take a look at how we have managed to do that. We are committed to it. We are not going to see the TTC go down the drain.

Mr. Cassidy: It's been dropping for years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I meant to say this earlier; I don't think the Leader of the Opposition, and I don't think any politician, does any of us a great service by suggesting that because this fare increase will go through that the TTC is going down the drain.

Mr. S. Smith: I didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Look at their report. It says without question it will remain the highest ridership or the highest density of any system in North America. It happens to be the best, incidentally, and it's going to continue that way; and it will do so with the support of this government on a fair, equitable basis.

Mr. Swart: In spite of you.

Mr. Warner: In spite of you, no matter how much money you withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members opposite can have all the non-confidence they want. I've got news for them; if they fought an election on this issue, even in Metropolitan Toronto it would be disaster for the New Democratic Party of the province, which might be a great thing.

Ms. Gigantes: We will look after ourselves, thank you very much.

Mr. Cunningham: You are trying to tempt them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm trying to tempt them; they are tempted, they're easily tempted.

They're tempted when they know that it ain't going to happen. I mean that's understandable.

Ms. Gigantes: Look after yourself.

Mr. S. Smith: So are you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But so is the Leader of the New Democratic Party. So is he.

So, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate; we're committed to urban transit, we're committed to the TTC, we're committed to the other municipalities in this province; and no government has been and no government will be more committed to this concept than the government of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Mackenzie: Heaven help us.

Mr. Warner: Turn in your award.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I'm enjoying participating in the debate, I'm sure that after the logic of my remarks gets through to the members opposite, they will agree the position taken by this government is right, equitable, fair, intelligent, and logical. Members may use any other descriptive words they may wish to use.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has invited me and others to look at the logic of his position, and since he's leaving I would like to address myself to his position. He is looking at separate funding for the Scarborough extension, the Scarborough use.

An hon. member: It's by-election time.

Mrs. Campbell: The interesting thing is that he's prepared to do that in advance of looking at the whole transit plan for Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is consistency.

Mrs. Campbell: It is consistent; it is consistent with Gray Coach, it is consistent with your whole approach.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is consistent with the Spadina subway.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Do you not want the LRT?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, it's consistent with the extension north into North York of the subway system.

You know, when you go back and look at the history of this transit corporation, when it was a city corporation it was managed in a business-like fashion. They did expand as they had the money to expand. Then this government imposed metropolitan government into this area in its wisdom. Of course because of that the transit system had to rapidly expand.

There was no overbuilding of the Yonge Street subway, if that's what was said.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The Toronto Transit Commission was broke because it built the Yonge Street subway.

Mrs. Campbell: Out of its own reserves.

Hon. Mr. Drea: That's right, and it was broke.

Mrs. Campbell: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Drea: And it was this government that saved it.

Mr. S. Smith: First you throw them into the water, then you throw them the rope.

Mrs. Campbell: What they don't seem to realize is, and they have actually taken the same position throughout, they have left that municipality to handle this matter of extension into the suburbs—and it should be extended, I have never questioned that; but it's that extension which has put us into the position in which we are today, basically. This is I think something that they should look at logically. I think it would be a tragedy if, as a result of these discussions, the decision had to be made to eliminate some of these extensions—although obviously not into Scarborough.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You have changed your mind; that was a quick change.

Mrs. Campbell: I was thinking of the minister's position, not of mine.

I do not think we should be dividing up this area into little units of transportation, but I have to tell the minister that the fare box is contributed to very largely by the citizens of the inner city, as it always has been. I do not think there is any dispute about that. What we are saying is, let us have the opportunity for that study without incurring any further problems to ridership. If the Premier finds that illogical, I suppose I have to understand it, since he has made a great statement about youth opportunities while he seems to be deliberately destroying Ryerson Polytechnical Institute. That is the Premier's logic, and it is logic we do not understand. I agree with my leader; this is not an issue to take to the public across this province. But if we are not able to do something at this point to try to protect that ridership, we will certainly be dealing ex post facto, and the Premier knows it. He wants to start making decisions about Scarborough before he sees an overall plan. Why doesn't he do what my leader suggests? Accept what Metro says; accept their donation to this system.

Hon. Mr. Snow: That's not what Paul Cosgrove says.

Mrs. Campbell: Paul Cosgrove, I don't think, is in Metro at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Snow: He was.

Mrs. Campbell: He was; yes, he was. And so have those members in this House who were there.

Mr. S. Smith: Your subsidy on the GO train from Oakville is 97 cents a ride; the minister knows that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Is it? I don't think so.

Mrs. Campbell: Let me say this to the minister: He knows this situation. He knows the decisions he has made which have hurt the Toronto Transit Commission. He knows what he has done as far as Metro Toronto is concerned. If they are prepared to put up this money, surely it is not unreasonable for the minister to ask for the study, which now apparently he has done—and we are so glad that the minister accepted at least that portion of our suggestion—but also to stand prepared to put up the equal portion asked when that report is in his hands.

The ministry, with its expertise, should be helping with that decision in that report, because it needs an overview; it needs to know where it's going in public transit right across this province. As in every other case, we are handling a situation in a totally unplanned way, in a total vacuum. Why can't the ministry, this time, actually plan and work with the TTC to try to develop something that will stand the test for other cities right across this province?

Apparently the minister wants to start things and then cut them off, simply because he doesn't look down the road.

[4:30]

Hon. Mr. Snow: Who is cutting off anything?

Mrs. Campbell: I am talking about the minister's general scheme.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, you are not.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, yes, I am.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You are talking about something you know nothing about. Let's be honest.

Mrs. Campbell: In real dollars at a time like this they need that additional money. And you know they do. You know it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: An 8.4 per cent increase is not cut off, and you know it.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order. Would the honourable member please address the chair?

Mrs. Campbell: I'm sorry. Would the Speaker please ask the minister not to interrupt?

Hon. Mr. Snow: You don't want to be kept honest, Margaret.

Mrs. Campbell: Is this gentleman suggesting I am dishonest, Mr. Speaker? If he is, I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to mean that the honourable member was dishonest. I was trying to correct the figures that she was giving in the House which I do not believe to be correct.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that I gave any figures.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I've never heard you so vocal, Jim. You must be getting worried about this—

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, we do need to really study what is happening in this system in Toronto. We need to have the time to do it. Actually what we are talking about is time. There is no time when the fares are going up next week—no time unless there is a commitment from this government.

Ms. Gigantes: You could have made the time, Margaret.

Hon. Mr. Snow: How come you didn't mention this during my estimates?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Why are you so uneasy, Jim?

Mrs. Campbell: I don't recall. I think during the estimates—I am not quite sure—I was actually worrying about some of the other moneys the minister was putting in—

Mr. Acting Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs. Campbell: —which he shouldn't have been putting in at all. I suppose I can't deal with every subject in every ministry in estimates. Thank you.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, although I come from an area outside of Toronto, I rise to speak on this motion before us for two reasons: First, because I suggest the implications of this go far beyond the boundaries of Metro Toronto; what is decided with regard to provincial assistance to the Toronto transit system will have to be reflected in the other transit systems throughout this province.

I also rise because the issue of public transit—and this has already been mentioned by my leader—has never been more important than it is now. We are all aware of the escalation of the world oil crisis at the present time. Even within a few weeks or a few months in North America it is going to have a very real impact on our transportation systems, particularly that of the private automobile. And so the debate. In fact, a decision on the matter of greater assistance to public transit has never been more timely than it is at the present time. Any government that

looks to the future, even the short-term future—even one, two, three or four years—will be taking steps to assure that there is a shift away from the private automobile to public transit.

The Premier, in his remarks, made the comment that no government had ever done more for the Toronto transit system and transit in Ontario than his government. He said they are committed to public transit. A number of years ago that statement was factual, but that statement at this time is not correct. There is on the part of the government an about-face on public services generally.

Shortly after I came into this House in 1975, there was a document tabled called, Special Program Review, more commonly known as the Henderson report. The document was a reprivatization of the economy in this province and the reprivatization of the services in this province. I would point out that the chairman of that committee that produced that report was the Honourable Darcy McKeough.

The fact is that in public transit, as in many other services, the government now is reducing its assistance to municipalities. From 1977 to 1978 the amount of public assistance given for transit generally in this province declined—by only \$1 million or \$2 million, but it was cut back—and the estimate is that in 1979 it will be down even further.

I suggest that the Ontario government and the Premier are reprivatizing the transportation system too. By their action in refusing to further subsidize the transit system in Toronto, they are privatizing it by putting more people back in their cars and away from the public transit system.

Coming from an area which has two small transit systems, I am as aware as anyone of the difficulties of public transit. I know how people like to use their own cars to get about; it is, of course, generally more convenient, particularly in the smaller places. I'm aware of all that. But I also say here today that a government has a responsibility to set up the overall policy. Any government now must put emphasis on greater use of public transit, not less. One way of doing it is by providing more public assistance to it.

Again, as has been pointed out by many of the people who have spoken on this issue, if you increase fares, ridership drops and the only alternative is to increase fares again. This shows up very sharply in the smaller cities throughout this province. The statistics we have on Toronto and elsewhere bear this out, that fare increases do cut ridership.

There can be no question about that. Therefore, if the fares are allowed to increase in Metro or elsewhere, this is going to cut the ridership in public transit from what it would otherwise be.

The Leader of the Opposition in his comments said that Toronto was different in this respect; he made the general statement that in the other areas of the province the ridership was not dropping the same as it was in Toronto. I would ask him and his party to take a further look at those statistics, and they will find that the ridership in the rest of this province is dropping or holding, or increasing slightly, at about the same rate as it is in Metro Toronto. We have to think about the whole province, not just Metro Toronto. That's why I'm concerned about Metro Toronto, because it is the key. If we can get more assistance here, I am sure we can get it elsewhere.

My time is rather limited and is going to run out, but I could point out that in a place like Welland at present they are getting less than 50 per cent of their revenue from the fare box. As they increase the fares again—and they will, unless there is greater assistance—that ridership is going to drop further, until ultimately we are going to kill those systems in many of the smaller cities in this province, at the very time when we should be encouraging their expansion.

The same thing is true in St. Catharines; ridership is increasing slightly, but deficits that were 30 per cent five years ago now are 50 per cent, or almost 50 per cent.

Mr. Haggerty: St. Catharines' streets are jammed with cars, and the buses are empty.

Mr. Swart: That's exactly what I am saying. We have to take more positive steps to get the people out of their cars and into the buses.

There has to be a reassessment of our attitude towards public transit, and here in Metro Toronto is the obvious place to start. We must ensure that the ridership increases. There is justification for using more public funds from the province. After all, the province in general, in their transfer payments to the municipalities, gives 50 per cent of the cost of building and maintaining the roads. The transit system, to a very substantial degree, is an alternative to building so many roads or the maintenance of the roads.

Hon. Mr. Snow: In your municipality what do the buses run on? Do they not have to run on roads?

Mr. Swart: Of course, they have to run on the roads. But if you can't—

Mr. McClellan: They don't have Krauss-Maffei in Welland.

An hon. member: I thought maybe down there they run on air.

Mr. T. P. Reid: They may run on gas.

Ms. Gigantes: That was the way you tried to build it.

Mr. Swart: I'm surprised that the minister is so far removed from the realities of the Welland area that he doesn't know that buses run on roads there.

I would also think he should know that if you can get 20 or 30 or 40 cars off the road at any given time, particularly rush hour, by having buses in their place, that you don't need as wide roads, and you don't need as many roads to transport those people who otherwise would be in those cars.

Hon. Mr. Drea: And how are you going home tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The people of Welland won't want me to cut down on their roads.

Mr. Swart: At the present time the Ontario government—the ministry can correct me if I'm wrong—is still spending something like three times as much in subsidies to the municipalities on roads as they are in subsidies to public transit. I suggest that in this day and age that ratio may not be the proper one and we should be looking for a shift in that ratio.

Here, today, we have the opportunity—well, we don't have the opportunity, because all this debate is meaningless; we would have the opportunity if the debate were taking place tomorrow morning—to determine whether we really mean that we should give greater emphasis to public transit in the future.

I say to the government that the \$6 million payment is justified; it's wise, even short-term but particularly long-term, because now is the crucial time that this additional payment should be made to the TTC and should be reflected throughout the rest of the province.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would like today to clarify my ministry's position, my position, regarding the additional \$6.2 million in operating subsidies that has been requested by Metro for the TTC. That is \$6.2 million over and above the \$33.5 million that has already been allocated to Metro. And I might say that is \$33.5 million out of a total of \$62 million for all of the province.

To begin with, let's clear some of the confusion which resulted from the statement that provincial grants to the TTC have decreased rather than increased. First, the charge that the total subsidy to the TTC has decreased is perhaps correct. But that includes the sub-

sidy to the TTC's subway construction, which was dropped from \$37.6 million to \$34 million, because the only subway construction under way is the work remaining on the east and west ends of the Bloor Street extensions—the Spadina line, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has already been completed—

Mr. McClellan: All it needs is passengers.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —so naturally our capital subsidy has been reduced.

But the gut issue, that of TTC transit operating subsidies, that amount showed an estimated increase of \$2.5 million, or as the Premier has already mentioned, 8.4 per cent increase over last year. That increase was allowed in that area despite the fact that other municipalities across this province were restricted to five per cent increases for many of their programs. That kind of treatment for Metro, I believe, indicates that my ministry, no matter what the opposition members claim, considers Metro and its transit system unique and special.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of getting into a battle of percentages and statistics today—or tomorrow for that matter. I'll leave that to those plastic people who like to throw figures around, figures that can be arranged to add up to almost anything the user wishes to prove.

[4:45]

Let's go back to the latter part of 1976, when my staff came down with a funding level designed to maintain the financial achievements of the various transit systems across Ontario. That funding level grew out of the Treasurer's concern for restraining general transit expenditures which, quite candidly, were rising at a fast rate. It was decided that operating subsidies in 1976 would not be more than five per cent greater than the previous year. Basically, that funding provided for a definite percentage of operating costs as the province's contribution.

In the latter part of 1977, the funding level and its application in Metro was agreed on by both Metro and my staff. It was also agreed at that time that this formula should be in place for the next several years, or until such time as the general fiscal climate had improved considerably. Now Metro and the TTC want to change the pitch, asking the provincial government to provide them with an additional \$6.2 million which would enable them to hold their fares at the current level. At the same time, it would allow them to review their internal procedures while they seek a solution to their operating problems.

This is not a realistic position under the circumstances, nor is it realistic to expect the

province to reassess its funding levels at this point in time. It further proves that the time for reassessment is not ripe. May I point out that provincial subsidies in such fields as health, education and social services have all been held to that five per cent level.

The funding level for transit was not simply a mathematical equation designed to limit our contributions to operating deficits. It was also designed to accommodate an incentive mechanism, meaning that if a transit system, through a more efficient and cost-saving program, reduced its operating deficits, the number of provincial dollars would remain constant. In short, the municipality would retain those subsidy dollars, thereby enhancing their overall financial picture.

Let's take a look at how the TTC itself sees this problem of the \$6.2 million in 1979.

Some months ago, the commission came down with the Transit in Metro: Some Tough Choices report. I commend the TTC staff for the excellent effort they put into this report. This report reinforces the premise that the success of transit in any urban area depends on many interrelated factors, all of which, or any combination of which, can be critical. It also underlines that none of these factors can be addressed in isolation.

For any transit system to succeed financially and provide good service it requires an adequate arterial road system, proper land use, adequate facilities such as parking and maintenance yards, and personnel, for example. Most critical is the factor that the fare box must provide a realistic portion of the costs incurred.

Finally, the TTC's own report concludes that the \$6.2 million additional asked for would only alleviate the problem the TTC faces for no longer than the 1979 year.

The next logical step is, "Who would make the necessary decisions to correct this situation?" I suggest to you here today that only the members of the city and the Metro councils, backed by the professional know-how of the staff of the TTC, can make such decisions. They will have to come down with solutions which recognize the reality of today's fiscal restraints.

For our part, in my letter to Metro Chairman Godfrey I outlined an approach designed to provide the TTC with maximum fiscal flexibility when considering their immediate needs.

First, it was proposed that replacement capital subsidies could be combined with operating subsidies enabling Metro to more fully manage their own system. Until now both were considered a separate item, but I think it's time plant replacement and main-

tenance and operating decisions should be considered as part of the entire process.

For example, our subsidies towards vehicle replacement costs have been estimated by the TTC to be \$6.8 million this year and another \$10.8 million for 1980-81. We proposed to Mr. Godfrey that these funds be available for whatever the TTC deemed proper over those next two years. We also proposed that in the future negotiations for any major facility or expansion project—and this is a totally new approach and has been mentioned today regarding the Scarborough line—both capital and additional operating costs be considered as part and parcel of the same project, or over and above the operating costs agreed to to cover the older systems which are already in place.

I further suggested the establishment of a joint Metro MTC-TTC steering committee. To this end I met with Mr. Godfrey and Mr. Warren on Monday of this week and this committee is now in place. It will actively pursue all available options with a single objective: to provide solutions which can solve the dilemma facing public transit in Metro and other places today. There are difficult choices ahead but please be assured that we will remain an active partner in this important venture with the TTC and with all the other 58 or 59 municipalities in the province that are running transit systems.

The government of Ontario has made and is making an immense contribution to the operation and development of transit across the province to the tune of \$442 million during the last three years—1976, 1977 and 1978—of which Metro received over \$316 million.

Lastly, I think it goes without saying that we want to work with the TTC and with Metro council in seeking ways to enhance the service and viability of their system. At the same time we'll be continuing to work in the same manner with the full 60 municipal transit systems throughout the province in addition to our provincial transit responsibilities through TATO.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly glad that you are in the chair in so far as I know this is a very urgent matter in Geraldton and other parts of Ontario, including Waterdown where I reside.

I do appreciate the very serious situation that we are in today. The previous speakers have characterized the situation as political and I suppose it has unfortunately degenerated to be somewhat partisan in a political climate. Frankly, I don't see how it is of major concern to the voter at this time, in

so far as I don't think that five cents at this time makes a great deal of difference to many people. But in the period of a year I would submit that ridership would decline, and this falls into the doctrine of cheap-smart, cheap-stupid.

I think if we could in some way assist with the financing of this operation, with the moderate request that has been put forth by the city of Toronto and Metro, we might arrest the further decline in the operation of the TTC. As you may have heard, the decline in ridership last year was in the area of 17 million rides. We have no reason to believe that rather serious situation would not increase and that it might conceivably reach 25 million or 30 million, thereby further undermining the amount of money that we get from the fare box. At that point the province and Metro will be put in a very difficult situation, one that will require considerably more money than \$6 million on the part of the province.

I am disappointed that this issue has been clouded by some element of acrimony. We should accept that the entire TTC system is one that primarily operates on a large fixed cost—costs that we don't have a great deal of control over but costs that somehow must be met. The arguments that the ridership will deteriorate and thereby place a further burden on people who must ride the TTC have a great deal of currency. I would suggest that if that trend continues it is not inconceivable that a ride on the TTC might be 75 cents or \$1 in the not too distant future. Then we would see, in what is a pretty good system, a decline that would not be uncommon to cities like Boston, New York or San Francisco.

In many ways, I sense the presence of the former Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is still lingering on in the cabinet. It almost seems that the book that Darcy McKeough never published, *You Are on Your Own*, was distributed prior to discussion of this particular issue in cabinet. This government is a great government for assisting with the financing to get you going but, once you are there, you are caught between a rock and a hard place, so to speak.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is what this government has accused the federal government of doing.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You know that is not right.

Mr. Cunningham: I do know that it is right and you know that I do.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No way.

Mr. Cunningham: Certainly, I don't think there is an individual here in the Legislature who would suggest a freeze on TTC fares right now as a panacea for its particular problems. The problems are serious. There are a number of things they will do, and I think this current situation will in many ways prompt them to action which might not otherwise have been taken, or at least not taken as quickly. But, again, I say there is a very serious necessity to prop up, for want of another word, the TTC temporarily.

I am amazed at the strange sense of priorities the Minister of Transportation and Communications has with regard to rapid transit and the whole matter of public transit in Ontario. On the same day that the request by Metro was denied, the minister was quoted in the paper as warmly accepting the idea from the federal government that we should have a STOL airport on Toronto Island. What a perverse sense of priorities, in my view.

At the same time, we see millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars being funnelled into the continuation of UTDC, a system that I could suggest is not going to function in the interests of the province of Ontario and the people of Ontario. It is a large, government-operated company that, frankly, has no future at all, a company that is costing millions and millions of dollars to operate.

If I could put in context the amount of money being requested by the city of Toronto and by Metro into the perspective of revenue spent in the province of Ontario, we spend \$3.4 million per day just to pay the interest on our debt in Ontario. The amount requested represents two days' worth of debt and then some—that is, of course, exclusive of Ontario Hydro's debt which is reaching possibly the same alarming situation.

It has been suggested by the third party that we have an election on this. I suppose a \$30-million election on a \$6-million request is indicative in a microcosmic sense of the economic policies we could expect from an NDP government.

Mr. McClellan: You don't understand transit issues at all.

Mr. Cunningham: The minister has just recently suggested in the course of this debate that the possible solution to this particular problem lies in the establishment of a committee of MTC and TTC to supervise the TTC's activities. In other words, we are going to see a committee to supervise the activities of a committee. That almost seems as if it is a bureaucrat's dream.

The minister mentioned there was a \$33 million commitment out of \$62 million spent

on rapid transit. I suppose that is a significant amount of money. I have no doubt that it is. But it is also a tremendous amount of money put into an area where half the population of the province resides and where a number of people from outside the city of Toronto and outside Metro utilize the facility. I use the facility from time to time and I must say in many ways the ride I take on that is being subsidized by Metro taxpayers. Frankly, we think that is somewhat inappropriate at the time.

I can only conclude by saying that the amount of money that is being requested now is marginal in comparison to the amount of money that will be required from some taxpayers' pockets some time down the road if the ridership in the TTC is allowed to decline in the fashion that it has.

[5:00]

Mr. McClellan: I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate, although I note the absence of the transportation man of the year. Time does fly, as he does. I note the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Nevertheless, we are confronted with a major crisis in the Toronto Transit Commission, and those who argue that it is a question of a nickel obviously don't understand the problem that confronts the transit system either in Metropolitan Toronto or in this province.

As a Toronto member, I intend to deal with the issue from a Toronto perspective but it is not a Toronto issue or a Metro issue; it has to do with the future of transit development in this province, and the government has no more commitment to transit than it does to any of the other human services in 1979.

Mr. Johnson: That's not so.

Mr. McClellan: What is the crisis is very simple. The fare box cannot support the cost of the system. Up until 1970, the TTC was supported entirely out of the fare box. In 1970, there was a surplus of \$1.9 million. By 1973, they were in a deficit position of \$17.7 million. By 1978, in a deficit of \$51.9 million. In 1979, a projected deficit of \$65.5 million.

Those who stick their heads in the sand and say, "Take it out of the fare box; put the burden on the user; put the burden on the property tax; let's pay for it out of regressive taxation; let the poor pay for it; let those who can't pay for it pay for it," don't understand the issue. They don't understand what they are doing to transit in this province. They are doing the same thing in every other community across the province and

they are not showing any commitment to urban transit whatsoever.

The transit system in Metropolitan Toronto is no longer a local transit service, it is a commuter service over vast areas of the municipality and the costs of that kind of a commuter service cannot be paid out of the fare box, period. Those who argue that it can and should be paid out of the fare box are doing a profound disservice.

Many speakers on the government side have thumped their chests about their commitment to urban transit and talked about the complexity of factors that go into the kinds of problems that the TTC is experiencing, and I don't deny that it is a complex issue. It is not, as the Liberal transportation critic seemed to imply, a question of five cents. It is an exceedingly complex matter. The government has done nothing on the other factors that have led the TTC into a position of overwhelming deficit, with the prospect of more deficit, more fare rises and more declining ridership down the line inevitably.

In February, the Minister of Transportation and Communications wrote to the chairman of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and talked about the four factors, the four variables that go towards making a viable transit system. I quote from his letter: "For a transit system to succeed: 1, The arterial road system must accommodate acceptable transit service. 2, Parking facilities and policies must be complementary. 3, Land-use policies must be co-ordinated with transportation planning. 4, The fare box should provide a realistic share of the costs of this important service."

So the minister set out some of the variables and said again today how he understands the complexity and their transit policies are dealing with the overall vector of forces that go into a viable transit system.

Let's just look at that; let's just look at that for a minute. The first point, the arterial roads system must accommodate acceptable transit service. So what's happening in this municipality, Mr. Speaker, is that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is proceeding with arterial roads in competition with the transit system. They are proceeding with the widening of Bathurst Street in competition with the subway, the new Spadina subway, a subway that was built at a capital cost of in excess of \$200 million and the province is pouring its transportation subsidy money not into pro-transit policies, but into policies of road widening which compete with the subway. Brilliant. Brilliant.

Let's look at the second point that the minister has cited: parking facilities and poli-

cies must be complementary. The city of Toronto has argued and pleaded and stressed with as much urgency as it can muster that the province must intervene to make sure that the park-and-ride facilities are built at Glencairn south of the Allen Expressway and that hasn't been done; it hasn't been done since the Transit Man of the Year allowed the Spadina Expressway to be extended down to Eglinton—I might point out with the support and urging of the Liberal Party members, who are now wearing their rapid transit hat. Where was their transit hat in 1975 when they were clamouring for the extension of an expressway in competition with the Spadina subway? Where were they then? Urging that the expressway be built. So the parking facilities haven't been built, the second point of the minister's four factors.

Number three: land-use policies must be co-ordinated with transportation planning. I turn to page 15 of the TTC's document, *Some Tough Choices*, and there is a statement at the bottom of the page: "The Spadina subway was opened in 1978 and operating mileage increased as a result, but it did not follow a major demand path, as previous subways had done." What that means, in a nutshell, is that thanks to this government and its pals at Metro the Spadina subway was built in the wrong place; it was built in the wrong place. Another triumph of urban transit planning. Another little gem in the Premier's transit crown.

Finally, the fare box. The fare box, says the minister, must provide a reasonable share. For him it's 72 per cent. Seventy-two per cent of what? Seventy-two per cent of a horrendous operating deficit, a deficit that exists because of botched transportation planning over the last 10 years. That's why the deficit is as high as it is, because of mistakes made by this government, because of inaction on the part of this government and its friends at Metropolitan Toronto.

It now says to the people of Toronto, "Well, it's too bad that your operating deficit is approaching \$70-million. It's just too bad. You are just going to have to take it out of the fare box." So we are stuck with the cost of the government's own mistakes, we are stuck with the price of the government's own mistakes, and the government says: "Oh, we're exceedingly generous. We are excessively generous. We are generous to a fault." They are generous to a fault with respect to lunatic schemes like the Krauss-Maffei project, which cost \$55-million.

Mr. Cunningham: You people used to be in favour of that. You were in favour.

Mr. Swart: You can't have a straight face and say that.

Mr. McClellan: That's certainly not true, my friend; that's simply not true.

Mr. Cunningham: Look at the record.

Mr. McClellan: Who would be in favour of magnetic levitation which can't go around a corner?

Mr. Mackenzie: Only the Liberals would support it.

Mr. McClellan: Only the government would think of a nuts scheme like that to waste \$55 million of transit money. I thought that couldn't be exceeded in the realm of lunatic, nuts schemes, but I was wrong. Now they have a proposal to run some kind of an electric train from Union Station to the CNE.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. McClellan: What's the price tag on that one? Perhaps they could hook it up to the roller coaster. It would make as much sense as everything else they have done over the last 10 years which has led us to the present mess.

Mr. Johnson: Sit down.

Mr. Gaunt: Or one of Hydro's idle power plants.

Mr. McCaffrey: Mr. Speaker, may I start off by congratulating the member for Humber. You look very dignified in that chair. It suits you to a T, and I am sure you will do a fair job throughout.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. McCaffrey: I can't start off by being dishonest and saying what a pleasure it is to rise and speak in this debate, because by and large I feel this exercise today is a shoddy use of this room and this place and the members' time.

Mr. Riddell: Of course, that is the way you look at most committees, too.

Mr. McCaffrey: I started off this morning, like I do most mornings—and this is the only reason that I am at all pleased to speak on it—because I am a regular user of the TTC and have been for some years. But this morning when I got on the Wilson Avenue bus on my way to the York Mills subway, I was joined by a neighbour who had read the Globe and Mail and was anxious to find out if it was true that there was going to be an emergency debate here and a possible vote of no-confidence in the government over

this matter of the TTC. I assured him that was my understanding too, that in all likelihood that would be what transpired. He was, like most people—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You don't always understand, Bruce, but you got that one.

Mr. McCaffrey: —in my community, shocked that this silliness would have developed to this level. He went on to show, and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) will appreciate this, that he is about as well-versed in the intricacies of parliamentary procedure as I am, when he said, "Is there not provision, when silly things like this happen, for the government to move a motion of no-confidence in the opposition?"

Mr. Cunningham: It wouldn't carry.

Mr. McCaffrey: I said that wasn't true but that I would look into it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That certainly lowers the tone of this debate.

Mr. McCaffrey: From time to time when I do get on the subway and come down here to this elaborate chamber, I talk to people in my own and neighbouring constituencies, and particularly in the last few weeks—

Mr. Warner: That is the \$40,000-plus crowd. We know about your constituents.

Mr. McCaffrey: —this topic of possible fare increase has come up. By and large the attitude has been that even with the fare increase, meaning that the token would then cost fifty cents, it is the best half-a-buck in town. Most of the people of my area recognize that.

I was intrigued when the Leader of the Opposition spoke today. I find him always, quite frankly, a thoughtful individual. I listened quite carefully to what he said. I thought throughout he was both thoughtful and supportive of the government.

I am quite prepared to reread Hansard, but two or three things stand out in my mind. He supported the historical and significant financial support for the Metro transit system that this government has provided. He was very supportive of the Premier's very clear desire to continue to be a leader in the field of transit. He applauded this government's stated wish to see a broad Metro transit plan before any additional moneys were given. I couldn't help but think, as I listened to him wind up, that if I have difficulties with parliamentary procedure from time to time, I don't have any basic difficulty with the English language, I know what the word emergency means. How he could justify his

theme today—and it is in Hansard—with this emergency debate, I find quite unusual.

Mr. Riddell: That was debated before the Speaker made a ruling.

Mr. McCaffrey: And to suggest, as has been suggested by some members of the Liberal Party, including the leader, that this would become an election issue only if all the other Ontario centres outside of Metro rose up in support, is frankly just a sad comment on the Liberal Party's near paranoia with Metro Toronto.

The member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham), who—I wouldn't say this, but people who know him better than I say he is capable of being partisan from time to time.

Mr. Eakins: That's where you part company.

Mr. McCaffrey: I can't say I have ever seen that.

Mr. Eakins: Is that what sets you apart, Bruce?

[5:15]

Mr. McCaffrey: However, it was intriguing to watch his contribution today. The member for Wentworth North was only disappointed that this issue had become political, and he found that the third party's desire to have an election on this was somewhat disconcerting. Again I stand to be corrected, —and I would be anxious to go back in my own files—but I am confident that the Liberal Party not very long ago made it clear they were going to initially support a potential motion of no-confidence. They eased up on that. I wouldn't use the word "flip-flop," Mr. Speaker, I think that's sometimes over-used, but let's say that they just eased up—

Mr. Warner: Call it a reversal.

Mr. McCaffrey: —pretty significantly on what their position was three weeks ago is an understatement.

Mr. Eakins: Did you ever hit your head on a rifle butt?

Mr. McCaffrey: People have made it clear, I think, by now, and there has been a pretty extensive contribution to this, that a fare freeze by itself won't affect transit use in Toronto.

Mr. Cunningham: The reason you won't give it is you haven't got it. You've spent so much money over the years you haven't got it. That's the bottom line.

Mr. McCaffrey: The bottom line, it's a good expression.

There are a number of factors which have influenced ridership on the Toronto transit.

Fare level and fare structure are just two of those factors. The quantity and quality of the service has been a major factor. Auto ownership in Metro Toronto has been a major factor, and over the last five years the growth in owner-used automobiles to commute has accelerated. Population growth, on the other hand, has levelled off. The size of the work force and general economic conditions have a great impact on how many people use the TTC. The amount and the location of high-density development, parking policies, auto disincentives and land-use co-ordination are just some others. It is clearly not just the five cents, although some have used that while pretending not to use it to get an afternoon wasted in this chamber today.

The problem is significant and I think the record of this government proves their awareness of it. But to blame the TTC and the fare increases, and primarily those fare increases, for the woes of Metro transit completely misses the point. Most riders are aware of increased costs in fuel, salaries and equipment, and they can readily discern the need for a fare increase. What is more important, however, is that most riders are more sensitive to the quality of transit service than they are to its costs and from time to time the public do express their view and their concern, not so much with exorbitant fares but general service conditions.

Transit's own report, *Some Tough Choices*, advises that reasonable growth may be expected if certain actions are taken. A fare freeze, interestingly enough, is not listed as one of the prerequisites for this growth. Contrary to some who would leave a misinformation on this, the decline is not irreversible and the retention of ridership is not contingent upon the provision of subsidies.

Projecting a decline in transit usage due to increased fares assumes a loss of a revenue source. However, the net revenue increase, despite what some would have us believe, meets the 70 per cent target figure for fare-box contributions in relation to operating costs. The effect of the increase is not projected indefinitely and the downward spiral that has been referred to does not describe a cause-effect reaction involving fare increases leading to lost ridership. The spiral is much more complicated than that. One inescapable conclusion that can be drawn from the rationale forwarded by the fare freeze components is that they do believe it is the sole criteria upon which we are to judge the TTC success. The plain and simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the market for potential riders is not expanding.

On the average, each Toronto resident rides the TTC 156 times a year. This is the highest transit use per capita in North America and one has to question whether that number can be substantially increased without providing additional incentives to use the system, in the form, I would suspect, of better service. Even if the subsidy due to the TTC were increased by \$12.3 million, spending these funds to hold fares down may not be the best way to retain ridership. Again the transit report itself suggests that future increases in spending of public money be used as an instrument to increase the level of service to attract riders, not to subsidize an inevitably declining ridership. This report, *Some Tough Choices*, outlines a number of factors which could possibly affect the number of transit users. Metro can encourage ridership without having to resort to larger capital expenditures and without going beyond the present financial commitments of subway expansion and light rail development. A land-use policy, including densification at appropriate subway terminals, is the obvious place to begin bolstering ridership.

Mr. McClellan: What is densification?

Mr. McCaffrey: However, a land-use policy does not fall within the jurisdiction of the TTC and, clearly, transit requires an official commitment from Metro.

Mr. Philip: What would you people know about land-use policies? You've never had any.

Mr. McCaffrey: Several other transit-related issues fall within the scope of Metro Toronto.

Mr. McClellan: You've already got densification.

Mr. McCaffrey: One is completion and improvement of the arterial road system.

Mr. Philip: Where are you going to have the density—in the Niagara Escarpment?

Mr. McCaffrey: We're not going to have it wherever there's an NDP council, that's a certainty.

Mr. Philip: Maybe we'll have a little bit of industry where there is an NDP government.

Mr. McCaffrey: Arterial roads are necessary to increase rapid transit efficiency. They are the feeder system for it. Larger transit subsidies coming from the Ontario government will not be offset by providing smaller subsidies for roads, not if the system is going to improve.

Mr. Conway: Reading speeches is improper.

Mr. Cunningham: Especially Darwin Kealey's.

Mr. McCaffrey: Of course, the more extensive use of surface vehicle priorities such as contraflow lanes—that's a good one—and also a Metro-wide parking policy would increase transit system efficiency.

Mr. McClellan: I don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. McCaffrey: But these and other issues remain unsolved because, like many things, they involve a trade-off and in some cases a sacrifice by residents in the immediate areas affected by a pro-transit policy.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. McCaffrey: To blame fares and fares alone for this occurrence is irresponsible, misleading and represents the kind of buck-passing that is, in the long run, both detrimental to the TTC and unfair to the Metro residents.

Mr. Eakins: You sure threw your heart into that one.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I guess we have no rapid transit in Essex North or around Woodslee.

Mr. Eaton: They say you drive pretty fast through there.

Mr. Ruston: We do have a bus that goes by my door once a day, I believe, but since my car has 95,000 miles on it I suppose I should be able to speak a little about transit.

In some ways I have taken an interest in rapid transit, because I don't think there is any metropolitan city that can get along without a combination of more than one type of transit system, whether it's automobiles or streetcars or subway or whatever it might be.

Mr. Makarchuk: Bicycles.

Mr. Ruston: Bicycles, yes. That might come about in time too.

What I think we require to keep a metropolitan area viable is a good combination of more than one type of transit system.

I suppose I can look close to my own area, to a large metropolitan area, the city of Detroit, where they never did go into any rapid transit system. Of course, most people would say the reason they never did was because it's the automobile centre of the world and, with the automobile industry there, naturally they didn't want to see the car being second-rate, so they built a more or less ideal system of expressways. The only thing that caused a problem with that in the city was that the people then moved out to the suburban areas and the downtown area was blighted. They haven't got over that yet.

They may have thought they were helping themselves and the automobile industry—

which I myself am very much interested in because in our area that's our main employer—but it just shows that you have to have some of both if you want a city to stay alive.

I have had the opportunity over the last 11 years to attend, I think, all the estimates of the Ministry of Transportation—it was called the Department of Highways for a number of years, but it's now the Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

I have had a certain amount of knowledge that it is one of the methods of transportation that has helped Toronto and the Metropolitan area, the subway system. My goodness, I would suppose it's one of the better ones in Canada and maybe even in the United States, built, of course, at a great deal of expense to the taxpayers of Ontario. We all know that. I don't know what the latest charge is for building a mile of subway, but I think it's become so expensive that there will probably not be any built in the future.

I think one of the figures I heard was \$31 million a mile. Maybe someone could verify that. That certainly isn't cheap.

Looking at our area, we build highways a great deal cheaper and, of course, we make good cars, so naturally the people are going to use the cars.

I had a fellow tell me the other day that he was reading in the paper about the cost of taking people from Montreal to Ottawa on Via Rail. He works for Greyhound Bus Lines. He said the cost to the taxpayers of Canada by Via Rail was about \$30. He said he can take the people on the same route for \$11.50 on a Greyhound bus. Somebody is paying a lot of money to have somebody travel around. Maybe we should be looking around for the most economical method of transportation. This fellow, I suppose, had a conflict of interest, but that is what he was telling me.

As far as the subway system in Toronto is concerned there is another odd situation. I was talking to a fellow the other day who said he went down to buy tickets at the subway station. He threw down \$2 or \$3 and the fellow handed him back all these tickets. He looked at them and started counting them. He said, "That doesn't seem right." He turned to the fellow and said, "I think you gave me too many tickets."

The ticket issuer said, "Oh, no. That's the rate for senior citizens."

He said: "I don't know, but I'm no senior citizen. I'm only 57 years old." He said, "I just thought you were a senior citizen. You looked as though you should be old enough."

If they're doing that, they're losing a little income. That isn't the intent of that. I don't know who it was, but I heard this happened. Somebody had better start looking at to whom they're selling tickets. I hope it wasn't the present Speaker. I don't think he looks that old.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Could have been.

Mr. Ruston: The present Premier has a way of playing around in the political system. Someone mentioned the politics of it a while ago. The present Premier of Ontario has used transit more to his liking in politics than anybody else. He was named Transit Man of the Year. He was going to stop the Spadina Expressway in a great show in the 1971 election. He was doing great things, but nothing very much ever happened. That was just using it as an election ploy, and you couldn't get anybody who used it more than him.

My goodness, he ran the election saying, "Cities are for people." He said, "Stop the Spadina Expressway." We always called it the ditch. People would come down and they would say to me, "What's that?" I said, "That's the Davis ditch." He did put a little pavement part way down, and made a little road. They call it an arterial road now, I believe. They don't call it an expressway.

I've come down on it a couple of times, but when you're coming in from western Ontario, it's not much help. You come out on to Eglinton and make a lefthand turn and come down Avenue Road. It's still the Davis ditch as far as I'm concerned. He didn't really solve many problems with it.

Mr. Nixon: Should have gone right through to Buffalo.

Mr. Ruston: I suppose if the people from Windsor who make cars had been doing that, they would have made an expressway all the way through downtown, but there again, they would be interested in cars. That's what they would have done, I suppose, but it would have disrupted many areas of downtown Toronto. There's no doubt about that.

We have to have a viable expressway system as well as a rapid transit system. It is most important now that we look at rapid transit because we've got it built, and we've got to use it, because of the amount of money that went into the Spadina line—the latest one. Apparently, it's losing money terribly right now.

I understand we need rezoning in that area so they can build highrises along there and then we can get the passengers. This has to be done. After all, we can't be using the money of the taxpayers of Ontario to build a

rapid transit system and then not see that the city and Metropolitan Toronto take their share to see that it's used properly.

I can agree that our leader is right, on a temporary basis right now. As I say, I have no interest in my own area. I think the two types of transportation have to be used in any metropolitan area if you want to have a good and viable city. That's why I'm speaking about it, Mr. Speaker.

I am very much interested in a good, alternative system of transportation. You can come in from the airport—and I've done it a few times—economically. You can get a bus to the Islington subway station, for \$1 and then it is 55 cents to come downtown by subway. That's \$1.55. That's pretty economical. That's very economical when you look at what we have to pay. I'm 20 miles from the airport in Windsor, and if you had to have somebody drive you there it's going to cost you \$15, I suppose. That's what we have to pay out in the boondocks, as the former member for Sudbury, Mr. Sopha, used to call it. It's not cheap for us people in the boondocks.

[5:30]

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to emphasize that we need a good rapid transit system in a city the size of Metropolitan Toronto. It needs some funds from all places to make sure it operates viably. The city of Toronto and metropolitan area are going to have to zone these areas so that the highrises will be built in an area where the subway is now built. Maybe it was built in the wrong place. I can't tell you that. But it's there now and you're going to have to use it. If it needs rezoning, then it should be done.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I rise to try to deal with some of the issues that have been raised this afternoon, and to answer some of the debating points, to the extent that they deserve an answer, that have been made against the position taken by this party.

I find it immediately ludicrous that the Conservative government, Conservative Party, and the Liberal Party are joined together in a common determination to avoid a vote in this assembly on the question of whether or not this small amount of \$6 million would be available to the Toronto Transit Commission so that for a one-year period the working people in Toronto who use the public transit system would not have to bear an increase of 16 to 17 per cent in the cost of their transportation. I want to make that very clear.

The Liberal Party is on record in the press and in this House that it does not want a vote on this issue, and today the House leader

of the Conservative Party, in consultation with the House leaders of the Liberal Party and of this party, has refused this party the opportunity to debate this issue in this assembly as a matter of confidence tomorrow, which is the last sitting day of this assembly before the fare increase goes into operation.

Mr. Sterling: You know what the result is.

Mr. Renwick: I want to say that again. I want it to be very clearly understood in this House and elsewhere in Metropolitan Toronto and in Ontario that the Tory government and the Liberal Party are frightened to have a vote on this issue in this assembly at this time. The House leader of the Conservative Party, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch), has said so by admitting that the vote will not take place on our motion tomorrow. Let's have that position perfectly clear.

Let me make a second point, and let me make it clearly because the Premier said that if there's one thing that this government does it is to stand by its decisions. Where did it stand by its decisions on real property tax reform in Ontario and in Metropolitan Toronto? Where did it stand on the question of the punishment that it was going to mete out to the citizens of the province on the OHIP increase? How firm were they in that decision?

Let me just pursue this for a moment. The net result of the failure of the Conservative Party to provide an equitable tax system in Ontario, particularly related to real property taxation, has meant that they played the age-old game of playing the users of public utilities in Ontario, in their capacity as users, against the same people in their capacity as property taxpayers. That's what has been done by the metropolitan chairman and by the metropolitan government. They have said, almost laughingly, when the chips are down they will make the user of the TTC pay rather than the property taxpayer because they want to make it certain that the property taxpayer in that capacity is the one who will get what little relief is available.

On a provincial basis, what this government should be headed towards doing is providing, out of the progressive tax revenues of the province to Metropolitan Toronto—from the contributions which Metropolitan Toronto makes to those general revenues of the province—the kind of money which will, for one year, provide an opportunity for Metropolitan Toronto in some way to get a handle on the TTC, to enable Metro to avoid the disasters which are going to accrue to the ridership of that system, if this government does not change its policy.

I want to say how disappointed I am in the Toronto Transit Commission. One need only read this report, *Some Tough Choices*, including the introductory memorandum from the chairman of corporate planning to the chief general manager, to see that it was begging. It was begging Metropolitan Toronto, and the government of the province of Ontario, to refuse the moneys which were required to freeze the fare box in the city of Toronto.

I don't understand all the sophistication of the figures about transit systems. But I do understand one thing: I do understand it when the people who use the public transit system are the ones being punished by this government, because in a large majority they come from the very kind of riding that I represent and that my colleagues in this assembly represent, namely those who use it for practical purposes because they have little, if any, other choice.

One need only look at this report about the use of the subway system and metropolitan transportation, both road and rail—the 1978 survey on attitudes and uses—to get some conception of the whole and total point which has been missed in the media, by the metropolitan government, by the Toronto Transit Commission and by this government, and deliberately overlooked and distorted in their presentations to the public. Let me just read from this report which would indicate that, in some way or other, it is an inconsequential matter.

“Among heavy riders”—those are the people who work and use the transit system for work purposes—“almost three quarters, 72 per cent, reported they used the TTC to go to and from their work and for other business purposes. Of secondary importance, 18 per cent were attending school and/or university.”

How do you distinguish a heavy user? Well, I'm not going to go into it at great length; it's right at the very beginning of the report. “Seventy-one per cent of heavy riders live in none or one-car families, while 49 per cent of non-riders are members of two-or-more-car families. Non-riders are found almost always among those whose annual household incomes are over \$20,000 a year.”

So, when my friend from Armourdale uses an average figure of 150 rides per year, let me say this: what we are talking about, in this party, in placing our no-confidence motion on the order paper, is the people who use that system 500 and more times a year for the purpose of going to and from their place of work and for whatever other uses they may put it to. In that case, we are talk-

ing about \$35 a year, at least, as a minimum increase.

All right, I've listened for some time to this talk about the nickel—only a nickel. I want to say to this government that unless it begins to understand that at the cash registers in the food markets and at the fare box ticket offices of the transit system, nickel-and-dime inflation is bearing so heavily on the people in the city of Toronto, it will not be surprising that there is a revolt. Whether it is focused on the property tax or however it is focused, let me assure the government that if it does not pay attention to the people who have to walk up to the wicket to buy those tokens and if it is not prepared to protect them, then I can be certain that we won't suffer any disaster in the call of an election in Metropolitan Toronto. The Tory government and the Liberal government will suffer that disaster here.

The proof of that is that I challenge the Tory government to reverse its decision, to permit this debate to take place tomorrow and to have the vote taken in order to determine on what side of the fence the members of the assembly stand.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, for some hours this afternoon, the various figures that are relative to the operating deficit, to the ridership and to the future of the TTC have been discussed. I would just like to put on the record, because there has been from time to time this afternoon some talk about cutbacks and so forth, that indeed there have been no cutbacks this year. As a matter of fact, there was an additional \$2.5 million to meet part of the operating deficit of the TTC.

Mr. Nixon: That's not what John Sewell says.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The figure of 8.4 per cent in terms of that increase should be re-emphasized at a time when the general government increase in grants to meet operating costs of municipalities, for a very necessary social service to a great number of very vital parts of our community has been at five per cent. Indeed this government, as the Premier said just this afternoon, is more committed than ever to rapid transit, not just in the Metropolitan Toronto area, but in all the urban centres of this province.

Those who are providing just as vital services for the entire community in hospitals, in all the various social services and in a great many other areas that I have talked about might indeed say that the TTC this year is already a special case.

The record of this government not only in the promotion of but dedication to rapid transit in this province has been demonstrated in the past six or seven or eight years by many twenties of millions of dollars, not just going out to meet the operating deficit to prop up the sagging fare box, as some have suggested, for a short period of time, but to make rapid transit and urban transit a very viable operation.

The bulk of those funds have gone out to buy new equipment—not just subway cars, rolling stock, or buses for Metropolitan Toronto or Mississauga or the city of London, but throughout the province. The quality of the product throughout the province, as indeed the quality of the product in Metropolitan Toronto, is unsurpassed anywhere in North America. Everybody agrees to that. The reason for that is that the product has been put in place because the province of Ontario provided the bulk of the capital funds so that the transit rider—and I say this with all due respect to the member for Riverdale—has a first-class product to ride upon.

[5:45]

Today the question is, in order at this time—and I emphasize at this time—to avoid a fare increase, will the province provide at least an additional \$6 million on top of the already more than \$98 million it is providing to the TTC this year. But on the other hand I've heard more than one today very candidly admit that the fare box alone—and that's where that \$6 million would go—is not the answer to declining transit ridership.

As a matter of fact, the fare in the city of Hamilton is remarkably low, and yet it has in proportion the very same problem that the TTC does in not being able to attract or to keep its present ridership. Indeed there have been mentions about smaller communities raising their fares. They are having the same difficulty, as the fares go up, in keeping their riders.

Even the TTC finds this in its own study, and I don't think its own study is begging. I think that here is a transit corporation second to none in North America standing up, analysing itself and the problems it is encountering, putting them down and saying: "Look, if we could make the decision alone then we would have done it." But it has to be done in conjunction with Metropolitan Toronto planning—

Mr. Renwick: They've stopped fighting for the riders.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It has to be done in conjunction with the provincial government and

they're putting it out, some tough decisions to take and to make. They've outlined the problem, they talk about a sluggish economy and what it does to ridership.

Mr. Renwick: They treat the riders as statistics.

Hon. Mr. Drea: They talk about certain demographic factors—that there are fewer young people and what that has done to transit riders. They are quite candid about how in some years when they raised fares—and indeed the amount of those increases in those days—

Mr. McClellan: Finish the sentence, Frank.

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, go on.

Hon. Mr. Drea: —was just about in proportion to what this is—when they raised fares they actually attracted riders. They pointed out all of these things and they say there are some tough decisions to be made.

Mr. Cassidy: Not since 1975 Frank.

Hon. Mr. Drea: This is true, this is quite true. But the one thing that becomes overwhelmingly apparent is that it is not the fare box. It is not their operating deficit; it is not their fare. It goes far beyond all of this.

As the Premier said today, while the province is committed to urban transit the time has come for the province, Metropolitan Toronto and the TTC to find the solution to declining ridership; and it is not in the fare box. The argument has been said that you can buy some time by freezing, perhaps they won't lose as many in the short term as they might. If the fare box, by common admission, has extremely little bearing on declining or rising ridership, then I humbly ask how would putting more in—

Mr. Cassidy: So you'll charge a dollar a ride because you don't care; that's what you're saying.

Hon. Mr. Drea: —get down to facing the tough decision as how to attract riders. I don't mean just the people who may have departed from the TTC in the past year or so, but how to expand that market so that rapid transit does play its proper role in a balanced transportation system that is essential in a metropolis of the dimensions of Metropolitan Toronto and environs.

Mr. Conway: Stop picking up hitchhikers.

Hon. Mr. Drea: One way or the other, the person who rides the TTC and puts the token in the machine or the ticket in the fare box or pays cash, no matter what would be the decision today, he or she is going to pay the cost. They are either going to pay it in terms of what they drop into the box or they are going to pay it out of their own taxes.

Mr. Cassidy: That's under your government, yes. Why shouldn't the car driver contribute? Everybody benefits from that system. Why shouldn't they contribute to it?

Hon. Mr. Drea: One way or the other.

Mr. Renwick: Don't use that simplistic statement; it does you a disservice.

Hon. Mr. Drea: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that when the member for Riverdale feels I am being simplistic, then for the first time all day I feel very confident not only that I have touched a raw nerve, but also that I am absolutely correct.

It has been the government's position throughout the day that this whole debate over what would be the impact if one decision were made as against the other in terms of the fare box should have been directed towards the real problem, which is the declining ridership of the Toronto Transit Commission, the lack of utilization of the TTC services. The debate, while it has been meritorious and interesting, has really failed to come to grips with that point.

A debate in this Legislature, another subsidy, begging the question, or buying time isn't going to do it. Surely the time has come to end the controversy and the politics of controversy around the fare box and to put that energy into working with the TTC in Metropolitan Toronto to come to grips with the problem and with what we are going to do about it.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up where the previous speaker has left off, because what my colleagues and I are trying to suggest to that government is that it is exactly that period of time, that period of grace, to do the kind of in-depth examination that he and other speakers in that party have spoken about, that we are asking for.

We are not asking for a fare freeze for ever. We are asking for a fare freeze for one year for the very groups of people that the previous speaker just talked about—this government, Metro, the TTC—to sit down together and examine clearly what the alternatives are. That's what we are trying to do. That's why we are having this debate this afternoon. That's what we are trying, again and again, to bring to the government's attention.

I fail to understand how members of the government party can get up, one after the other, and say they also believe that this kind of in-depth planning is needed if we are going to solve the problems over the long haul and yet not agree with us to give this one-year moratorium.

The previous speaker also spoke about the fact that transit in Toronto and in many places in Ontario is among the best in the world. That's partially true, and it also goes right to the heart of what we are talking about. If we have taken the time, the energy and the dollars of the taxpayers of this province and of this Legislature, if we have built something of which we are proud and of which we want to continue to be proud, then for heaven's sake let's not turn our backs at this point. In the grander context, we aren't talking about an awful lot. You can't dismiss \$6 million; it's a lot of money. But it has to be taken in the broader context which is that what we have built is worth preserving. That doesn't apply just to the city of Toronto; it applies also to many other municipalities in this province.

In my own city of Kitchener there is going to be a fare increase this year. Our public transit system is going to be facing a deficit in excess of \$1 million; they are seriously examining whether public transit can continue to meet the needs of people. That's a question that's being asked London, in Sarnia, in Ottawa, in Hamilton, in Kitchener and, yes, in Toronto. The very kinds of decisions, the very kinds of planning, the very kinds of hope for the future that could come out of this one-year moratorium could have an influence or an impact on those other communities as well.

There is a uniqueness about Toronto, however. Let's accept that fact. Downtown Toronto, in particular, to a large extent has been planned and structured because of public transit. The kinds of things that now can happen in the downtown core of the city of Toronto happened to a large extent because we do have a good public transit system. Are we going to let that go down the drain as well? Once again, we have accepted here in the city of Toronto, and we are beginning to get that model accepted in other larger urban centres in this province, that there is a life and vitality to the downtown core, and that we don't want our people fleeing to the suburbs and abandoning the downtown as a skeleton that operates simply during the business part of the day, such as is happening in many American cities that the Premier himself referred to earlier this afternoon.

That is a fact. But surely if we believe that is something that we want in our urban downtown centres, then we must also reflect that the vitality of the public transit system makes it possible. It won't happen by itself. Are we prepared to lose that as well? This is really what this debate is all about this afternoon. It is looking at the heart of what we

believe we want to maintain. Everybody here says he agrees with that. Then, for God's sake, why don't we give them that moratorium? Why don't we give them in the broader context a relatively smaller sum of money? Why don't we give our cities and our public transit systems a chance to show that they can do it?

If a year from now they haven't come up with the answers, then we will have to start asking other kinds of questions. But I would suggest that the questions we are asking today, the issues we are raising today and the recommendations we are making today at least are worthy of consideration and at least are worthy of a year.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Scarborough Centre might appreciate this. He knows as well as I do what is about to happen to transit in Scarborough because of the decision of this government. As the fares increase, because of that fare increase we will not see any increase in the bus service in Scarborough. He knows that as well as I do. Further to that, he knows from the studies that were tabled along with some tough choices—the document from Michael Warren—that ridership will decrease with fare increases.

Mr. McClellan: That's what it says.

Mr. Warner: That is what has happened historically. We know that is going to occur. When it does, the TTC has no choice but not to increase service in Scarborough and in the other boroughs as well. What we're facing in Scarborough is deteriorating service not increased service. We don't have adequate service in Scarborough right now, and this government has made sure that we won't get any better service.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Scarborough is getting a new subway for \$61 million and a new LRT. Everything comes to Scarborough.

Mr. Warner: What bothers me is that when we faced the hospital closing decision earlier, we knew that a combined opposition could force a reversal of the government.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Why don't you ask the Mayor of Scarborough? He thinks everything is just fine.

Mr. Warner: The Liberal Party knew that, but when we come to another circumstance where a bad decision of the government can be reversed by opposition pressure, what happens? The Liberals bail out faster than one can bat an eyelash. They are gone, and not only are they gone but they supported the arbitrary decision by the government not to allow this party to have the important vote on confidence, the important vote that needs to be taken tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Drea: You know if they hadn't, you would be defeated.

Mr. Warner: That arbitrary decision is going to haunt this Legislature for some time. You cannot tamper with the parliamentary system the way this government arbitrarily does and get away with it.

Hon. Mr. Drea: You are tampering with it.

Mr. Warner: I will close off. The government members like to talk about the five-cent issue. This government isn't worth a plugged nickel.

Mr. Speaker: The time for the allotted item has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: Let's have a vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By agreement, there is no business statement today. I believe there might be one tomorrow. Before moving the adjournment of the House, I would indicate that tomorrow we will be dealing with Bills 74 and 75 in committee.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the procedure. The temporary government House leader or temporary minister has indicated we will deal with Bills 74 and 75 tomorrow. We do not normally deal with legislation on Friday. Is there some explanation for not dealing with the routine proceedings?

Mr. Speaker: There is really no explanation required. The government House leader determines the order of business in the House.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Grossman, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 8, 1979

Resignation of member for Wentworth	19
Introduction of new member for Sault Ste. Marie	19
Huronion Regional Centre, statement by Mr. Norton	19
Transportation services for handicapped, statement by Mr. Snow	21
Standing orders re supplementary questions, Mr. Speaker	21
Hydro expansion program, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. J. Reed, Mr. MacDonald	22
Co-payment fees, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Conway	24
Hydro load forecasts, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. J. Reed, Ms. Gigantes	25
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy	27
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Riddell	27
Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lawlor	29
Downtown revitalization, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Watson	30
Funding of post-secondary education, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sweeney	30
Hockey violence, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Martel, Mr. T. P. Reid	31
Grand River flooding, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Nixon	32
Huronion Regional Centre, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClellan	33
Vehicle licence fees, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Blundy	33
Re International Women's Day, Mr. Bounsall	34
Petition re vehicle licence fees, Mr. Blundy	34
Report, standing resources development committee, Mr. Havrot	34
Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Philip	34
Motion to appoint Mr. MacBeth as Deputy Chairman, Mr. Welch, agreed to	34
Motion re establishment of standing committees, Mr. Welch, agreed to	34
Motion re committee substitutions, Mr. Welch, agreed to	35
Motion re procedural affairs committee meeting, Mr. Welch, agreed to	35
County of Middlesex Act, Mr. Henderson, agreed to	35
Employment Standards Amendment Act, Mr. Bounsall, first reading	35
Non-Unionized Workers Rights Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	36
Pits and Quarries Control Amendment Act, Mr. Warner, first reading	36
Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	36
Motion to suspend normal business for matter of urgent public importance, Mr. S. Smith, agreed to	36
Debate re TTC fare increase, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Davis, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Swart, Mr. Snow, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McCaffrey, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Drea, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Warner	39
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Grossman, agreed to	62

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, B. (Armourdale PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1979

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

ORAL QUESTIONS ENERGY POLICY

Mr. S. Smith: I'll ask a question of the Premier, who I see is just arriving, inasmuch as the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) and his esteemed assistant, who is making remarks on his behalf in Ottawa, are both absent.

I would like to ask the Premier why it is that the government of Ontario feels free to play rather cute politics with the question of energy at a time when the national interest is perhaps a little more important? Why is it that only Premier Lougheed, the government of Ontario, and Mr. Clark in the opposition are now objecting and referring to as dictatorial a bill which is almost identical in wording to a bill to which Ontario took no objection just a few years ago? I refer to Bill C-42 and the remarks that were made by the member for Durham West (Mr. Ashe), the parliamentary assistant for the Minister of Energy.

Given the fact that electrical energy cannot be redistributed by the federal government under this bill without the agreement of the province, what is the objection of the province of Ontario suddenly, now, to the allocation of natural gas and oil in the event of a national emergency?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I realize the Leader of the Opposition has read the act and assessed it with great care. Of course he has also read the observations made to the committee.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Premier want a copy? We have a copy right here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes, I have a copy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know that the distinguished House leader for the Liberal Party has also read it with great care.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is not a debate, it's a question period.

An hon. member: It's a shouting match.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest—

Mr. Nixon: The Premier's implication is that we have not read it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no, I'm just saying that I'm assuming the member has.

Mr. S. Smith: It happens that we have; so why doesn't the Premier answer the question for a change?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess after that heroic performance yesterday afternoon on the TTC, the Leader of the Opposition is feeling just a little frustrated this morning. I understand that. I have great sympathy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the question dealt specifically with energy policy and I wish the Premier would confine his remarks to that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly make every effort, although you must confess that the Leader of the Opposition's question was really somewhat provocative. There was some editorial comment suggesting that we were playing politics. I think that was the general suggestion in his question.

Mr. Kerrio: Perish the thought.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm just saying that I—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the Premier have a response?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister himself will be here sometime within the next half hour or three quarters of an hour and he might like to deal with it in greater detail.

Just as a matter of general principle though, as a government we are concerned about some of the powers contained in that particular bill. I recognize the members opposite perhaps would like to take this issue in defence of the minister in Ottawa and the powers he wishes to obtain through this bill. The brief also pointed out—and I think it's really very relevant—that one of the concerns—

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, it's one country.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do you want an answer or do you not want an answer?

Mr. S. Smith: You are only starting to answer the question now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the Leader of the Opposition want a response?

Mr. S. Smith: I certainly do, but I wish he would have directed himself to the answer at the beginning of his reply.

Mr. Speaker: If you would stop interrupting, perhaps we might get a response.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it's fair to point out that this is really a little broader than just the bill. The submission made yesterday pointed out the concern of this province with respect to energy policy generally. The submission pointed out that part of the rationale of this province over the past number of years is the fact that the government of Canada, in support of the Liberal policy of Ontario, was moving to world price, that we were looking for the guarantee of supply in this process and that we really haven't made much progress in this regard. That too, was a part of the brief. We don't see anything in the bill that really brings this about.

I'm the first one to support, as I have and as I did at the first ministers' conference, the ability of the government of Canada to act, I think the phrasing in the proposed legislation then was, in "a compelling national interest." I'm not sure this was the right phraseology; I'm not sure it shouldn't be done in some better fashion and I'm not going to argue that today. But we do not without any question move away from the fact that in times of national emergency or compelling national interest there should be involvement by the government of Canada. This point of view is contrary to that of the producing provinces, including Saskatchewan, although my guess is that they were prepared to accept, shall we say, that compromise sort of position. Alberta obviously was not.

Ms. Gigantes: Saskatchewan is a co-operative commonwealth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What we're concerned about is some of the principles contained in the bill and just what they might mean in the long run. I think there is an implication in the bill that would give the government of Canada or the minister powers that really would usurp those normally discharged by the National Energy Board. The Leader of the Opposition may not read that into the bill, but I think the potential for that is there.

I think it's a very important piece of legislation. It's one that should be thought out very carefully.

Mr. Peterson: You have got the power to ration gas in the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say with respect that maybe it shouldn't be rushed through during the dying stages of the administration that may no longer be administering the affairs of this country after the next election.

It does get into the possibility of rationing, although Mr. Gillespie himself has acknowledged that it would take weeks or months to bring any such situation about. Our point of view, and the minister may express this in different terminology, is that the bill is a very important bill. It has serious implications for all of us. It does get into the question of the rights and responsibilities of provincial jurisdictions. I think it would have been unfortunate if we had not made our points of view known.

Hopefully, those brief words will help the Leader of the Opposition. If he hasn't received it, I will certainly get him a copy of the presentation made by the province. It may be he'll find a lot in it with which he can agree; there may be some things with which he doesn't. I understand that.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, would the Premier please explain to the House why a bill is now found dictatorial and objectionable just before a possible federal election when the very same bill, virtually word for word, was found acceptable by Ontario just a few years ago? Does the Premier not agree that in the event that international allocations of oil and gas were required, a national government would have the ability to make those kinds of allocations within this country, notwithstanding the objections of the Premier of Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We have always taken the position that, in times of national emergency or compelling national interest, or whatever language one may wish to use, the government of Canada has not only a right, but also a responsibility.

There are some provinces which disagree with that point of view. This province does not happen to be one of them. What we are saying is that this bill, put in place on a permanent basis, does raise several matters of principle which we think have to be assessed very carefully.

It is the Leader of the Opposition who is putting this into a political context, who is putting it into the context of our objections prior to a federal election. We have not put it in that context. He may have more knowledge than I have as to when the Prime Minister of Canada intends to issue a writ. I have not put this into a political context; nor did the presentation to the committee in Ottawa put it into a political context. If he wishes to do so, if he wishes to say people are playing politics with this, so be it. We are not.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: I welcome the posi-

tion taken by the government in this matter because of the very great concern that we had about the supine attitude of the government with respect to the emergency powers question two years ago and to the Anti-Inflation Board legislation.

My question to the Premier is, will he also provide us with a copy of the brief? And does the Premier, as the spokesman for the government with respect to constitutional change, in fact have background papers and a detailed position paper on the position of this government with respect to the doctrines of national emergency and national concern, which are obviously at the root of this question and led to the position taken by the government in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government has never been supine, as the member for Riverdale suggests.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Comatose, but not supine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I certainly will be delighted to provide him with a copy of the observations made, together with a copy of the bill.

I am trying to think what material we might provide him with as it relates to the position of this province. What I think I can get for him is the documentation that was used for the first ministers' meeting, which documentation really sets out the areas of consensus as it relates to distribution, particularly as it related to the resource industry. I think I can get that material for him. When I say "consensus", this was as a result of the meeting of the ministers responsible here in Toronto. I emphasize "consensus", because Alberta was opposed to the suggested language. Saskatchewan, my recollection is, was less than enthusiastic; it preferred Alberta's position. I do not think I am being unfair in saying that.

We were prepared to accept, I think, if there had been unanimity by all the other provinces, probably the draft that was considered. Some of us were concerned about the exact phraseology of that draft and whether "compelling national interest" was sufficient to enable the federal government to move in times of difficulty or crisis—I do not like the word "crisis"—but it did not get that far. We did not reach any agreement as to whether the word "compelling" or some variation of that would be acceptable at all to Alberta, and as a result the discussions did not go past that point.

I will certainly get whatever material I can for the member. I will also give him an opportunity, perhaps during the throne speech debate or whenever, to discuss this in greater detail, but I will get it for him.

Mr. S. Smith: For the Premier's information, the phrase is "national emergency", and not "compelling interest"—just for his information. He might read the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: Where is it? What is the Leader of the Opposition referring to?

Mr. S. Smith: Bill C-42, the bill to which the Premier is taking such serious objection; the words are "national emergency".

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I was referring to was the consensus that was reached. We are talking about two different issues here, if the Leader of the Opposition would listen. We are talking about the possibility of using the phrase "compelling national interest" in relation to the resource section of a new constitution. That is where the phrase "compelling national interest" emerged. That is what the documentation suggests. I did not suggest that the bill contained that phrase. I happen to know it does not.

[10:15]

USE OF HERBICIDE 2,4,5-T

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott), but he is not here again, so perhaps the Minister of Agriculture and Food might be willing to take this question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He was here yesterday.

Mr. Bolan: So were you.

Mr. Peterson: And nobody noticed.

Mr. Conway: The Premier is so much more pleasant when his wife is with him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If sometime you did the same thing, then you might be more pleasant.

Mr. S. Smith: I fail to see why the member for Renfrew North would wish to be with the Premier's wife, charming person that she is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Or more likely, I have to tell you on a matter of privilege, it would be a lot better company than some he keeps in that caucus.

Mr. S. Smith: But to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture: Given that the season for spraying the herbicide 2,4,5-T is almost upon us, or will be in a few weeks, is the Minister of Agriculture and Food planning in consultation with the Minister of the Environment to ban the use of this particular herbicide? In view of the unprecedented action by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States, will he issue an emergency ban on the spraying of that particular chemical? Granting that in Ontario this chemical is used basically for bush con-

trol rather than on food-growing areas, nonetheless, given the hazard to human health, is the minister prepared to issue a ban for this season until he has some further information?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, 2,4,5-T, better known as brush killer, is licensed by the government of Canada, not by the province of Ontario, and as soon as I heard about it, I instructed my staff to get in touch with the appropriate people in Ottawa to have some discussions on the matter. They will be the ones who will have to do any banning, right out of Ottawa. It's licensed under Ottawa agreements of course, as the member knows.

Mr. S. Smith: It is indeed. By way of supplementary: the provincial government also has jurisdiction in the use of these pesticides or herbicides in a sense, as the minister knows, and what I would like to know is whether the minister is aware that approximately 220,000 pounds of this substance containing dioxin, which is the single most toxic chemical known to man, were sprayed in Ontario in 1978? Is he aware that students were spraying it this past summer in large amounts under the Ontario Hydro right of way areas? The Ministry of the Environment has allegedly been studying this chemical closely for two years now. Given the resultant miscarriages in Oregon and so on, does the minister not feel that he has some responsibility to act and not just wait for some licensing arrangement to come through from Ottawa? The spraying is going to start in a few weeks, so doesn't he think he should be protecting the families and the people who may in other ways be affected by this spraying program?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I've already pointed out that I have drawn it to the attention of my officials who have talked to Ottawa. The Minister of the Environment, who is not here, is the person the question should be properly put to and I've had discussions on it with his people too. We work together as a unit over here and we understand what's going on—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Then you should be able to answer the question.

Hon. W. Newman: —and we are talking with Ottawa on the matter.

EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, if he will care to find himself back in the House. I have a question right now for the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is there.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He was there all the time.

Mr. Foulds: He was hiding behind the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle).

Mr. Cassidy: He's gotten so short.

Mr. Foulds: I didn't think anybody could hide behind Rene Brunelle, but Larry Grossman can.

Mr. Cassidy: That's the fastest reappearing act we've seen for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition gets cranky and you lose your eyesight, all in one morning.

Mr. Cassidy: In that case, I will ask a question beginning with the Minister of Industry and Tourism. In view of the fact that there are very serious problems in key sectors of Ontario industry, like the machinery industry and electrical products, can the minister explain why the government intends to leave it up to individual corporations to determine the province's industrial priorities on an ad hoc basis in the proposed new incentive scheme that was announced in the throne speech? Can he explain why the province is taking this patchwork approach to industrial planning rather than letting the province provide leadership in developing key sectors of our industry?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Firstly, as was indicated the other day, the details of the operation of the fund will be unveiled in the next few weeks and I would suggest to the leader of the third party that perhaps that might be an appropriate time at which to judge whether we are leaving all of this to the industries themselves. Having said that, I think I have gone to great lengths in the last few weeks to indicate that we do have certain priorities. One of those I have indicated has been the electronics industry and, following hard on the heels of the sectoral studies, we will be indicating some further sectors of the economy which on an industry specific basis will be those which will have some priority in terms of applications to the fund.

As well, we are going to be indicating which types of firms on a firm specific basis will within those sectors and across the board have priority in terms of their applications to the fund. I think this is a marked change for government in terms of indicating where its money can most effectively be used in terms of creating some long-term strength for industry in the province. In simple terms then, while the leader of the third party may, and I expect he will, take exception to certain

of the priority areas we indicate both on an industry and firm specific basis, nonetheless, I do want to assure him that we do have priorities.

In fact, we do have certain strategies which we will be indicating in the next few weeks. Finally, I think any determination with regard to which areas should ultimately be the areas to which our strategy is pointed ought to await determination of the GATT negotiations because, obviously, any particular strategy we might announce today could be dramatically affected by tariff and non-tariff changes two or three weeks down the road.

After the GATT negotiations, we will be spelling out in a rather detailed fashion those areas of priority and strategies we have developed for long-term strength in the 1980s.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: If I can take just the city of Hamilton as an example, is the minister aware that employment in the machinery industry in Hamilton has gone down from 5,500 four years ago to 3,600 today and that employment in the electrical industry has gone down from 8,100 four years ago to 5,300 today? Will the government be giving priority to key building block industries, like machinery and electrical products, in order to rebuild our strength in areas that have been allowed to wither away under the Conservative government?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With respect, I think it's ridiculous to suggest that this government had the slightest thing to do with the withering away of those particular sectors.

Mr. di Santo: It's true.

Mr. S. Smith: It's not your fault?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: These things have a lot larger implication than specific provincial policies. In fact, as we have tried to make clear—and I understand for political purposes that the leader of the third party would prefer to ignore it—the fact is that what we are attempting to do in this province is to move into some of the vacuum created by a lack of any co-ordinated federal government strategy of any sort whatsoever over the last few years. As well, we can't ignore the fact that international circumstances, which have given rise in part to what has happened in the federal government of this country, are creating a bit of a crisis of confidence. All of these things begin to build up over time to create a situation in which Ontario now must respond in specific sectors to help specific sectors out of some of these problems which, let's face it, have not been created by this government in this province.

It is facetious to argue that, and members opposite would reject any argument made

by this government which allowed us to take credit for a similar increase in those sectors in terms of employment, if that had occurred over the past few years. If the leader of the third party is taking the position now that we ought to be only or mainly responsible for that decrease, I trust he will maintain that position, if we see an increase in certain sectors, and allow us to take full credit for any increases that occur over the next year which, by the way, I believe there will be in many sectors.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: While the minister is setting forward the guidelines with respect to the Ontario employment development fund, will he be able to advise the House as to the alternatives that that fund might assist? I am thinking particularly of the Budd situation in Kitchener where re-tooling or other opportunities for use of those funds might be of assistance, even though the marketing for the product that it so happens that company makes is a somewhat different circumstance, as the minister is well aware. Will there be the opportunity at least to have those alternatives dealt with as possible applications under this fund?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, that's a very relevant question and one that we have been considering, specifically with regard to the Budd situation. To be fair to Budd, they have not asked for, nor indicated yet, any need for that sort of assistance. Their problem is, as you have indicated, a market for whatever product they might find themselves able to produce with or without some additional assistance.

One of the things we really want to take care the public is aware of is that the new fund is not one which is only aimed at, or perhaps even primarily aimed at, incentives to multinationals to locate in this province. In fact, I would expect a great deal of the funds out of that employment development fund would be pointed toward the Budd type of situation, provided that a new long-term market can be developed for a new product or process which will give us some assurance of stability for employment in that given community for a long period of time; not for two or three years, but for a generation or so.

If that company can offer sourcing in Canada, long-term stability, perhaps some export potential and some technological advancement, then that is a typical situation where I would conceive an application to the fund would be warmly received.

I think we now have to begin to develop the manoeuvrability and the mobility within that fund to respond to situations like that

in two ways; firstly, to provide adjustment assistance to permit plants to convert into profitable operations and, secondly—and this is one of the reasons that a board of ministers is being considered and has been developed—the ability to respond quickly before large layoffs take place and a plant shuts down, which then is more difficult to rescue than operating before the fact. So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, the Budd type of situation is one which I expect would well qualify.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary to the original question: Is the minister aware that the employment in the secondary manufacturing sector in Ontario has been decreasing gradually, year after year, because of lack of a policy of this government and not of the federal government or the GATT negotiations in Geneva? Secondly, what insurance can the government give that this new grant plan of financing selected and winning companies will not produce the same disastrous effect as the past fiscal policy of this government in exempting the machinery-producing companies from sales tax which has not produced one single job in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I can't give you a total and complete assurance of the success of this program, or any other program that this or any other government, regardless of strife, is able to put forward. No one has any iron-clad guarantees of success.

What we do believe is that this program will give us some manoeuvrability in order, quite frankly, to avoid layoff situations and situations where governments historically have come in after the fact where we are trying to put the pieces back together again, after an industry has been permitted to operate on its own and finds itself, after many years, in a situation in which its goods or services or products are no longer competitive.

We are trying now to speak to firms which are doing reasonably well, but which we anticipate, through competition, tariff changes or whatever, may find themselves on the critical list in three or four or five years and in this fashion we can avoid coming in after the fact. Instead, we can come in before the fact and perhaps put those firms in a long-term healthier situation than if we had sat back and done nothing and waited until they applied to us as a lender of last resort to bail them out of a death-bed situation. I think in the long term this will provide a lot more job security than the old system which was more of a Band-Aid one.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister assure the House

that the assistance given to these various corporations will not be to the detriment of other Ontario and/or Canadian companies at present manufacturing a similar or almost similar product?

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, absolutely. I think, in fact, the selectivity approach will give us the flexibility that, in some cases, we didn't have earlier to try to look after that sort of situation. In any case, let me say to the member for Windsor-Walkerville in response to his question, we will continue to be as carefully selective as we were last June in the V-6 engine plant.

But quite seriously, the older system, the system which would have us respond only through the traditional ODC mechanism, was one more tied to universality and programs in which if one came within the four corners of the program one got the money. That put us in a position where sometimes we did have situations where a new endeavour, newly financed, would be in a somewhat competitive position. In this way, because we are trying to build up long-term competitive and industrial strength, we would be defeating our purposes if we helped one firm build up while at the same time we allowed another one to fall down as a result.

The answer to the question in simple terms is yes, we will be avoiding those types of situations.

HYDRO LOAD FORECASTS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In an attempt to get a clear answer, after trying to listen to the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Auld) response yesterday on questions of Hydro's future plans—as I mentioned yesterday, a one per cent error in forecasting of demand growth by Hydro will cost, according to Hydro itself, consumers of Ontario half a billion dollars a year in extra payments for electricity in the 1980s—I would like to ask the minister:

In view of the contentions by several members of cabinet that the substitution of electricity for uncertain oil and gas supplies is going to raise the total rate of electrical demand growth, is that the government's position; and in that case, does the minister therefore reject the Ministry of Energy forecast, which indicates very clearly that if oil and gas supplies are uncertain that will, in fact, lower the rate of growth for electricity demand to a rate even lower than the ministry already forecast?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The Premier indicated earlier that the Minister of Energy would be here later this morning, and I believe that question should be directed to him.

Mr. Cassidy: If I can ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I will refer it back to the Minister of Energy if the minister insists, but I would like the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development to say whether, as Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, he is exercising any oversight over the failure of the Ministry of Energy to exercise any specific—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oversight? There are never oversights over here.

Mr. S. Smith: You overlook a lot of things.

Mr. Cassidy: —of course there are—whether the Ministry of Energy is exercising any control at all over Ontario Hydro's development program, or whether the government has simply decided to leave Hydro with its projections, with all the costs that will entail because of overforecasting for the Ontario consumer?

Mr. Nixon: Rene, tell us what you think; this may be your last chance.

Mr. Speaker: New question.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that question is referred to the Minister of Energy.

BOISE CASCADE DISPUTE

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower in regard to the labour dispute between Boise Cascade and lumber and sawmill unions at Fort Frances and Kenora. Since this legal strike has been on since last September and there doesn't seem to be much movement on either side, from either the company or the unions, in resolving the owner-operator dispute, can the Minister of Labour and Manpower suggest if there is any new movement in settling this dispute and if he might be ready at this time to table the Joyce-Lewis report and its recommendations in order to bring the parties together and resolve it?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, I might take the opportunity to thank the member, as well as the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and the members for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy) and Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds), for the excellent rapport there has been during this very difficult dispute. As I am sure the member for Rainy River knows, we have put a great deal of effort into trying to resolve that situation. I am pleased to table not only the original report of the disputes advisory committee, but a follow-up report

which I just received yesterday. I will also forward copies of those two reports to the leaders of the opposition party and the third party and to the labour critics.

I think it would be fair if I could read, perhaps, from the final report I received yesterday from the disputes advisory committee—Mr. Stephen Lewis and Mr. Robert Joyce—in a selective way: "We still believe that the route of voluntary arbitration can be fair to both parties, especially if the arbitration board were constituted as originally recommended. We remain more than willing to intervene again, or to help in any way if it seems appropriate."

So, in more direct answer to your question: I have to say that the disputes advisory committee and I remain firm in the belief that both parties should seriously give thought to accepting voluntary binding arbitration as a means of solving an issue which at the present time I frankly find very difficult to see being resolved in any other way. I say that, having met with them personally on many occasions and having resolved every other matter in dispute—except that one remaining and very fundamental issue.

I would also like to take this opportunity to say that there has been great co-operation with the Solicitor General (Mr. McMurtry) in this regard, in that the Solicitor General was good enough to have members of his staff meet with union representatives. Policing arrangements and problems have been ironed out, to my knowledge, very satisfactorily. So I think it has been a good, co-operative effort to try in every way possible to resolve that dispute in as equitable a way as seems reasonable.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Supplementary, if I may: I would like to thank the Minister of Labour for his co-operation in regard to this.

Mr. Peterson: What's going on here?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It is called "getting along," David.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: David wouldn't know what that was.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Do I take it, then, from the minister's answer that he will be formally contacting both Lumber and Saw and Boise Cascade and putting to them formally that they should accept voluntary arbitration, and that perhaps in the meantime, while that process—which I believe would take about three months—is going on, they would revert to the status quo? Will he do that formally?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The original disputes advisory committee report recommended that there be a return to work, if the principle of voluntary arbitration was accepted. So that's

in line with what the member has said. I certainly do intend, as a result of the report that I have just received, to write to both parties or to communicate with them in some other way, indicating our view that voluntary arbitration is something they should give serious consideration to.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. Bounsall: I have a question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Since the previous minister, the member for York Mills (Miss Stephenson), rejected the thrust of an internal ministry report, aimed at the introduction of legislation on equal pay for work of equal value, will the minister give a commitment to review that report, with the positive view of introducing as soon as possible into this Legislature for debate a bill on equal pay for work of equal value?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think the member asked that question knowing full well that I do have a firm commitment to do whatever seems reasonable to try to redress the imbalances that have existed between women in the work force and men such as yourself, I am sure.

I want to tell the member, however, that I also made it clear yesterday in a statement before the Legislature that I would review what was going on in the Ottawa area and in Quebec with regard to equal pay for work of equal value, and that I would continue to have good rapport and discussions with groups that supported that view.

But it is not the only view. As the member knows, this government has taken several initiatives with regard to this problem: first, with the equal pay for equal work legislation, which may well be coming up for review; secondly, with regard to our affirmative action program, and thirdly, as recently as this week the Premier wrote to all ministers reaffirming the need for the ministries to be more actively involved and to help correct the imbalances that may exist within the civil service.

Mr. Warner: It is not good enough. It is not good enough, and you know it.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why is there no progress?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If you want the answers, then be quiet. In addition to that, yesterday I advised through a press release and through a statement I made that we felt equal opportunity was an area that deserved particular emphasis at this time. I therefore had appointed a high-level labour-management advisory council on equal employment opportunities. It comprises: Terry Meagher, secretary-treasurer of the Ontario Federation

of Labour; Lucy Nicholson, president of the Ontario Division of CUPE; Don MacLeod, president of Savage Shoes; Helen Slater, director of the Office of Equal Opportunity at Ottawa; Kay Sigurjonsson, executive secretary of the federation of women teachers, and Bill Winfield, the vice-president of personnel, Warner-Lambert. I suggest that these are earnest and honest endeavours to try to redress a problem.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: First of all, would the minister table in the Legislature that internal ministry report on equal pay for work of equal value, plus any and all documents associated with it? And since that equal opportunity committee he has just mentioned is only to encourage equal opportunity in the industrial area of the province and within unions and to advise the women's bureau, and it intends to meet only about three or four times a year, surely the minister must see that is no new legislative thrust whatsoever.

He must see we have no commitment, in the throne speech or from him or anybody in his ministry, to introduce into this House anything like equal pay for work of equal value or what he is talking about in terms of this committee—contract compliance. Is he going to introduce any new legislation into this Legislature on women's issues or will this be another year of a big goose egg and nothing for women in terms of any legislative advancements?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, just so that the record clearly shows the concern this minister and this government have about women's issues, I would like to quote from a speech that I made yesterday to the confectionery manufacturers' association. I regard this issue as a vital work-place issue, much like several others to which I have given my attention in the past six months. There is no doubt about this government's interest and concern about women's issues and I have outlined what I think are positive steps that have been taken and that will continue to be taken.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Labour and Manpower not recognize the fact that women have been studied to death on this issue and they need to have action? There is no point in continuing these studies endlessly; it's only a matter of stalling on the issue.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I think the record clearly says that there is no stalling going on. We have been addressing the issues from time to time in a variety of ways. At the present time our ministry is carrying out a

survey of some 25 industries to see just what the impact has been of our affirmative action program and then following that to consider and decide what measures should be introduced.

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'Neil: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. I received several calls from constituents of mine in the Belleville-Trenton area who have applied to the Eastern Ontario Development Corporation for assistance in expanding or setting up new industry. They have been told there are no funds available. Because of this all meetings of the corporation have been cancelled and no new applications, as well as many applications that have been approved, will not be dealt with.

Can the minister explain why, especially at a time when we are looking to expand and open new industry in eastern Ontario, a situation such as this should exist?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes; in fact I welcome this opportunity to clarify the situation.

Beginning about the time of the Ford plant transaction last year, business at the Ontario Development Corporations—EODC and NODC—all increased dramatically. As a result, in an attempt to respond to that increase in business, we were faced with a choice of trying to ask ODC to be more difficult in terms of those applications and slow down the mechanism; or suggesting to ODC that, notwithstanding the impacts on this coming year's budgets, they continue to respond to that unprecedented increase in applications. As a result, it turns out that the ODCs, through their current year's activity—that is the 1978-79 fiscal year—have now used up, or almost used up, all of the previously allocated 1979-80 money.

[10:45]

The honourable member will understand that commitments made in 1978-79 draw down funds which are allocated to us in 1979-80 and, if we have an unprecedented amount of business in 1978-79, that means that by the time we hit the new fiscal year we may have committed funds coming in our 1979-80 budget.

That has created a situation where we wanted the opportunity to sit down with the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and analyse just which responsibilities the employment development fund would take over from the Ontario development corporations and which would be left in the Ontario development corporations, perhaps through restructured programs, to carry on.

For example, obviously one of the options that the ODCs will be looking at is whether they should shift more to guarantee programs with perhaps some interest subsidy rather than only the traditional loan programs. In order that there be no misunderstanding, though, let me say that I expect loan programs also to continue through the ODCs.

In any case, what has simply happened is a determination by the Treasurer and myself to sit down and put the two funds together prior to agreeing upon an increased allocation for ODCs next year.

The people who have called the member for Quinte will no doubt all have been in receipt of a letter from the development corporation, indicating not that the corporations have been wound up and not that there would be no moneys coming, but simply that until the end of this fiscal year—that is, the end of March—by which time the Treasurer and I will have reached some conclusions on this matter, the applications cannot be finally processed.

In order that any applicant will not suffer any financial harm as a result of this hiatus period, we have also indicated in each of those letters that anyone who has a severe financial problem, who really needs his application processed before that time, will in fact have his application processed immediately by the ODC.

Mr. O'Neil: Is the minister telling us then that, because of some of the larger loans that were put out to large corporations, some of our firms and companies in eastern Ontario will suffer because of this?

Is the minister aware that there are approximately 50 companies that have had loans approved but will not get them until after the first of the year—and likely not until some later date—and that there are many other applications on file that cannot be dealt with because he has no money?

We are worried in eastern Ontario. We want these loans to our smaller companies. We want some jobs created. We wonder what the minister is doing about it. We are worried that some of these larger companies will take away from some of our industries in eastern Ontario which need the money.

Mr. S. Smith: You gave it all to Ford; now you've got nothing left.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You would have given Ford 50 per cent; remember, Stuart?

Mr. S. Smith: I would not have taken it away from eastern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Precisely what happened was that each and every dollar committed last year by the grant to Ford was

over and above all the ODC money; it was extra money found, as indeed each dollar in the employment development fund is extra money.

I also want to make clear, in case the honourable member did not follow the important, I think, explanation I gave a moment ago, that there has been no reduction whatever in the 1979-80 allocation to the Eastern Ontario Development Corporation; in fact, there will be somewhat of an increase.

What has happened because we have responded to a great number of applications—more applications than we have ever experienced before—and given that money out, is that we have committed more money than ever before to eastern Ontario and are in a situation where we have already committed all of the moneys that were approved in the budgeting process and everywhere else for eastern Ontario through 1979-80.

We are analysing the cases that are pending from eastern Ontario and trying to decide which of them should be handled in the new employment development fund and which should be handled through the Ontario development corporations. That will be sorted out in literally a matter of days. The point I want to make, though, is that all of this means that there is substantially more money for eastern Ontario—

Mr. O'Neil: How much more?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That will obviously await the budget, but I can assure the honourable member that there will be substantially more employment for eastern Ontario and northern Ontario through the vehicle of the employment development fund and the Ontario development corporations.

It is because we have committed more than ever before and more than anticipated to eastern Ontario that we are currently in this situation.

BRANTFORD HOSPITAL CLOSURE

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier's irresponsible restraint program will force the closing of a Catholic hospital in Brantford as an active treatment facility, will the Premier ensure that interim funds are available so that the local health council can re-evaluate their decision and ensure that the hospital is kept operating as an active treatment facility; as is desired by thousands of people living in that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There's nothing irresponsible about any program developed by this government.

Mr. Warner: It's totally irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know that it's not always acceptable to the members of that party, who always believe there is an unlimited supply of money from some source.

Mr. Warner: Unlike you, we support the health care system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would suggest to the honourable member that he perhaps has not totally understood the situation in the way that he has phrased the question. I'm sure the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) would be delighted to help in his educational process and explain this in greater detail to him next week. I will certainly alert the minister to be prepared for that particular question.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: In the response given by the Premier he has quite clearly taken the question as notice for the attention of the Minister of Health. I fail to see how you could have a supplementary to something where there is a commitment to answer it next week. Why don't you wait on the response next week and then give your supplementary to him?

Mr. Nixon: Would you permit a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: There's really nothing out of order. There hasn't been a formal response—

Mr. Makarchuk: He hasn't answered the question.

Mr. Speaker: That's right, he hasn't; he's taken it as notice. I'll hear a new question.

Mr. Nixon: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There's nothing out of order in the question period.

Mr. Nixon: How do you know?

Mr. Kennedy: Because he said so.

Mr. Speaker: There's nothing out of order, because you give complete discretion to the Speaker as to how he will run the question period. I will provide ample—

Mr. Nixon: With great respect, we will not challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. I will now recognize the member for York Centre.

RAPE CASE

Mr. Stong: In the absence of the Solicitor General and Attorney General (Mr. McMurry), I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. As a result of the acquittal earlier this week of an accused charged with the rape of a prostitute, and more particularly in light of the succinct summary of your crown attorney who prosecuted

the case, and who summarized the verdict as follows: "A prostitute becomes an unrapable person;" will you confer with your colleague and give instructions to the crown attorney's department to investigate the possibility of appealing this decision, which has all the earmarks of a perverse verdict?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would be very glad to confer with my colleague, but I will stop short of that. I will leave it to him, as the chief law officer of the crown, to make up his own mind as to what further action he might take with respect to this matter.

BACK DISABILITY CLAIMS

Mr. Wildman: I have a question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Since, in the words of Dr. Ferrier of Sault Ste. Marie, the scarfing process at steelworks, "results in the application of tremendous force on the fulcrum of the lower back," and that scarfers are prone to lumbar sacro disabilities and a well-controlled study of the incidence of back disability among scarfers is long overdue; will the Minister of Labour and Manpower request the Workmen's Compensation Board to initiate such a study at Algoma Steel?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I haven't read that report; but I would be glad to review it, and if it is warranted I will make a recommendation to the WCB.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: Could the minister also investigate to determine why Dr. Chovil and his colleagues at the Workmen's Compensation Board would maintain to doctors and union representatives in Sault Ste. Marie that nothing in the literature indicates undue incidence of back disability in scarfers; even though Dr. Dowd of the Workmen's Compensation Board had carried out a study of this problem at Stelco in 1968 and employees there have been making claims for low-back disability, many of which have been accepted on an individual basis for over 10 years?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I will certainly be glad to look into that matter for the member and report to him.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There are no points of order.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege; I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I had a question that was referred by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle) to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) when he came into the House. Is it now possible to have that question referred to the Minister of Energy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: On Monday, Michael.

Mr. Kerrio: The member has had all his time-outs.

Mr. Cassidy: On Monday, okay.

Mr. Nixon: How come, Mr. Speaker, you accept points of order from the NDP but not from the Liberals?

Mr. Speaker: It wasn't a point of order.

Mr. Nixon: I think you're favouring them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't pay any attention to him.

FAMILY BENEFITS

Mr. Peterson: You're really unfair to all of us, Mr. Speaker, so don't worry.

A question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower, Mr. Speaker: As chief custodian of human rights in this province, would he not agree with me that the Ontario Human Rights Code is being violated by the family benefits legislation in this province in that it does not give an allowance to a single male parent, with dependents, on the same basis as it does, for example, with mothers' allowance? Does the minister not agree with me that that is a clear case of legislative discrimination?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, that particular matter does not come within the scope of the human rights code. I'd like to refer that question to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) when he's here.

Mr. Peterson: Because it's a clear case of sex discrimination, could I ask the minister to look into that and report back to this House what his point of view is from the point of view of his jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I'd be pleased to review it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McClellan: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Try it.

Mr. McClellan: Since the issue relates to inadequacies in the code, may I ask the minister whether he intends to bring the code before us for amendments in this session?

Mr. S. Smith: That is clearly not a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, it remains my clear intention to bring the code before the House for review. At the present time we're going through final drafts of proposed legislation, which will then go through the regular routine that all legislative matters receive; that is it will be reviewed by cabinet, by caucus, and then by the various policy fields.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the minister got cabinet support? It wasn't in the Throne Speech, why was it left out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was in last year; we don't like to repeat ourselves.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It remains my intention to introduce legislation with regard to the human rights code to this House.

RESOURCE EQUALIZATION GRANTS

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue in the absence of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells).

I would like the Minister of Revenue to restate his commitment to the municipalities of this province that \$8 million will be transferred to the municipalities that have lost out on resource equalization grants. Could he indicate whether the number of municipalities have been increased and whether that money has been decreased?

Hon. Mr. Maecck: Mr. Speaker, this, of course, should be directed to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I made the initial statement that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs would examine and provide some funding, but the final amount of funding and the number of municipalities involved certainly come within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I suggest the question should be directed to him.

Mr. Speaker: A new question. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The minister has taken notice of it.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Mr. McGuigan: My question is of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In his new role as Minister of Labour and Manpower, will he be setting a target for the number of jobs to be created specifically for women in this province as a part of his overall employment strategy?

Mr. Mackenzie: It won't be worth much anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, this matter was just mentioned in the Speech from the Throne on Tuesday. Next Monday I'll be commencing some briefings on the various issues related to the eventual incorporation of manpower, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I'll be

pleased to respond to the member on a later occasion when I have completed that review.

Mr. Mackenzie: It needs another study.

Mr. Cassidy: It has been studied to death.

WOMEN CROWN EMPLOYEES

Ms. Bryden: I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, but it's also to the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's your day, Bob.

Ms. Bryden: In view of the fact that the latest report on the status of women crown employees shows that the gap between men and women's average salaries in the public service of Ontario has been widening and that there has been no major improvement in the occupational distribution of women in the 1977-78 fiscal year, I would like to ask the minister to flesh out his avowal that he is working towards improving the position of women in the public service beyond mere letters from the Premier suggesting that something be done on this, and give the women who will be demonstrating Women's International Day tomorrow something to celebrate by committing himself to restructuring jobs in the Ontario public service and to more vigorous affirmative action, so that next year's report will show some progress?

[11:00]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, it's all very nice to say that we do nothing but send letters, but I must tell the member that the Premier, in his most recent letter to all the ministers, was very firm in his direction. If I may read a portion of that to the member—

Mr. MacClellan: Dispense.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why is the gap growing?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: "I want to be assured that we are giving maximum support to the catch-up program for women employees, to which we are committed under the guidelines and directive approved by the Civil Service Commission and Management Board in 1977."

That's a very strong commitment and it's a commitment I give, too. It may be true that we tend to favour affirmative action programs in the hope that business and government, because it's rationally right to do so, will improve the lot of women in society—because it should be done. If it becomes necessary at some time to introduce legislation to achieve that, I'll be happy to look at it. That doesn't give me any problems.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why is the gap growing?

FARM STORM DAMAGE

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs

(Mr. Wells), I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In the absence of his colleague, can the minister indicate whether cabinet has had the opportunity to decide upon recommendations in the matter of the Renfrew county disaster relief application; to make the adjustments that were called for by the local county agricultural committee, with respect to making the payments on a shared basis directly from that fund to the aggrieved farmers?

Mr. Ashe: Did you get up late this morning and forget your tie?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, which should go to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: as the member knows, I was very much involved when the disaster first struck in Renfrew county, along with the sitting member up there, Mr.—he's not here this morning, but certainly he was in touch with me right away on the matter.

Mr. Riddell: Who is he, by the way?

Mr. Nixon: What is his name?

Hon. W. Newman: Paul Yakabuski—a very fine person, and don't forget it.

Mr. Makarchuk: You had to think about it, though.

Mr. Kerrio: I've heard Paul say that himself.

Hon. W. Newman: I was involved in contacting Intergovernmental Affairs. The minister, I realize, has received a resolution—I have also received a copy of it—asking for a direct 50-50 payment. I think that's what the member is talking about. I think the minister's staff up there explained exactly how the emergency fund would work.

I have not had a response from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to the letter the member is talking about, at this point in time.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: Would the minister, as Minister of Agriculture and Food, take into consideration the unique circumstances of this particular disaster, as it relates to a farming community scattered across a rather wide area in this instance; and would he make representation to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or the cabinet generally that a special provision be made for the future, so that this kind of difficulty does not arise on a future occasion and so that farmers so aggrieved will automatically be able to partake of this kind of assistance?

Hon. W. Newman: I would hesitate to say that's the best solution. If one goes the disaster area route that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs was talking about it is

quite possible that the farmers will receive a lot more assistance than they would get by going the route the member is talking about. That's what the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is looking at at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: For all the farmers.

PETITIONS

TTC FARE INCREASE

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I have some petitions from Scarborough, from more than 3,000 people, collected by Richard Johnston, the NDP candidate in Scarborough West.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's about all he will collect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Saying, "Get us a better candidate."

Mr. Warner: These 3,000 people, and many more constituents in Scarborough, object to the Premier's fare hike which is now destined to take place on Monday.

An hon. member: What a phoney issue.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by 224 transit users in Metro Toronto.

An hon. member: That's one bus or subway car.

Mr. Grande: This petition, before other members on that side of the House begin to talk about the 224 names—

Mr. Ruston: You can get more than that on one bus.

Mr. Grande: —is the effort of one and only one individual, by the name of Ms. Janice Crook, of Marley Avenue in Toronto, who became incensed at the stubbornness and uncaring attitude of this government regarding the TTC fare increases.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is she one of your campaign workers?

Mr. Grande: The 224 signatures were collected over a six-day period only.

Mr. Makarchuk: It bothers you a bit.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member was loafing.

Mr. Grande: The petition says: "We, the undersigned, urge the government of Ontario to reconsider its decision not to turn over \$6 million to the TTC so that no box fare increases will take place this year."

Mr. Speaker: I want to remind the member for Oakwood, and all honourable members, that any petition that prays for the expenditure of funds is clearly out of order.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MILK AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. W. Newman moved first reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Milk Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. Newman: I just very briefly point out this is an act to allow the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, which is now holding their levies in trust, to pay them to the Canadian Dairy Commission. It really is a very long and involved legal situation, but all this really does is make it legal for them to send their funds on to the Canadian Dairy Commission.

TREES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved first reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Trees Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The general purpose of this bill is to strengthen the provisions of the Trees Act relating to bylaws passed by counties and other municipalities to prevent the destruction of trees. In order to provide reasonable flexibility, the bill sets out some general exemptions from such bylaws and will authorize the municipalities to make exemptions from the bylaws in specific cases.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the bill was introduced last session and the compendium provided at that time still applies. However, if either party has misplaced theirs, I can get that for them.

LIQUOR LICENCE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Ziemba moved first reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend the Liquor Licence Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Ziemba: The purpose of this bill is to provide for a licence issuance suspension period during which the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario will cease to issue new liquor licences in Ontario. This would be a five-year period and during the suspension period the board will study the issuance of liquor licences in Ontario and make recommendations concerning the extent to which the issuance of liquor licences is consistent with the goals of public health and welfare.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ACT

Consideration of Bill 74, an Act to establish a Code of Procedure for Provincial Offences.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Before we consider Bill 74, I would just take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to all of the members of the House for the honour they have bestowed upon me in electing me Deputy Chairman of the committee of the whole House. I realize that this is a position that requires impartiality and a firm hand. I will try to administer it to the best of my ability in keeping with the best traditions of this House.

Mrs. Campbell: Before we start with Bill 74, in view of the fact that some of us have just received the proper copy during the course of these proceedings, could we be assured that everyone entering the debate is debating the same bill?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: That sounds like a reasonable suggestion to me. Is there anybody who feels he doesn't have the correct copy of the bill? It's the one that has on the back of it "March 6, second reading." Are we all satisfied we have the right bill?

Mrs. Campbell: It is the bill reprinted as amended by the administration of the justice committee.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Right. Are there any comments, questions or amendments in connection with Bill 74?

Mr. Lawlor: I rise, quite facetiously I assure you, Mr. Chairman, to point out that this bill, if you just glance through it—and you were in the committee—has been so renovated and so totally changed from anything that previously emerged that we are dealing with a totally new bill.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are you suggesting, Mr. Lawlor—

Mr. Lawlor: Facetiously.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right, because I think all the renovations that you are referring to actually went on in the standing committee.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The bill is certainly well fingered.

Mrs. Campbell: There are some amendments.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I have asked if there are any comments, questions or amendments. I gather the first question is one on section 6. Any comments before section 6?

On section 1:

Mr. Lawlor: I've got so many bills now, I can't—I have a question arising out of section 1(1)(f). We had before us a representative from the Justices of the Peace Association of Metropolitan Toronto, but then they withdrew and sent a letter. I have a

letter in front of me of February 8. The last sentence says: "It is anticipated that such a brief will be submitted by the end of February 1979." Has that been done and is that available to us?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Can the parliamentary assistant answer that?

Mr. Sterling: We have received the brief from the justices of the peace association. I don't see any objection to making it available to the opposition critics.

Mr. Lawlor: Is it possible, without prolonging the agony, for the parliamentary assistant to give us a brief encapsulation of what they said? They were very much concerned before us as to the administration, where the whole weight, or a very great weight, is going to fall upon the justice of the peace in this province from here on in. [11:15]

Mr. Sterling: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give a total view of the whole report that was submitted by the justices of the peace association but one of the main concerns related to the role of the justice of the peace under section 6, to which I will be proposing an amendment today. Basically their concern was the duality of their role both as an adjudicator and also as a defence counsel in cross-examining the prosecution or the police officer, which might be required under section 6. That was one of their major concerns in that report.

Mr. Lawlor: They don't object to the extent of the jurisdiction or number 2 with respect to some kind of guidelines being afforded to them to discriminate between serious and less serious and non-serious—and I'm not even serious—the various degrees and permutations of seriousness that go into this legislation?

Mr. Sterling: I'm sorry, I would have to take that particular question under advisement. I am not in a position to comment in relation to that aspect of their report. Perhaps I could give you a copy of the report at this time and then after we had finished with another section of the bill you could return to that topic.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm quite prepared to do that, Mr. Chairman. It's a matter of very considerable puzzlement to me and always has been and I am sure it is to you and I am sure to the ministry even—this whole problem of how to sort out where those justices of the peace who are pivotal to the whole works fit in. What is the subject matter? What is the meat that they are going

to chew? They are in the dark. I'm in the dark.

We are putting through the legislation. There has been in the committee hearings a certain refinement, a certain understanding reached, because we were given very large folios of a multitude of offences under provincial jurisdiction which I didn't even suspect existed. It was most enlightening to know there were so many laws governing the most esoteric areas of our lives. But there you are and so it continues. Before I let the legislation go through, I thought this point ought to be pinpointed.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I also might be afforded a copy of the brief. I have discussed some aspects of it with the minister and with the parliamentary assistant but I would like to see the brief itself.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We will return to section 1 later then. Are there any comments in regard to section 2? Anything before section 6? Shall sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 stand as part of the bill?

Sections 2 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Sterling: In relation to some of the comments made by the member for Lakeshore, I have had an opportunity briefly to go through the report. It doesn't appear they address the situation as to the seriousness of the offence or to that distinction between the varying degrees of offence. As such, I don't know whether it would help in that particular regard. However, I am most pleased to give both the member for St. George and the member for Lakeshore a copy of this report.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Mr. Sterling moves that section 6 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"(1) Where an offence notice is served on a defendant whose address as shown on the certificate of offence is outside the territorial jurisdiction of the court specified in the notice and he wishes to dispute the charge but does not wish to attend or be represented at a trial, he may do so by signifying his intention on the offence notice and delivering the offence notice to the office of the court specified in the notice together with a written dispute setting out with reasonable particularity his dispute and any facts upon which he relies.

"(2) Where an offence notice is delivered under subsection 1, a justice shall, in the absence of the defendant, consider the dispute and, (a) where the dispute raises an issue that may constitute a defence, direct a

hearing, or (b) where the dispute does not raise an issue that may constitute a defence, convict the defendant and impose the set fine.

"(3) Where the justice directs a hearing under subsection 2, the court shall hold the hearing and shall, in the absence of the defendant, consider the evidence in the light of the issues raised in the dispute and acquit the defendant or convict the defendant and impose the set fine or such lesser fine as he is permitted by law.

"(4) This section applies in such part or parts of Ontario as are prescribed by the regulations."

Mr. Sterling: Could I add my congratulations to you on your appointment as Deputy Chairman? I think it is most appropriate that one of the first matters that you would be dealing with in your new position would be Bill 74. As members of the committee know, you had a substantial participation in the justice committee when this bill was before it. Further to that, the amendment to section 6 and the retention of section 6 can, I believe, be in a great part due to your participation in the debates in the justice committee, although there were many other members who supported the retention of this section.

Mr. Lawlor: That is just because you happen to be a Conservative.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I am glad the member for Carleton-Grenville said that. Being in the chair, I'll have to refrain from making comments, but it is only because I am in the chair.

Mr. Sterling: While section 6 was seen as a very innovative step in the whole administration of justice and quite a departure from the normal procedures carried on in the courtroom, it was also seen as an extremely useful tool for those people who were unable to appear in court to, in fact, be able to have a trial.

I think we all recognized in the committee that this section, which allows basically for a defence by a written dispute, will, in fact, allow people who live far away from the jurisdiction where the trial is being held a chance to dispute a minor offence. In the past, I believe that people who had been charged with a minor offence and lived some piece from the courtroom would, in fact, plead guilty when perhaps they did have a legitimate defence, just due to the economics of the whole situation.

This amendment basically takes the application of a written dispute out of the generic sense and restricts the application of the

principle to a pilot project stage. First of all, it restricts the application of the section to a person or a defendant who lives outside the territorial jurisdiction of the court where the offence has occurred. The second main change is in relation to subsection 4 of the section, which basically makes it come in in terms of application by regulation. This will allow us the opportunity to attempt to try this particular section in one jurisdiction within the province so that we can properly monitor the people who will be, in fact, working with this particular section.

I think everyone who was sitting on the justice committee is aware of how important the education of the justice of the peace will be, in relation not only to this section but to the whole act. The monitoring of this particular section will be very critical in that there is a great deal of reluctance on the part of some members to depart from the old concepts of justice in the traditional sense of a trial.

I think that basically points out the two major changes in this section. It also tries to clarify what is meant by the person's written defence. It refers to it in the amendment as a dispute, and it tries to differentiate between the written word being evidence within the trial—in other words, it is trying to separate the fact that the plea or the pleadings, as one might want to describe this particular document in lawyers' terms, is not in fact evidence, but it is a dispute. It also points clearly to how the justice of the peace is to use that particular written document in the procedures that go on.

Those would be my opening comments on this particular amendment. It is an important section of the bill, as I have said before, and I am anxious to hear some of the debate on the matter.

Mrs. Campbell: I first would like to express my appreciation to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), his parliamentary assistant and his staff for their co-operation in meeting with me and assisting me with my very real concerns about this section. I am pleased, because one of the first things that concerned me was what I felt to be the ambiguity as to the status of the statement as it would be presented. I think there has been a very real attempt now to incorporate in this unusual way a pleading. Therefore, I assume that in referring to it as a dispute it now has the status of a pleading in a civil action, so at least it clarifies the situation.

[11:30]

I have to say that I have been concerned about this section right from the start, as I

think you, Mr. Chairman, know. One of my concerns is that in a case of this kind if a statement is given in response to a minor traffic matter, and the statement should, really, indicate that a more serious charge should be available. I have discussed that with the persons to whom I have made earlier reference, and they have taken the position—and they may be quite correct—that it might be a matter of difficulty from an evidentiary point of view to establish it as some form of confession. It doesn't, however, entirely allay my concerns about this statement.

Secondly, I have had a concern right from the start about the duality of the role of the justice of the peace; and I expressed it—it seems to me ad nauseam—in the committee. Again, I am assured that, save and except in traffic court, there will be a prosecutor in the court. It doesn't satisfy me completely; it leaves it a little open.

The situation is that here you have someone who is going to adjudicate also possibly entering the arena and cross-examining a crown witness. It just doesn't appeal to me as a way to proceed and, with the greatest respect, I don't think it has been addressed in this amendment. I understand that is one of the major concerns of the justices of the peace as well, so I am pleased that I at least have that kind of confirmation of my concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to move against this section. I believe there are a number of people, including the committee itself, who seem to accept the principle of it, but I remain, I'm afraid, personally opposed to this section. I think it is capable of abuse, and I don't see it as having been that well clarified in the amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, the amendment is welcome and a considerable improvement over the section it is replacing; there's no doubt about it. It is now reformulated on the basis of a pilot testing procedure to see how it will work.

The complaint has arisen out of this, I suppose, as this may be the most controversial section in the legislation. It is probably the most novel departure from the present operation of those courts in its criminal capacity. We have prated and talked about the decriminalization in this statute, and that is what it is all about.

Part of our difficulty, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, is that despite what we say we are still under some kind of bias or cloud of the criminal. We think in terms of offences; we think in the way of the criminal law and its full panoply. We just have a very difficult time abstracting ourselves from that, standing

aside and being able to judge it externally. This is, in the context of these offences not being considered criminal offences, a very worthy and worthwhile move on the part of the government to deal with the issue.

In the brochure that was initially issued by the ministry in explanation of all these sections and the philosophy, tenor and purport of the act itself, it says, "A further alternative to the existing system provides for those who, although convinced that they are not guilty of an offence, pay the fine out of court to avoid the inconvenience of a court appearance. It will permit a defendant to plead not guilty and to deliver to the court a written explanation or submission. This, in turn, will be considered by the justice."

The complaint arose that this was altogether too cozy, too private and too unexposed and that enormous power was reposed in the discretion of a single justice as to whether or not he would see fit to acknowledge that there was some weight and some real matter in the written submission or not. In the first instance, it was presumed he would exercise his power to call a hearing. If added evidence was necessary in order to back up what was being said in this written statement, then he would call a hearing. If he felt there was a moot point of law involved, he would call a hearing. And—this is the third step and the tricky one—if he felt there was no substance in what was being said, he would convict bang on the spot, and that was it. Arising out of that, there were appeal procedures of a fairly flexible kind and with fair ease to rectify any position that might be taken in that particular regard.

It got to the point because of these latter points that I mentioned that the section was to be deleted entirely. Again it was a hang-over from a criminal approach. If you don't take that approach, then it should be retained. So a compromise has been reached, one to which I give full accord, namely, that you are going to restrict it with respect to its territorial operation, namely in the county of York, and to cases that arise extrajurisdictionally, that is, somebody in Red Lake or somebody in Welland who is accused of the offence in Toronto may write in from wherever he happens to be outside the York jurisdiction and submit his case, thus saving a great many people the journey.

Many of us—I am sure every one of us in this House—at one time or another have gone ahead and paid the fine because it was too much of a nuisance to do anything else, nevertheless feeling that if we had the time and could sort out the other obligations we have, we would appear in court. On occa-

sion, some of us did, in night court particularly, but when the House is sitting at night, of course that becomes a very difficult thing to do very often too. So you pay the fine and that breeds a disgruntlement, a real sense of grievance, in many people in this population. For a balanced jurisdiction, as we hope to be or are trying to be, that is an unnecessary irritation in the flesh of the Ontario population, and we want to obviate it.

I'll obviate it by half-measure, if I can't get whole. We will support the changes presently being placed before us.

Mr. Breithaupt: The comments made by the member for Lakeshore with respect to the historic background of the attitude that we're at in this section, I shall not repeat.

The section, as it was discussed in the committee, as I recall did bring forward a number of alternatives and suggestions with respect to making this proposal of being able to deal with an alleged offence in a much more convenient way to the public. We have seen some changes which have occurred in section 6. I do welcome the opportunity that this section will have to be applied to various parts of the province. I think that the best result of these proposed changes will be the opportunity to try to see if, as the member for Lakeshore has mentioned, the half-loaf approach is going to work.

I would have been much concerned about attempting to bring in a section like this and have it made applicable to the entire province at once. I think there really would have been a series of difficulties and problems which would have arisen that would have scuttled the benefit a section such as this may well have, once it has matured and is useful to the people of a region. If that region or county has the benefit of dealing this way and the results are beneficial, then I think the move to the entire province is an intelligent one on behalf of this Legislature.

I do share the concerns that the member for St. George has raised with respect to some of the difficulties that may come up in this section. It is not going to entirely answer those objections. However, I do feel that it is perhaps worth a try and we will be very interested when the monitoring has taken place over the next year or two to see whether those objections the member for St. George has made are in fact the ones that are likely to result.

I hope there is the opportunity as this section is applied to come up very quickly with an intelligent summary of the statistics which will be made available to the members of the justice committee on an ongoing—perhaps quarterly—basis. This would be an

opportunity of keeping at least the critics for the respective parties, if nobody else, current with the results and expectations of the section. When changes do come they would then be more readily accepted by the House on the basis of knowledge which those two members particularly, and perhaps others of us, might have.

Mr. Lawlor: Just one other question arising out of the point about the training of the justices of the peace: have you devised your plan with this alteration of the section in mind? In other words, are county of York justices of the peace alone to be given instruction in this? Because this was the one with the greatest discretion reposed in the judicial officer. Or is it your feeling that you are going to clue in the other justices of the peace of the province in a preliminary way? How do you handle it?

Mr. Sterling: Perhaps I could answer that direct question immediately and then comment in general on the other comments that have been made.

Basically I would imagine there are many other parts of the legislation which will require extensive education of the other justices of the peace in this province. Section 7, for instance, will require that there be some education in regard to it—on the walk-in guilty plea. Probably because this section has been amended since the committee hearings, which only took place in mid-February, I don't know whether or not we have addressed the question whether there will be a special section dealing with those courts that will be imposing section 6 alone or whether we would include that in the overall education program.

Mr. Chairman: Before you go on with the other comments—

Mr. Sterling: I think probably what will happen is that there will be an overall education program with the justices of the peace dealing with the whole act. Then those who will be implementing this particular section would be taken aside and we would deal with that section in more depth; that would be the approach.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, I rise with a bit of trepidation because I believe all the others who have spoken on this are members of the legal profession. However, I will overcome that and make some comments—

Mr. Breithaupt: There is no reticence, surely?

Mr. T. P. Reid: All you need is common sense and that, unfortunately—

Mr. Swart: That's right. As a matter of fact, I'm glad you raised that. Perhaps that

is not confined to the legal profession. I think the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk might agree with me on that from previous comments he has made.

[11:45]

Section 6 is a section that is the key to the whole bill. It's a section on which the committee struggled, as everyone here knows, and I think largely on a non-partisan basis. There are genuine concerns about it. Yet there is also the realization that this can provide some greater degree of fairness and perhaps justice in the province.

This amendment has been tabled by the parliamentary assistant and I think there is general agreement with that, but I want to hear some comments on one aspect of it.

What we struggled with was concern, on the one side, that at the present time justice is not being done because of the inconvenience that exists with regard to people charged with minor offences. They in effect just plead guilty when they're not guilty and pay a small fine, rather than fight for justice, because the cost of fighting for it is greater than by pleading guilty.

On the other side, there is the concern, mentioned by my colleagues, the member for Lakeshore and the member for St. George. That is, there's danger that justice will not be done by this system when you can't cross-examine and have the normal court proceedings. In effect, two changes, as I see it, have been made. I don't have the amendment in front of me, but my understanding is that two changes have been made.

One is going to be a kind of pilot project, starting in one place. Secondly, the ones who will be able to write in are only those people who are outside of that jurisdiction.

I'm in full support—because of the problems that exist—with regard to the first; that is, the pilot project. I also think I'm right in saying that by regulation this can therefore be extended, if it works well, to other parts of the province. It could be that within a year or two years it could cover the whole province. I think that is desirable.

But is it not right that you would not be able to extend it, without a change in the act, to provide that people living within a jurisdiction could write in in their defence? Therefore, it seems to me that this is some disadvantage. I would like to hear the parliamentary assistant comment on that. Why could you not allow people—if you want to start a pilot project—to write in a defence, even though they lived within the jurisdiction?

I would point out to you—as you are well aware—that in some jurisdictions they are very close to the court. It's not much of a penalty to have to go to court, perhaps. But in other jurisdictions they can be a long, long way from the court. It's more of a hardship for those people to have to go to court for themselves. They may have to travel 50 miles, or even more, to get to that centre of justice.

In addition, it is not just a case—as I think we all recognize—of the inconvenience of travel. It is also a case of the inconvenience of employment and, perhaps, having to take a day off from employment, even though they are close to the court.

I guess my question to the parliamentary assistant is: Why do we need that clause which gives this right only to those outside the jurisdiction? Why could we not have the pilot project within one jurisdiction, but allow anybody to write in their defence? If it works, then we can extend it to the rest of the province. To make that arbitrary division I think has some very real disadvantages.

I would like to hear your comments on it.

Mr. Sterling: Perhaps I can directly respond. Basically, I think we're dealing in terms of where does a greater inequity lie? I think the greater inequity lies with someone who lives outside the jurisdiction, who has no real opportunity to defend himself at all, with regard to this minor offence. In terms of inequities, it's much more disastrous for a person in general from outside to come to the jurisdiction to defend himself in a minor matter.

In picking a group of people who would benefit more greatly from the terms of section 6, I think the committee in general felt these were the type of people who would benefit most. I don't argue with the supposition that the people within the jurisdiction would also greatly benefit, but we're approaching this whole section and this whole concept with a great deal of caution basically, because it hasn't been done anywhere else. It's very innovative and, quite frankly, a lot of the members of the committee and, I think, of this Legislature are sort of caught in the balance.

As you said, this bill, in total I would say, was debated in a non-partisan way. I saw during committee hearings that members from all parties were wondering in terms of what views they took on a particular section. On this particular section I think the Attorney General felt, and I felt, that we were so close to the balance that to approach it cautiously at this point in time, and keep the numbers of these rights in disputes to it

somewhat to a minimum so that we could monitor them well, is extremely important on this front end.

The other thing to remember too is that to open this bill, because of that caution that was expressed by many of the members of this Legislature in taking this quite innovative step, I think we basically owe it to those members to come back to this Legislature and amend the bill so that it would, in fact, apply to the people within the jurisdiction. I think we on the government side too often hear that we can regulate things in and regulate them out. With this issue being so touchy, let's say, in terms of the balance that we're achieving I think that we owe it to the Legislature to come back when we take that larger step, because I think, in that case, you will be dealing with many more people in the province. I think that this is the right balance at this time.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could breach the rules somewhat by asking some questions that flow from the submissions of the justices of the peace association and which I didn't have the opportunity of asking before?

I note they are concerned about the statements and that their question is if this is regarded as a pleading, is it permitted to a person to, in fact, submit the statement in any language, or would it necessarily be in either English or French only? I would assume that while it isn't evidence, in view of the fact that there is provision for evidence to be given with an interpreter, that this would be permitted even though it has the significance of a pleading. I think it's an interesting point.

I would also ask this and they do pose the question: When a justice makes a determination as to whether a reasonable ground of defence has been set out in writing in this section, is this determination considered an administrative or judicial act and, therefore, should a record be kept? Would the statement become an exhibit?

I would assume that those questions are pretty readily answered, but I would like to have for the record just exactly what answer has been accorded to the justices of the peace association with reference to those matters.

I note they also have expressed other concerns with reference to the set fine and so on. I think those are pretty apparent from the bill itself.

I wonder if I could have an answer on those.

Mr. Sterling: Yes. Basically in relation to how the person could write in the dispute, it

would be controlled by the Judicature Act. Therefore, in the designated areas of the province where French was acceptable in terms of dispute, it would be a legal document in those particular areas.

Also, it would be necessary to provide a translation service for a document that came in. We could not reject a dispute on the basis that it was in French and it was an area which wasn't designated under the Judicature Act. That's the feeling of the Attorney General on that issue.

Mrs. Campbell: What about other languages? Are they not acceptable?

Mr. Sterling: Whether or not they would be acceptable, there would be a notice of dispute. We would have to deal with that dispute one way or another. In fact, we would be forced to translate that dispute.

Mrs. Campbell: Fine.

Mr. Sterling: The determination is a judicial determination and there would be a record of the proceedings and, also, the letter would be an exhibit.

Mr. Ziembra: Mr. Chairman, this amendment clears up some of the concerns I expressed in the committee. Phasing in this streamlining process by limiting it to out-of-towners I think is commendable in this respect. I was very supportive of the bill when I first read it, but the more I thought about it, the more concerned I became about the other side; in other words, the police.

Here we have police out trying to make up their quotas every day, ticketing cars. The only check on that quota is the fact they know they're going to have to spend so many days in court when these summons eventually come to trial. This check, to my mind, was being removed by this streamlining process. In other words, because people would have the right to write in, most people would write in, expectation would be raised and hardly anyone would bother going to court any more. Police would be freed from courtroom duties and I'm sure their quotas would be expanded as a result of that.

Because we're phasing that in, I don't see that happening, and for that reason I'm prepared to support it at this time.

I have had an awful lot of complaints from people who have received tickets and they all blame the computer. They've received tickets from Hamilton when they work in Toronto, or tickets from all over the province. They don't know the reason these tickets are issued in error but they haven't got the time and they're not going to lose a day's pay by going to Hamilton. So this is welcome legislation.

Perhaps because we have an Attorney General who is also the Solicitor General and a parliamentary assistant who is perhaps parliamentary assistant to both—

Interjection.

Mr. Ziembra: You're not? Are you just the assistant to the Attorney General?

[12:00]

Perhaps what they could do—it could be a blessing in disguise—we could have all these police officers freed from court duty and assigned to community relations roles, where there is a sad lack of staff. Perhaps that might be a good thing in the long run if we can get some commitment from the Solicitor General that the police wouldn't be giving out that many more tickets. Tickets are getting darned expensive in this city of Toronto.

Mr. Philip: I know. I just got one yesterday.

Mr. Ziembra: You just got one yesterday? I have one right here which I will be talking about in a few minutes.

Mr. Philip: A five-dollar parking ticket.

Mr. Ziembra: That's cheap. That's a good deal, Ed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be speaking on section 19 of the bill, as well.

Mr. Philip: I found the arguments by the parliamentary assistant to be persuasive. I think that this amendment is far preferable to deleting the section, which is another possible alternative. I certainly think we will be able to get some experience with it and closely monitor what is happening to it, then gradually, if it is as successful as we expect it might be, phase it in in other jurisdictions.

I can see a real problem in areas of northern Ontario, for example, where the territorial jurisdiction is very large and where, in fact, someone may have to travel. I am sure the parliamentary assistant and the minister have thought about this. I have thought about it and I have no solution but perhaps he has already commented on it. I had to be at another meeting when the bill started to come under debate. But I am sure that it is something we will be discussing in estimates in the next few years.

I realize that by regulation you can, of course, expand the number of jurisdictions in which this is used, but we may in fact have to come back with an amendment at some future time to deal with the problem of distance within individual jurisdictions.

I would be in support of the government's amendment.

Mr. Stong: I rise very briefly to voice support of my colleagues with respect to the amendment to the act.

I might say that I am pleased to see, in fact, that this type of approach has been taken by the ministry, in terms of convenience and in terms of backlog and overload in our court system.

However, there is one concern I would express in relation to this section. I suppose it can be ironed out as the section is put into operation and the courts are set up. Again, it is a pilot project, subject to regulations, and can be changed.

The only concern I have is where a justice does in fact determine, after having received written submission, that it warrants a hearing. There is no indication when the hearing should be held; whether it be held immediately or whether a date should be set. Once he finds some validity to a defence or to a submission by a defendant, I would have preferred—although the committee did not go this route and I just voice this at this time—that where a justice finds a validity to a submission by a defendant, and he does in fact direct that a hearing be held then, perhaps, in addition to directing that a hearing be held and setting a date or time for that hearing, the defendant should be notified in writing and by mail that the hearing is to take place. This would then give the defendant an option in his own mind, if nothing else. He is not commanded to attend, but he is at least given notice that his submission warrants a hearing—and nothing more.

I had hoped that section would be covered in this section, although it is not in there. It is just a concern I have about it. Other than that, I think the section ought to be given a fair trial, as the ministry has set out, and I am in favour of it.

Mr. Lawlor: I have a couple of points. We are dwelling on this section because it is new and perhaps we should spend a few moments on it. I notice in the justices of the peace statement that they say: "We are reasonably sure that it will be difficult for a court, after having heard sworn testimony from the witnesses for the crown and just a written statement from the defendant, to come to any other reasonable conclusion in most cases but to accept the evidence as presented by the crown and register a conviction against the defendant."

I think there's kind of a fundamental misunderstanding involved in all that. We know—and this is regrettable from my point of view and I'm sure from many other points of view—that judges sitting in criminal matters particularly tend to favour the crown. There's a natural acclivity in those in office and those prepossessed with responsibility to support the other echelons of the system. This is in

some instances to the detriment of the citizen.

The purpose here is that if you've got the written submission, it affords grounds for cross-examination and to check with the police officer, by asking, "Well, what about this?" so that it won't all go by the board without questioning while the statement made by the officer is taken at face value without more examination. I'm content with that; I don't think that that's something one should quarrel with at all. On the contrary, at least it gives a bit more representation than presently exists where the statement is taken *carte blanche* and nothing goes beyond it. If it's taken in that particular form, invariably a conviction follows. It just might be that on some blue moon in early December somebody might have justice done in this particular context because he can't afford the time, trouble or money to come to that court.

The other thing I would mention has to do with what was said with respect to notices going out. I think we brought this up in committee. Under the regulation, I would like **some assurance** that whatever rights flow from a particular position being taken be communicated to the person who is penalized or is in any way hurt by it and an indication given to that individual of what the remaining mode of redress may be. Again, I am looking at the justices of the peace statement which says: "The next notification the defendant would receive in relation to his case would be a conviction notice. At this time, the defendant will probably wonder if his submissions were considered"—this is one of the problems with the section—"or even if the letter was received. In addition, it might be expected that most defendants would close their letters with the point that if any other facts are required that the court should feel free to contact them."

All I'm saying is that I want to get a spoke in this wheel at the moment. No amendment is necessary in this context. Nevertheless, under the regulation in this particular, where a conviction is registered there should be some notation to the individual involved that he has a right of appeal and this set forth specifically for his attention.

Mr. Sterling: Perhaps we could answer a few direct questions now while they're still present in everyone's mind.

First of all, there is the point raised by the justices of the peace in relation to the dispute on the fact that in most cases there would be a conviction because the only evidence that will be presented in trial will be that of the prosecutor. I think that this was

presented before. Perhaps they had the amendment to section 6 or they probably had not seen the amendment to subsection 6 as it now stands.

I think the amendment clarifies what the dispute is to be used for. It is to be used to cross-examine that police officer and get on evidence out of the police officer what the facts are in relation to the dispute that's been written to them.

The other fact is that they will be getting a notice after the dispute has been entered and has had a trial. The notice will say, "Your dispute was considered but does not constitute a defence in law." They will get that notice indicating that the dispute has been considered, so there will be acknowledgement that the justice of peace has received it and has considered it.

As to the appeal notice, I would hope that the regulation would point out the time limitations in relation to an appeal, and I'm assured by the Attorney General's staff that there will be a notice on the conviction notice as to the time element required for appeal.

As to the note from the member for York Centre (Mr. Stong) about getting a mail notice as to when the dispute would be heard, we did discuss this in committee. I think the member for St. George brought it up. However, a problem comes out of that. What you are doing is putting an extra step in the whole procedure. What you are saying is you get a double chance almost at the whole process, so that you mail in your dispute, they say you have or you have not a defence and then you get a notice about the trial. That's the only reason you would give a notice of the trial, so that the person could show up at the time that the trial would take place, and so really what you are doing is you are giving them two cracks at the process.

The whole idea of the bill is to streamline and provide this section really for those who feel that they cannot show up in court because of other commitments, where the offence is of a minor nature.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further comments or questions on the amendment?

Mr. Sterling: Could I make a few general comments in relation to some of the other matters brought up by some of the other members? I think I indicated before that it was a very non-partisan committee and that the chairman, Mr. Philip, indeed contributed a great deal to the way the debate went during the committee and I congratulate him on this particular matter.

As I mentioned before, I think on this whole section it's a matter of balance and

there isn't actually right or wrong in terms of deleting this section or putting this amendment in, but I think in the total balance it's probably worth the effort to go ahead, that there are injustices being done now, as the member for Lakeshore pointed out, and that we should proceed with the amendment and then review this from time to time within the estimates of the Attorney General and perhaps bring in an amendment later if it turns out as successful as we surely hope it will be.

Mr. Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Shall the amendment carry? Carried.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

On section 7:

[12:15]

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, again I am referring to the concerns expressed under this section by the justices of the peace association. They are concerned, and the committee was concerned it seems to me, that, "If it is the intent of the proposed legislation to implement the provisions of section 6"—and that is, of course, prior to its amendment—"should not the same privilege apply to a defendant under this section, because the penalty portion suggested is the same? It does not"—and I am reading from this brief—"It does not appear to be consistent that a defendant can plead not guilty in writing and set out grounds of defence along with submissions to sentence, in the event his defence is not accepted, yet a person who admits his guilt and saves the province the cost of a hearing and wishes only to speak to sentence is required to attend in person."

It is an interesting question raised, it seems to me, by the justices of the peace, and I think it appropriate that we should note it duly at this time. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant would like to comment on it?

Mr. Lawlor: Before he speaks, may I add a word so we can get the whole picture?

It is an interesting thing. On the other hand, I see that one of the reasons for not wanting section 6 was precisely because people would be addressing themselves to penalty and not to the gravamen of the offence itself and they didn't want that. And why not? Because I am sure everybody in the world would send in a written submission with respect to penalty. And why not? You might save yourself 10 bucks by writing a letter; you have to take your chances.

I suspect that you'd be swamped if it were fully operative; and if that happened then

there would be some very considerable undermining of the very purpose, at least of section 6. Therefore, section 7 deals with a totally different situation: namely, one believes he's guilty but doesn't believe he's that guilty, and I can see no harm in him appearing.

I don't think the points being made here are well founded or well taken. Thank you.

Mr. Sterling: When going through this bill I wondered the same thing as the justices of the peace in relation to section 7. However, if a dispute does outline in some way why the fine should be mitigated, I think that the justice is well within his power to mitigate that fine if he should choose to so do.

Mr. Stong: May I just ask a question of the parliamentary assistant? What mechanism will be in place for the situation that may arise where the defendant has indicated that he intends to plead guilty, but wants to appear to speak to sentence, but in the interim has received some kind of advice that maybe he should appear and defend the charge? Will a date be set over? Will he be bound by his plea, so to speak? What mechanism or plans do you have for dealing with that type of situation where a defendant has indicated previously that he wants to appear to speak only to sentence or extension of time and in the interim changes his mind and wants to defend the charge, even though he has written in that he is going to speak only to the sentence?

Mr. Sterling: I would imagine that it would go through the normal court process. In other words, if in fact the dispute has been considered and there has been a finding and there is a judicial decision on it, then he would have to go through the appeal procedure to defend the charge.

If it was before that, I am sure he could appear before the court and move to have the dispute withdrawn and to proceed the other way. I don't see any problem in relation to that in terms of any other interlocutory procedure that might take place in the present system.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to argue with the parliamentary assistant. There is no mitigation. In subsection 2 we have made it very clear, with respect, that he should convict the defendant and impose the set fine—nothing less, that's it. Of course, in subsection 3, if he holds a hearing, then you have amended the earlier legislation and given him a much wider power. Again, I think that is the way it should be.

Mr. Sterling: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I misled you in terms of what I said before. You are correct. If he directs a hearing he can reduce the fine under section 6(3), but he cannot reduce it under section 6(2).

Section 7 agreed to.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. Lawlor: A word on section 9(b)—this arises in a number of areas within the bill. The section reads: "Where the certificate of offence is not complete and regular on its face, he shall quash the proceeding." The question in my own mind after I read that is: May the justice of the peace then take it upon himself to alter an irregularity so as to keep the matter before the court rather than quashing the proceedings? What is the position on that?

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, as the parliamentary assistant prepares his answer, again one might refer to the JP's association. The justices of the peace seemed concerned as to whether the examination of the certificate in these particular circumstances is to be considered an administrative or a judicial act. One would presume that consequences will flow depending upon which theme it is considered the JP is following at that time. As a result, I am wondering what response the parliamentary assistant might have on that point?

Mr. Sterling: There is really no one at that point in time, as I understand it, who could move to amend the certificate of offence, and the justice of the peace is not given any jurisdiction under that to amend it. He only has the choice of quashing the certificate of offence.

Mr. Lawlor: What about the other point? Surely it is a judicial act?

Mr. Sterling: Yes, it is a judicial act.

Section 9 agreed to.

Sections 10 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. Lawlor: This is my old bugbear—just to bring it up and run away from it. That wording in section 13(1)(b) is: "authorizing the use in any form prescribed under clause (a) of any word or expression to designate an offence." I still have misgivings about it. I want to put it on the record, the danger continues to be there, in spite of all the assurances in the world. I am sure it will only happen in the most recondite circumstances. Nevertheless, we are all terribly suspicious of government these days. If it didn't happen to get a particular matter set forth properly

in the statute and the circumstance subsequently arose, then it is the easiest thing in the world to pass a regulation. The regulation could define the terms of the offence in such a way as to catch, in the net, what wasn't expressly done in the statute.

All I can say is that—Mr. Williams is not here this morning; the member for Oriole is in Baltimore. He's the chairman of the committee that is supposed to look over these things and pay attention as to whether or not this type of abuse might occur. I trust that they will do so.

Section 13 agreed to.

Section 14 agreed to.

On section 15:

Mr. Lawlor: I have just one word on that. That's the business of saying to the municipalities, "You are free, except when you're not," which is most of the time. I am not going to raise any amendment or fuss about the thing, particularly; I just point out that as against the earlier section, it now becomes mandatory, within a time limitation of two years, for all municipalities to opt into this legislation, whether they like it or not.

I think it is preferable to have consistency in the application of this particular court and its jurisdiction established universally, rather than to have an isolated municipality proceeding under its own bylaws. It is a good move, but it should be pointed out in this House that this is a change.

Section 15 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park-Swansea indicated that he had an amendment on section 19. Is there anything prior to that?

Mr. Ziemba: I did, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could ask you to stand it down for a moment. I am getting some copies made of my amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: I will speak on section 19.

Sections 16 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 19:

Mr. Lawlor: It is the same objection I had a few moments ago with respect to another section. This has to do with parking infractions: "... where the justice is satisfied that the certificate of parking infraction is complete and regular on its face . . ." The very broad powers do give this legislation a tincture of criminality. All borrowed from the Criminal Code of Canada, they repose in the court's infinite jurisdiction with respect to altering documents, changing words, altering even the offences involved—adding offences, producing things out of the blue. This whole procedure, I think, goes against the grain of this non-criminal statute.

In any event, the word "regular" bothers me. Can section 35, or any of that multitude of other sections be brought to bear to permit him, right there on the spot, to change something which would remove a defendant's defence?

Mr. Sterling: In case of a trial under this section, I believe that section 35 can be used.

Mr. Lawlor: Apart from that, where there is no trial or hearing, it can't be used.

[12:30]

Mr. Sterling: That's correct.

Mr. Ziemba: This is a very important amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Mr. Ziemba moves that section 19(1) be amended by striking out, in the first line, the word "fifteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty."

Mr. Ziemba: Parking tickets are getting awfully expensive in Toronto. They've jumped the rates. They are a real hardship for people living in the inner-city area where there is nowhere to park on the street and where there are limited spaces, so the parking summons becomes kind of a licence, I suppose, to park. We are getting an awful lot of complaints from the inner-city area about parking violations.

I was assured in the committee, when I moved an amendment somewhere along near the end of this bill—section 19(3)—that the Attorney General's people were not that difficult to deal with. There were days of grace and "not to worry; 14 days is working out fine; it will continue to work out fine." Well, I found that's not the case.

I got a ticket in front of the Sir Nicholas Restaurant on Roncesvalles on January 14 of this year. It was \$20 for "no standing at any time." So I sent in my \$20 on January 28, exactly 14 days after I got the summons. Well, so much for your days of grace, Mr. parliamentary assistant. I got a very snarky letter back from a Mr. D. B. Chard, the administrator for the ministry of the Attorney General:

"Dear Sir or Madam: Your parking tag and payment are returned herewith because they were received late and cannot be accepted. The parking tag states clearly that it must be received"—underlined—"by the court office not later than 14 days from date of issue."

If we're going to charge people \$20 for parking, then surely we can give them 30 days to pay it. It's a hardship to me. I'm sure it's a hardship to people who make less money than I do. I think that this relief is really called for at this point in the bill.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I would concur with the amendment of my colleague from High Park. I think if we look at other forms of dealing with government, of appealing decisions by government, we find that certainly more than 14 days is allowed for an appeal.

Those of us who are dealing with any government body, be it an appeal with the federal government on a decision not to grant citizenship, be it a workmen's compensation case or be it decisions of the Ministry of Community and Social Services or what have you, all have a fairly lengthy time in which you can appeal a decision. I think, if we are going to be consistent, surely this is the kind of thing that we could extend an extra 15 days. It will in no way affect the processing. It simply means then that you backlog the block of work handled by those people in the courts who are processing it at that particular time.

So we're not talking about any additional costs to the operation of it. I would think the extra 15 days, considering some of the difficulties that our mail system has had at the present time and considering the way in which other matters dealing with appeals to the government are handled, would be a reasonable change.

Mr. Sterling: Mr. Chairman, we discussed this at length in the committee. Basically I think it was shown by the inter-relationship of the various sections within the act that a person after receiving his parking ticket had somewhere between 45 and 60 days, if he extended it to the total extent, that he could take under the existing act as it is now set out. If we add another 15 days, it will be either 60 or 70 days in which the person has to pay that fine.

I point out to the members of the Legislature who were not part of that committee, there are extremely generous sections within the act to have payment delayed for a period of time, just by asking the justice of the peace. There are also provisions whereby a person can pay it in periodic payments over a period of time. It's just a question of how long do you want the procedure to go on. It makes it more cumbersome administratively; as you lengthen the period out you have that many more people on file.

Some of the members of the committee felt that by lengthening the period extensively, what you do effectively is cause a problem for the person who is paying the fine. Some of us do better when we pay a bill or a fine when it is imposed; if we put it away we seem to forget about it. But that's notwithstanding what this Legislature might do.

Basically it's a 45-day minimum now. The member for High Park-Swansea wants to extend that to 60 days. Our position is that 45 days is enough, and if that isn't enough there are liberal provisions under the act where a person can walk in to a justice of the peace and get that time extended or make arrangements for periodic payments.

Mr. Breithaupt: The matter was discussed rather at length, as the parliamentary assistant has said, at the committee stage of the bill. I am quite content that the time frame he has suggested is a practical balance for the present time, and I would advise the chair that we would not support this amendment.

Mr. Ziemba: Perhaps there is just one point the parliamentary assistant might have missed. I am asking for 30 days for people who want to plead guilty and who do not want to get relief but find 14 days just not enough time to raise \$20.

Mr. Sterling: They have that possibility within the terms of that act as it now exists.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived.

Section 19 agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Any further questions or comments in regard to the bill?

Mr. Ziemba: Yes. Are we going section by section?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Yes, section by section. I want to know what section you next wish to speak to.

Mr. Ziemba: I have an amendment to section 132.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any other members wishing to speak to any section prior to 132?

Mr. Lawlor: With respect to my own colleague, he has an amendment on section 132(2) which is applicable to section 23 of the present bill—or is it? Could I ask for a clarification on that?

Mr. Breithaupt: May I have a copy of the amendment so that I would know what is proposed?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I guess we all need clarification. Mr. Lawlor has asked a question. Whom are you asking it of? The member for High Park-Swansea? I don't think the chair is in any position to clarify it.

Mr. Philip: We are going to have a mini-caucus meeting.

Mr. Lawlor: I've raised the point in section 23. Perhaps my colleague could explain why not section 23, but rather section 132.

Mr. Ziemba: I felt section 132 was the appropriate place to talk about identification because that's the section that deals with arrests.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: May I ask in the meantime whether sections 20 to 22 shall carry?

Sections 20 to 22, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Lawlor: Can we go as far as section 30 and pause there for a moment?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any questions on any section prior to section 30? Shall sections 23 to 30 carry?

Mr. Warner: No. I would think that as long as there remains some confusion as to what the relationship is between sections 132 and 23, it might be prudent to stand down section 23 for the time being until we can resolve this matter. In looking at both those sections, I can understand that an amendment may be necessary to relate section 23 to section 132. Perhaps we could stand down section 23 and proceed with section 24 and so on.

Mr. Hodgson: You are a professional stander-down, aren't you?

Mr. Warner: We've had a lot of experience.

Mr. Breithaupt: I've no objection, other than to say that in my reading of section 23 it only deals with the fact that the provincial offences officer may serve the person with a summons. Identification really doesn't come up in that light.

It can be stood down, if that's the wish of the committee. But I presume that the matter of identification as the point at issue would appear to fit into section 132 in the notice of reason for arrest and production of process. I would see no reason to stand down section 23. But if it's thought that it might have some beneficial effect, it's fine with me.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are you content with that, Mr. Lawlor?

Mr. Lawlor: I accept the position of my colleague. I don't think section 23 should be stood down.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right. Are we agreed that section 23 has carried?

Section 23 agreed to.

Sections 24 to 29, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Does anybody have a comment to make on section 30?

Mr. Lawlor: My next reference may be section 42.

Sections 30 to 41, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 42:

Mr. Lawlor: You understand we've had three periods of evolution. Whether or not we've matured, I don't know. First of all we had a bill. Then before we had second reading we got a new bill with alterations. Then it was subsequently changed for the third time in committee. This section is one of those in which there is the third change.

[12:45]

I'm almost willing to suggest that for the purposes of the House, when the third change comes along, the one made in committee, some mention should be made of it and it be pointed out that this is not on all fours any longer, by any means, with the earlier legislation. Subsection 2 here has to do with the keepers of prisons and conveying prisoners to courts, et cetera.

I'm not sure if it makes a substantive change in the legislation. Perhaps the parliamentary assistant would spend a moment explaining that subsection. Why the change?

Mr. Sterling: Are you referring to subsection 2?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I'm referring to subsection 2. The only change has to do with reasonable charges.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Help is coming.

Mr. Sterling: I'm sorry. Could I stand that down in order to give you a reasonable explanation of your query?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Is it agreed to stand down 42(2)?

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps the section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right, that's better. We'll stand down the whole of section 42.

Sections 43 to 50, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 51:

Mr. Lawlor: Section 51 must be taken in conjunction with section 82. Just let me check with section 82 and see if there has been any change in that with respect to the new bill that came on our desks this morning. No, it's the same.

It was raised in committee, and I'm still wondering if adequate consideration was given to the position. We were a little jealous of the rights of the defendant with respect to counsel or agent to appear on his behalf. I'm still not satisfied as to the inter-relationship between those two sections. One of them, 82, appears to grant that as a right without any ifs, ands or buts, but 51, the one we're on, cuts back and gives the court a very con-

siderable discretion as to whether the man will be represented by anyone or not.

If the court finds a person is not competent, that is, surely, a highly subjective judgement, in many instances. Sometimes it's quite clear that he isn't competent. Lord, that applies to lawyers too. But what an easy masquerade to exclude what would be a perfectly competent but totally obnoxious human being from the courtroom on the grounds of personal feelings because he didn't like the colour of his eyes. This is the danger.

Has the parliamentary assistant considered it since our committee? I raised it at that time and I raise it again.

Mr. Sterling: I can only respond in the way I responded in committee, that it was felt it was necessary for the justice of the peace or the provincial court judge to have some control over an irresponsible agent who was acting for a person, and that this was the way we thought would be the most suitable to give the judge control over an agent who wasn't acting in the best interests of his client.

Mr. Breithaupt: Would the parliamentary assistant not agree that a justice dealing with section 51(3) would, in fact, have to act judicially, and that if there were the rejection of a person to act as agent on a mere whim or caprice on the colour of that person's eyes, surely there are remedies available for review of such a decision that would, in fact, require a serious and judicial interpretation of this section by the person whose responsibility it is?

Mr. Sterling: Yes, I think we discussed that fully. Again, judges and justices of the peace have a lot of discretion and, especially under this particular bill they really are going to have a much greater control placed over their activities because appeals from anything they do within a courtroom, in most cases, will go directly to the provincial court judge who is over that particular justice of the peace. We think there are enough safeguards so that this will not be used unwisely.

Mr. Lawlor: I think subsection 3 is a very novel one. I know of no other area in law in which it is set out in such express terms. Of course I don't mean "the colour of one's eyes." It just tends to be a phrase that happens to be at one's fingertips. But it's very easy for a judge to say that the case is not being presented properly, the right questions are not being asked, the mode of approach is wrong. "He should have done it another way. If I were the examining agent I would present it totally differently. And he's incompe-

tent." That really bothers me, but I don't know how to change it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You are not making any amendment then.

Mr. Lawlor: No.

Mr. Ziemba: I would like to speak to that. I believe this section was written with one individual in mind, Mr. Chairman, a Mr. Zoltan Szoboszloi. Mr. Szoboszloi appears in traffic court almost daily and some judges don't like him. The reason they don't is because on numerous occasions he has expressed the opinion that he doesn't recognize the Queen as the head of state. For that reason he was thrown out of court a couple of times. I don't know whether he still feels that way but I suspect that's why we see this section before us.

I just wanted to put on record that there has been one case where someone has been, I guess, in the court's eyes, obnoxious or objectionable—

Mr. Philip: "Traitorous" is the word to some of us who are monarchists.

Mr. Ziemba: —and they wanted to get rid of him. If the constitution is repatriated that problem won't arise and Mr. Szoboszloi would be able to continue appearing on behalf of people in night court without having that difficulty.

I agree with my colleague from Lakeshore that while it's objectionable, I don't see what we can do about it.

Mr. Breithaupt: To take that particular example, repatriation of the constitution will make us no less a monarchy, so presumably this individual's dislike of the style of cause of an action might well continue.

Section 51 agreed to.

On section 52:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: How far is the member for Lakeshore going to let us go?

Mr. Lawlor: Somewhere in this mess is an objection that I had with respect to appeal procedures.

At this hour of the day my mind is not clear as to what my objection was or what the appeal procedure might be. Did you meet and accommodate my request, whatever it might have been, within the terms of the amended bill we got this morning?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Is it with regard to section 52, Mr. Lawlor?

Mr. Lawlor: It could be 152, for all I know. That is why I don't want it to go much further without hitting it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Well, we'll carry section 52 and we'll look to the House leader.

Section 52 agreed to.

Mr. Sterling: Could I comment on section 42 in relation to the amendment? That was the only one that was stood down. You were referring to 42(2)(b), I believe, is that correct?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, to 42(2).

Mr. Sterling: The only reason we amended that particular one was to clarify where the expense of bringing the prisoner to court was going to lie. We were concerned that it not lie with the Correctional Services people. That was the reason for the amendment.

Section 42 agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I believe the only section up to section 52, and including 52, that hasn't been carried is section 1, and we have agreed to go back to that.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the committee of the whole House reported progress.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 9, 1979

Energy policy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Renwick	69
Use of herbicide 2,4,5-T, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. S. Smith	71
Employment development fund, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. di Santo, Mr. B. Newman	72
Hydro load forecasts, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Cassidy	74
Boise Cascade dispute, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. T. P. Reid	75
Equal pay, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Bounsall, Mrs. Campbell	76
Development corporations, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. O'Neil	77
Brantford Hospital closure, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Makarchuk	78
Rape case, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Stong	78
Back disability claims, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Wildman	79
Family benefits, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Peterson, Mr. McClellan	79
Resource equalization grants, question of Mr. Maeck: Mr. Cooke	80
Employment opportunities for women, question of Mr. Elgie: Mr. McGuigan	80
Women crown employees, question of Mr. Elgie: Ms. Bryden	80
Farm storm damage, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Conway	80
Petitions re TTC fare increase, Mr. Warner	81
Milk Amendment Act, Mr. W. Newman, first reading	82
Trees Amendment Act, Mr. Auld, first reading	82
Liquor Licence Amendment Act, Mr. Ziemba, first reading	82
Provincial Offences Act, in committee	82
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	96

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Bollan, M. (Nipissing L)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Edighoffer, H.; Chairman (Perth L)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Deputy Chairman (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McGuigan, J. (Kent-Elgin L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
(York Mills PC)
Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 4

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Monday, March 12, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1979

(The House met at 2 p.m.)

Prayers.

COMMONWEALTH DAY VISITORS

Mr. Speaker: If I could have the attention of the honourable members for a moment, I would like to draw their attention to the fact that today, the second Monday in March, is Commonwealth Day. It is being celebrated by countries, provinces and states throughout the Commonwealth of Nations.

Earlier today I had the honour of hosting a luncheon for members of the Commonwealth consular corps who are resident here in Toronto. Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, and representatives of all parties in the Legislature attended the luncheon. I am sure honourable members would like to welcome those distinguished persons who are members of the consular corps stationed in Toronto. They are in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon.

Would you welcome them on this occasion?

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

USE OF HERBICIDES

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Because of the concern regarding the use of two herbicides, 2,4,5-T and 2,4,5-TP, in Ontario, I would like to update the members on the action my ministry has taken in this situation.

First, let me assure the House that use of such substances is strictly controlled under the terms of the Pesticides Act. Before a specific chemical is approved, its safety is carefully assessed. The ministry then continually monitors and reviews current scientific data that may affect its use.

Our experts are well aware of the recent report on the two chemicals released by the United States Environmental Protection Agency. They will be receiving a copy of that report shortly. In light of this new information, I have arranged to pass an immediate regulation to the Pesticides Act which will temporarily prohibit the use of these herbicides. This will give ministry staff and the Pesticides Advisory Committee time to completely review the data.

If careful examination of the report finds that specific uses may be acceptable, the

regulation can always be changed. But if serious concerns are justified, I will take immediate action to have both chemicals permanently declared illegal for use in Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: Good move.

ORAL QUESTIONS

WESTINGHOUSE CANADA

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism: When, if ever, did the minister first become aware of a study undertaken by Westinghouse Canada which may well result in putting 700 production employees out of work in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't have that information with me today but I believe we were informed of that just recently. I would be pleased to get the details for the Leader of the Opposition if he wishes. I will have it tomorrow.

I wonder if at that time the Leader of the Opposition might want to pursue for this House in question period some of the thoughts he was pursuing on Saturday night. I would be interested to do that as well.

Mr. Renwick: Shame.

Mr. Hall: It wasn't Saturday night.

Mr. S. Smith: When the minister is indicating a lack of familiarity with this matter and speaking of having received only very recent notification, I presume he is speaking of Friday or Saturday, which is when everyone else heard about it.

May I ask him why it is that his ministry did not follow up on the announcement in November 1978 by the president of Westinghouse Canada, an American gentleman? He said then that the role of Westinghouse Canada, as a branch plant, is becoming less viable. He also said the strategy for the future of Westinghouse in Canada was being developed by Westinghouse Corporation in Pittsburgh. This was in the public press.

Does the ministry not follow matters of this kind? Why was the minister not talking to Westinghouse about their plans—their so-called "rationalization" plans? Why was he not, in fact, alerting the people of Ontario, and the workers of that plant, to the kinds

of decisions being taken in Pittsburgh affecting their future and ours?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While the member has been expanding a bit, I located some information which indicates that the first contact with our ministry occurred in October of last year. There was further contact on February 22, at which time, by the way, the company reported 125 employees being recalled, not laid off.

Those conversations, I would presume, are continuing. I might say to the member that I suppose in my book I have exactly 62 pages of information regarding companies with whom we are carrying on discussions at any given time. Obviously, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition there are 124 members of this House who could rise and ask me a question with regard to our ongoing discussions with any particular firm. I would obviously need to go back in our files and find out exactly what the status of those conversations is.

If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to raise this type of question, I think it is important that we be in a position to notify the House with regard to just what conversations have gone on. I would be happy to do that.

Perhaps he might follow the procedure that some of his colleagues have followed; that is to call us a few days in advance and say he would like to raise this particular question in the House. At that time, I might be able to give him all the details of those conversations. Having said that—

Mr. McClellan: What about getting notice from Westinghouse?

Mr. Hall: Wouldn't that be nice. Wouldn't that be nice.

Mr. Renwick: He is unprepared.

Mr. McClellan: You are right on top of things, aren't you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Having said that, may I say that those types of conversations, which are exactly the type we have been talking about over the last few weeks, are the types of conversations we are going to continue to have with the American firms with branch plants in this country. We are determined to speak with those firms and try to identify situations where, instead of closing plants that have become unproductive, or for whatever other reasons they might have, they might put themselves in a better position to carry on business here in a rationalized way.

Mr. Mackenzie: You are totally unprepared.

Mr. McClellan: Do you sing and dance?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might also take this opportunity to say to the Leader of the

Opposition that I presume his community in Hamilton has benefited somewhat by the presence of that American multinational up until this time. I will say further: to suggest that for this government to go out and offer some incentive grants to locate those types of firms under certain conditions is a policy which should not be followed, is hardly doing anything to promote the corporate decision that Westinghouse or anyone else is going to make to locate in this province.

Mr. Warner: You are totally lost.

Mr. Martel: You haven't said a thing about the company yet.

Mr. S. Smith: Are we going to have to give them money to stay now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For example, when the Leader of the Opposition stands up and suggests that the reasons for our attempts to create employment in the riding of Windsor-Walkerville were in essence so that Tory cabinet ministers could attend a ribbon cutting—

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister is going far afield in regard to the specific supplementary.

Mr. McClellan: The answer is he doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, with respect, the Leader of the Opposition is raising a question about our relationship as a government with multinationals carrying on business in Canada.

Mr. Martel: A pox on both your houses. You would give the store away.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it's totally relevant. I hope he pursues it.

Mr. Speaker: Does anyone have a supplementary? The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Martel: Does anyone have an answer?

Mr. Mackenzie: Is the minister not telling this House that he's totally unprepared to deal with the issue of Westinghouse and the potential layoff of 700 employees, which is another decision being made by a company that's not owned in this Canada, over which we have no control or say and which is going to directly affect the workers in this province?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That of course totally ignores, which is convenient for the member, the exchange the Leader of the Opposition and I have just had. If he wants to raise the question again before question period ends or if the Speaker will permit me to get the necessary information so that we may carry on an intelligent rather than a rhetorical discussion about Westinghouse, then I will be happy to do it. I might say that it's more easy for the member to jump on the multi-

nationals which may have made some decisions, without having the facts before the House. I'll be pleased to obtain those facts. I'll have them before 3 o'clock. I'll tell the member what part my ministry and the Ministry of Labour have played in this situation.

Mr. Warner: The minister probably told Westinghouse, "We treat you royally."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then he can see if it's as easy to jump all over the multinationals and the attempts by this government to maintain those jobs as it is at 2:10, without giving us any notice of the question he was going to raise.

Mr. S. Smith: If I may have a final supplementary from this particular desk, does the minister not realize that what he is saying is that despite a public announcement in November that this type of decision was being contemplated, his ministry has still left him rather in the dark, considering the plans of this multinational which now will affect very likely 700 jobs in Hamilton? Doesn't he think it's time we had a code of proper corporate behaviour showing community and social responsibility for the foreign-owned corporations and, for that matter, domestically owned corporations in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be really quite pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition participate perhaps later today—one can never tell—by way of explaining what kind of corporate code he might talk about imposing in terms of moral suasion or whatever he intends to impose upon the American multinationals.

Mr. Mackenzie: Something better than Columbus McKinnon.

Mr. S. Smith: Will the minister adopt it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let the Leader of the Opposition issue it tomorrow morning and then ask some questions tomorrow afternoon, or indeed if he's ready to go tomorrow morning, let him get into it this afternoon and we'll be pleased to respond to it.

Mr. Nixon: Do you want notice?

Mr. Martel: Are we going to have a crash program?

Mr. Nixon: Back to city council.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must point out that over the last many weeks we have been talking about things such as global product mandating, which is exactly the type of situation which will allow multinationals to carry on profitable enterprises in this province.

I must point out that we have been talking extensively over the past few weeks about

the use of the employment development fund in order not only to give incentive grants where appropriate, but to obtain from the American firms appropriate undertakings with regard to such things as sourcing in Canada, research and development and technology. I have to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I know he's aware that we've been saying that, because he repeated almost word for word yesterday or the day before all—

Mr. Sargent: Time. Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —policy statements that this government has been talking about over the past two months, saying that if they were elected, that's what they would do. He's been reading those speeches very carefully, taking them over and trying to say the government is not doing them. I'll wait for tomorrow morning and hear his code of conduct for American firms.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Before this pathetic piece of self-justification by the minister comes to an end, is he aware, as I told him on Friday—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: —that between 1974 and 1978 there have been 2,800 jobs lost in the electrical industry just in the city of Hamilton? What action will this government take now in order to protect the electrical industry and protect the 700 jobs now being cut in Westinghouse Canada?

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As I indicated, I will be happy to discuss the situation with regard to Westinghouse in Hamilton before 3 o'clock and secondly, as I indicated on Friday, we have had a task force investigating the electronics industry and we discussed it in estimates. If the member would ask the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren)—

Mr. McClellan: Where have you been all that time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —we got into it in detail and we will have more to say on the electronics industry after that task force report becomes public.

[Later (3:03):]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition earlier that I would try to get some details about the Westinghouse situation before 3 o'clock. The Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to forewarn me that he did have to leave around 3 o'clock but, nonetheless, I know he will have wanted me to give whatever information I do have at this time.

I am informed by my staff that late on Friday we were in receipt of what was and is

only a press release indicating that Westinghouse was indeed moving its switch gear and control division to, we are informed, other Canadian plants. We are informed that is due to the age of the particular plant and that this is part of a program of rationalization of their operation.

I must say I am rather disappointed, if the information I have is correct, in that as an ordinary matter of course our ministry is notified, not only formally at the time of layoffs, which we haven't been yet, but in most cases well in advance of layoffs so that we might work with the particular firm involved to see what other strategies might be involved in terms of that particular plant and also in order that the Minister of Labour might work with the employee group in question.

In any case, we are not in receipt of that formal notice at the present time. Notwithstanding that, arrangements had been made first thing this morning for our development officer in the area to meet with the executive of the Canadian Westinghouse early this week, which should be today or tomorrow. I will have a more formal statement to make tomorrow with regard to the outcome of that meeting and some further details surrounding the number of employees and what steps might be taken.

Mr. Speaker: We will add a further two minutes to the question period.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary to the minister's statement, Mr. Speaker: In view of the clear unwillingness of Westinghouse to be co-operative, as shown by the fact that they did not notify the ministry in advance, as the minister had said is customary: will the minister himself not be prepared now to intervene: to talk with the president of Westinghouse Canada; to talk, if necessary, with the heads of the international corporation in order to find out what's going on; to get clear answers about how many jobs will remain in Ontario; and to tell the corporation that this is not the way a multinational should deal with Canadian workers' jobs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I should indicate to the House that I have asked my deputy minister to contact the head of Canadian Westinghouse. He has already done that. I think he has spoken with him within the past 40 minutes—since the question was first raised. By way of explaining the situation from our standpoint: I should add that the deputy minister and myself were tied up in a meeting in this building from 9 o'clock right until question period. As soon as that meeting was finished, the deputy went back and contacted the head of that company.

Now, of course I will be doing, in this case, what I have done in other cases, including the Budd case and others: that is, contacting the appropriate executive officers, both here and in the United States, to see what follow up is required at a senior level.

[Reverting (2:17):]

THAMES RIVER FLOODING

Mr. S. Smith: In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld), I will direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. One has to ask the question anyhow. In view of the dreadful flooding on the Thames River in Dover township near Chatham, can the minister explain why preventive measures were not taken, such as dredging the mouth of the river properly, or breaking up the ice a short distance upstream with an ice-breaking vessel, and can he explain why it is that the Prairie Siding bridge gauge was not working, the gauge which is supposed to indicate a warning when the level comes up? Why was that not working even though the one up in Chatham was working? Does the minister know the answer to this and can he tell us how it is that the conservation authority seems so ill-prepared to deal with items of this kind which keep recurring in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition would like to have as much information as possible. I am advised that the Minister of Natural Resources will be here shortly.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I think, rather than have the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development take it as notice, with the permission of the House, could we defer that question until the arrival of the appropriate minister? Is that agreed?

Mr. Makarchuk: No.

Mr. Speaker: The only thing is, if he doesn't make the statement prior to the end of the question period, there won't be an opportunity today. As we don't have unanimous consent perhaps the member could pursue it.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, when the minister eventually makes a statement, will the provincial secretary see to it that his colleague makes a statement regarding what can be done for the people who have been affected by this flood and what measures will be taken by the province of Ontario to relieve some of the very severe damage, much of which is not covered by insurance? Will the minister undertake to have a statement on that matter?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will be pleased to do so, Mr. Speaker.

[Later (2:40):]

Mr. Watson: A question for the Minister of Natural Resources regarding the serious situation in Dover township with the flooding this weekend: There have been many accusations made regarding the reason the Thames River overflowed. It did so much damage, the people in my riding would like some kind of official explanation. Would the minister responsible for flooding in this province, if I can put it that way—

Interjections.

Mr. Watson: —or would the minister, being responsible for flood prevention, which might be a better way of putting it—

Interjections.

Mr. Watson: —seek some type of report or inquiry so all the facts can come out as to why we did experience the disaster we did and what could be done in the future to prevent similar things from happening?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, perhaps with your permission, I might read a short statement I had hoped to read at 2 o'clock but I was delayed because of a luncheon meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have unanimous consent to revert to statements?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: This will be deducted from the question period.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This has to do with Dover township, Mr. Speaker. At approximately 2:30 a.m. on March 9, earth dikes on the north side of the Thames River in Dover township were breached in a number of places. Twelve breaches have been reported. All except one of those breaks occurred in sections of the diking system that had not been reconstructed under the federal/provincial diking program.

Mr. Eaton: The feds pulled out.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We'll come to that. Extension of this program is being discussed now with the federal government.

The breaching was caused by an ice jam. This matter is being investigated and a further report will be given as soon as all the facts have been put together.

According to Ministry of Natural Resources staff, the Fanshawe, Wildwood and Pittock Dams, which control flooding on the Thames, were operated according to procedures for the conditions that existed beginning March 4.

The Lower Thames Conservation Authority has been monitoring flooding in the Thames and in the Chatham area since March 4 and also became involved in the Dover town-

ship areas on March 9 when it was learned the Ontario Provincial Police were evacuating some residents in the area. Up until this time, the authority was not contacted for assistance by the municipalities.

Since becoming involved, authority staff and Ministry of Natural Resources staff have been working closely with the—excuse me—OPP to help evacuate residents and have been patrolling the flood area issuing further warnings.

Mr. Peterson: There was no difference before and after you cleared your throat.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Fortunately, no lives have been lost but approximately 8,500 acres have been flooded. Township officials are still trying to get an accurate count of the number of homes affected. I add to this statement, Mr. Speaker, that I understand that the water has receded since the ice jam, which had moved to the mouth of the Thames, has been removed by dynamite.

May I also add, Mr. Speaker, that as far as disaster relief is concerned, I believe an application is being made by at least one municipality, if not more, to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) whose ministry deals with our disaster relief legislation. I assume he will be in a position to say something about that when some better idea of the amount of damage has been established.

To answer particularly the question of the member for Chatham-Kent, I would simply say it would appear that the various participants were acting according to their best judgement which may well have been the best judgement at the time. I would suggest it's necessary that the member municipalities of the authority, who have members on the authority, would have a meeting of the authority to get a report from the staff themselves rather than simply waiting for the next regular meeting. Certainly, if it appears that there has not been the best judgement exercised or there is some disagreement as to whose responsibilities were involved, that is the municipality or the authority, then we would conduct a further investigation.

[2:45]

I'll be in a better position to comment further on that, Mr. Speaker, when I've had an opportunity to get further hard information from the area. I think it's fair to say that the activities in the last day or two have been involved more in making sure that there were no personal injuries, or that those kinds of things were at a minimum, and also to reduce property damage, than to sit

down and take a good look at what transpired and how the matter was resolved.

I know the concern of the member for Chatham-Kent and other members in the area and I would hope that perhaps by Thursday we would have a definitive answer in terms of approximate total damage and further information about the various actions that were taken.

May I only add at this point that I am informed by our own staff that dynamiting is not always the best answer because if it is effective and does not damage the downstream area, all it may do is move the problem farther downstream where the conditions might turn out to be worse. I think it's also fair to say that the fact that the repairs and sort of renovation of the dike which I believe is part of a municipal drainage system in the original instance are not complete. It's significant that 11 of the 12 breaches in the dike—and those breaches were what caused the flooding—took place in the area where the renovations had not been completed.

Mr. Speaker: In fairness, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk had attempted to raise this on Friday and so had the member for Brantford so if they wish to pose supplementaries in that order, they may.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Leader of the Opposition had also asked your permission to follow up with a question when the honourable minister had made a statement. I would certainly yield to my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton West, then, followed by the member for Brantford.

Mr. S. Smith: Basically, when the minister was a little late, I asked his colleague, who may pass on the question to him, but fundamentally it is simply this: Why is it that the conservation authorities never seem to be able to respond to these matters before they actually occur? For instance, why were they not dredging the silt away from the mouth of the river sufficiently? Why was there no ice-breaking tug used on this occasion as has happened in the past? Can you say why it was that the gauge that's supposed to indicate when a dangerous level is being reached was not operating at the Prairie Siding area even though the gauge was working upstream in Chatham?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can't yet answer the question about the flood gauge. I can tell the honourable member that the Canadian Coastguard vessel and ice-breaker—I cannot remember now the name of the vessel—was standing by at Amherstburg, but

apparently, in the view of the various parties concerned, it was not felt to be required at the time the flood was taking place.

The original ice jam was at a curve well above Lake St. Clair, some distance above, and well above Chatham, and the pressures that were exerted there on that part of the dike, which as I said had not yet been repaired, caused the original flooding and the main damage according to the reports that I have today. There is apparently some damage in Chatham but apparently not as great as that on the farmland and the fields in Dover township.

[Later (3:05):]

Hon. Mr. Auld: This may be a matter of personal privilege. A little further information came to hand about the Dover situation. It may well be—and I wouldn't want to imply that it was the federal government's fault—but that was a shared program, in that I think the owners or groups in that area would pay 10 per cent. They may have declined to go along with the completion of it. I'm not sure, but I just wanted to indicate that and find out more about it in the next day or two.

[Reverting (2:18):]

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would like the consent of the House to postpone a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) until, as I understand, he arrives in the House shortly. Perhaps I could stand a question down.

Mr. Kerrio: Forget it.

Mr. S. Smith: Same co-operation you gave us.

Mr. Cassidy: The Minister of Health is coming in now.

Mr. MacDonald: The late Dennis Timbrell.

Mr. Cassidy: Coming from behind the arras, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the recently arrived Minister of Health.

Mr. Breaugh: Soon to be departed.

Mr. Cassidy: On Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health denied—

Hon. Mr. Davis: At least he has arrived, Michael. You haven't even arrived yet.

Mr. Cassidy: I am getting there; just you wait. On Thursday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health denied that 50 to 70 per cent of the doctors in the city of Peterborough have opted out of OHIP and I would like the minister to table in this House at once the full information regarding the numbers and the percentages of full-time practising phys-

icians who have opted out of OHIP in the city of Peterborough and in other centres across the province, because the OHIP administration in Oshawa has today confirmed for us that at least 50 per cent, if not 70 per cent, of the doctors in the city of Peterborough are now out of OHIP and that this is also the case in the city of Orillia.

Mr. Mackenzie: Talk about the Hamilton General too, and see who is telling the truth.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I apologize for being a little delayed.

Mr. Warner: It would have been better if the minister hadn't shown up at all.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can give the members the figures by administrative regions as at the end of February. I've got only one copy, so I'll get some copies made during the question period and send them to the member.

I can tell him, though, that for the Oshawa office, which includes the county of Simcoe, the region of York, the district of Muskoka, Haliburton, county of Victoria, county of Peterborough, region of Durham and the county of Northumberland—

Mr. McClellan: Why doesn't the minister answer the question?

Mr. Swart: Tell us about the city of Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I haven't got those figures with me but I'll be glad to get them.

Mr. Martel: The minister said we were lying about Peterborough.

Mr. Mackenzie: Oh, he hasn't got them yet. He is slipping as much as the other minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If members won't give the minister the courtesy of answering the question, something as detailed as that—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is not answering the question.

Mr. Speaker: —I'm going to insist that questions of that nature be put as an inquiry to the ministry requiring detailed information. If you want to hear what the honourable minister has to say and ask a supplementary, that's fine, but if you are going to continue to interrupt I have no alternative but to insist that questions of that nature be made inquiries of the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I'll get this information for the member. We do not keep the figures on a city-by-city or town-by-town basis.

Mr. Martel: Then why didn't the minister just say he was wrong on Thursday?

Mr. Turner: You were.

Mr. G. Taylor: Fifty isn't 70.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have it on the basis of counties. I can get it for him on the basis of counties. Particularly, in that regard, the figures for Peterborough county are below 50 per cent; they're not 50 to 70 per cent. But I'll get the material for the member.

Mr. Mackenzie: The minister is satisfied that it is 50 per cent, is he?

Mr. Martel: He said we were distorting the figures.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary: Since the minister said on Thursday that I was wrong in saying that in the city of Peterborough it was more than 50 per cent, he obviously must have the figures. Will he table those figures? Will he table the figures for opted-out physicians in every county of Ontario? Will he do it now, so that the people of the province can judge whether or not there is a threat to the universality of medicare across the province because of doctors opting out with the permission of the government?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It is not a threat to universality. It is not; it is not a threat.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why doesn't the Minister of Colleges and Universities go and find a throat specialist in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member, he is mistaken as regards the Peterborough area. On the question of the universality of the system, as I said repeatedly, the act of opting out is not, in and of itself, a threat to the universality of health care, otherwise we would have a problem before now—

Mr. Warner: It is and the minister knows it.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It is not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shhh.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —because we've had opting out as a fundamental element of the plan for more than eight years, I guess, now, and there is no indication whatsoever—

Mr. Warner: Boy oh boy, the expert of distortion.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that at any point in that time, nor currently, has the universality of the system been threatened or is it being threatened. I haven't got the county-by-county figures with me. If the honourable member would like those I'll be glad to table those in this House. In the meantime, I'll give him the numbers that I do have by administrative region of OHIP, that show, for instance, that out of the Kingston office almost 95 per cent of the doctors are opted in. There are areas that are higher. The area that I started to describe is the counties and regions—

Mr. Warner: Tell us about Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that are served out of the Oshawa office, where 77.8 per cent of the doctors are opted in. It does vary across the province. I'll be glad to get that to the member.

Mr. Warner: What is the minister going to do about it?

Mr. Swart: What about Peterborough county?

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since the minister now admits that in a seven-county area that is served by the Oshawa OHIP regional office 23 per cent of the doctors have opted out of OHIP, since the amount of opting out has gone up by 70 per cent, according to the ministry's figures, between April of last year and January of this year—that is, from under 11 per cent to just under 18 per cent—and still appears to be climbing, and since the minister said last April 18 that he is monitoring the situation, and since he is clearly keeping figures for his own benefit in order to reply to questions in the House, will the minister table all of those figures in this Legislature today so that the people of the province can judge for each part of the province and, hopefully, for each city just what is the situation and how great the threat is, because we believe it's very ominous?

Mr. Speaker: That is the same as the previous question.

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Speaker. I asked for the specific commitment that the figures will be tabled. I have not had that from the minister yet.

Mr. Speaker: That commitment was made.

The second question from the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's answer was no and I regret that.

Mr. Speaker: No.

RIDEAU REGIONAL CENTRE

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker. The minister is aware that Mr. Lyle Leeson, an employee of the Rideau Regional Centre for the Mentally Retarded, was acquitted February 22 on a charge of having sexual intercourse with a feeble-minded resident. Will the minister explain why Mr. Leeson has not been reinstated in his job now that he has been acquitted by the Perth county court?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the matter is currently under review and I expect to have

final advice from senior legal advisers within the very near future. I would like to get this matter resolved as quickly as possible, but I would also point out to the honourable member that the fact in itself of an acquittal on a criminal charge does not necessarily rule out any possibility of administrative action in some instances. That is the matter that I hope to have resolved very shortly.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary: Was the party not found innocent? Did the witnesses against him not admit they had cooked up the story and lied? Has he not been suspended without pay since September 18? Since when in this country do we find somebody guilty in advance? Can we be assured not only that he will be reinstated in his job but that he will receive back pay for the period that he has been suspended?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the finding of a court in this country is that of guilty or not guilty as opposed to the finding of innocent, as is the case in some jurisdictions, and I am well aware of that. The matter of the suspension and reinstatement is a matter I will determine as expeditiously as possible, as soon as the full information has been reviewed and I have had final advice upon it.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the ministry saying that Mr. Leeson is being subjected to a form of double jeopardy because of administrative action by his ministry? If that is the case, can he defend why double jeopardy is being employed when the employee has gone through the whole mechanism of a trial by a court? Will he guarantee that when Mr. Leeson is reinstated he will get his full back pay for the period in which he has been out of a job because of action by the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I assure the honourable members opposite that Mr. Leeson will be dealt with in the fairest manner possible when I have all the information finally before me.

I am not suggesting there will be a difference in this case—please don't misinterpret what I am saying—but there is a difference in standards of proof and admissibility of evidence and so on between criminal proceedings and administrative proceedings before various tribunals other than courts that exist in this province.

I am sure the honourable members opposite would wish that I be very certain, in the interests of all parties concerned including residents, before a final decision is made in this case. I'm sure members would wish me to have at my disposal all of the information that was presented, in the courts and other-

wise, and the very best advice I can obtain. That is all I am waiting to do. I do not wish that you misinterpret what I am saying. I don't believe in any event that this is a situation where what might happen one way or the other could be construed as double jeopardy.

RESOURCE EQUALIZATION GRANTS

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. As the accumulated loss of equalization grants by the city of Windsor has been estimated at approximately \$30 million over the years, as it is also substantial in relation to other municipalities, and as the previous Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has admitted this inequity, can the Premier inform the municipalities at this time what the extent of that grant will be and when the cities can expect it?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, one of the members opposite asked a comparable question related to some other municipality, I think on Thursday or Friday.

An hon. member: No, it was Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, was it Windsor? Somebody over there asked the same question on Thursday or Friday. I think the answer was given then but I certainly am quite prepared to repeat it.

An hon. member: There was no answer given.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, I think there was an answer given. As I recall, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maek) referred it to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells); the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs was not here, but there was an answer given to the question. I am prepared to expand on that answer.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is not here. He will be prepared to answer the question when he is here. But, in the interim, I would say to the honourable members that we are contemplating some interim steps to deal with this particular situation. Although I would point out to the members from Windsor that, in terms of equalization, while it does not appear in any grant formula, we have made available certain funds for capital works in the surrounding municipality to accommodate that very significant industrial enterprise called Ford Canada Limited, which apparently the honourable member's leader was not happy with over the weekend, even after he advised this House we should

go it alone without the feds or at least 50 per cent, the logic of which I find a little difficult to follow.

I might also ask the member for Windsor-Walkerville, is he a part of the liberal or conservative part of the Liberal caucus of Ontario?

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: As the Premier would have provided equal assistance to any other municipality in Ontario, he did not treat Windsor any differently from the way he would treat other municipalities. But in the case of the grant structure—and the Premier believes in fairness—he knows he has mistreated the city of Windsor. The city of Windsor would like to strike a tax rate and is waiting and has been waiting for a substantial period of time, for an answer from his government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really was not being facetious. As a matter of fact, we are expediting certain capital works to assist the city of Windsor, and I guess that has some impact on the great county of Essex with respect to the Ford plant. I notice from the press that even the members locally disagree with their leader and think it is a great thing for the economy of that part of Ontario. But that does not surprise me; I have never expected logic from across the House.

Mr. Kerrio: We just hit the ball back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on; my friend just wishes he had it. He knows how he was longing to get that in Niagara Falls. He remembers our conversation.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are not talking about Niagara Falls.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who is he kidding? Was he at the meeting on the weekend?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Van Horne: We're tired of your nonsense. Get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to the member for London North, if he can identify nonsense, he should have no trouble within his caucus—no trouble at all.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would just repeat what I said in answer to the initial question: We are planning some interim solution to it and, as soon as it is available, we will inform the members of the House as well as the municipality of Windsor, a great municipality.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, we already know in this House that the government has

planned some interim measure. What we want to know is when the dollar figures are going to be announced. There was an \$8-million commitment. I would like to ask the Premier, has that \$8 million been changed, and has the number of municipalities that are to receive grants been increased? If so, that means Windsor will get considerably less than what the government originally promised.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with very great respect, I do not recall the government committing itself to any particular number of municipalities. My recollection—and I am subject to correction—

Mr. Kerrio: Frequently.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, frequently. I notice by the press that the honourable member is part of the conservative wing of the Liberal caucus. How can he explain that to me? How does he explain that?

An hon. member: The whole bunch of them are.

An hon. member: He is what you call a progressive conservative.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Just ignore the interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The honourable member is blushing.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have got high blood pressure. I am not blushing; it is the heat of the lights.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Meanwhile, back in Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A great town to be back in.

As I recall, Windsor has made submissions over a number of years; the city of Sarnia also has made submissions, as well as two or three other municipalities that have become rather public. I think it is fair to state that this government never said that whatever interim measure we develop would be confined only to those municipalities that made submissions.

In any policy, the honourable member would understand that, even if a very small municipality is involved in the same difficulty as Windsor or Sarnia—you name it—it should receive the same degree of equity. So I think the honourable member can assume that whatever interim measure we introduce would take into account some logical rationale or basis for whatever new grant program is introduced. It might go beyond those municipalities that have been discussed in this House.

Mr. Warner: It's called equal punishment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member could not dispute the equity of that. He wouldn't want to deprive some of the smaller municipalities of some assistance. He doesn't want it all for himself.

Mr. Cooke: I think you will find that we have lost \$30 million.

Mr. Warner: Just because they didn't vote Tory.

CO-PAYMENT FEES

Mr. Wildman: I have a question for the Minister of Health, if he will return to his seat.

Mr. Makarchuk: Are you going to the meeting in Renfrew on Friday?

Mr. Wildman: Is the minister aware of the hardship that his so-called co-payment plan for chronic care patients will impose upon pensioners such as the elderly lady in my area who may lose her home in order to pay the \$9.80-a-day charge for her husband's long-term hospitalization for his chronic illness? Can the minister explain why the co-payment plan discriminates against pensioners, since a family of two earning less than \$15,000 a year is generally exempt from paying co-payments, while a couple over 65 and receiving OAS is not exempt?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, the honourable member, I am sure, has explained to that constituent that his party caucus supported that recommendation in October—

Mr. Wildman: No, no.

Mr. Cassidy: It is another distortion.

Mr. Warner: Stop distorting things.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am sure the member has also explained that at no point when the report was considered in this House or in the committee did they protest.

Mr. Cassidy: You are going to get Bette Stephenson's reputation.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think the member will know that in arriving at the details of the co-payment we have been able, I think by and large, to avoid the kind of horror stories which the honourable member tried to describe. For instance, we have not, unlike other jurisdictions, included at any point in the calculations a consideration of the assets of the individual patient. So the home would not, in fact, be counted against the ability of that individual to pay. It would be counted strictly on the question of their pensions.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister saying that if indeed they are pensioners, they are treated differently than if they were married and under

65 and earning less than \$15,000? If that is what he is saying, can he explain how this person is supposed to pay the \$9.80 and still maintain her home when her income is only her pension and her husband's pension?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The material was considered by the select committee and by the other bodies which made this recommendation to us—the senior citizens' advisory council, the Taylor committee and the various other associations. They made that recommendation based on the principle that an individual is, at that time, receiving income to support him in the community. Inasmuch as he is not in the community, the principle is that that money should be applied against his support where he is—namely, in this case a chronic-care facility, or for that matter in a nursing home perhaps, or a home for the aged or whatever.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: It would appear that in this chronic-care charge there are a number of people who are in wheelchairs, who are chronically confined to chronic-care hospitals but who are still alert in mind and relatively young in age—still, in fact, in a position where they should be able, and ought, to participate in the community from time to time, go downtown, shop, go to a play.

Given that it costs about \$50 or more just to get transportation for these wheelchair patients to go downtown, can the minister make some provision so that they are not reduced to \$45 a month, which is what you are now allowing; so that the meagre alimony allowances or meagre pensions—which they may have built up during their years of employment—are not going to be taken away from them, thus imprisoning them in the chronic-care hospital. For those of active mind who need to participate in the community, will the minister try to make some special arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will take a look at that and see if something can be done.

GRAND RIVER FLOODING

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I might say to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), who asked me a supplementary question on Friday I guess, that I did get some further information over the phone this morning from the general manager of the Grand River Conservation Authority regarding dynamiting. The full report is coming here by land, sea or air and has not yet arrived.

Mr. Peterson: It is coming by water, that is why.

Hon. Mr. Auld: "Sea," I said. Sometimes the mail takes a long time and you wonder whether it comes via the Suez or the Panama Canal.

The Grand River Conservation Authority—this deals with the area between Paris and Brantford—has no written policy on dynamiting to relieve ice jams. But it has been the practice of the former commission, and the present authority, not to dynamite ice jams but to eliminate their formation by flow regulation in the Grand River within the limits of the capacity of the existing reservoirs.

This latter method has proved to be successful. Dynamiting has been carried out by local authorities with or, more often, without the knowledge of the conservation authority. A personal inspection was carried out by the assistant general manager on January 11, and in a meeting with town officials he advised against dynamiting.

On March 5 town officials attempted to secure an expert on dynamiting the ice jam without success. In a meeting between town and conservation authority officials all agreed it was too dangerous to attempt dynamiting because of the potential for damage and possible loss of life.

The jam partially broke up of its own accord as a result of high river flow.

Mr. Makarchuk: In view of the fact the conservation authorities are dependent upon provincial funding for channel improvements and dike construction and repairs, will the minister ensure the conservation authorities have adequate funding to build the channels and the dikes they know they require now and therefore prevent these incidents from recurring in the future?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am afraid I couldn't give such blanket assurance. The honourable member—

Mr. Makarchuk: You are going to continue with a flood a year.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As the honourable member is aware, the conservation authorities were primarily set up some years ago to deal—

Mr. McClellan: Minister of natural disasters.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's right. And we all know they have to be repaired. And they've got the plans and the studies and everything.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question has been asked.

Mr. Peterson: Will you provide money to build an ark?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —with flooding and, in some cases, drought problems—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you part of the conservative or liberal wing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —to regulate, within human capability, the water levels in the watersheds of the province. The conservation authorities and the local municipalities that put up varying percentages of the funds—

Mr. Makarchuk: They would be happy to do it, providing you put up your per cent.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —may decide, in their own judgement, generally speaking, the priorities of that authority.

Mr. Makarchuk: The priorities are floods now, repairs later.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will undertake to pursue the matter of flood control again with the Grand River authority—

Mr. Warner: You guys are one big ice jam.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and I would say we will certainly be pursuing the matter of federal reparticipation in the matter along the lower Thames.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is one every four years you are having now.

Mr. Speaker: It's my understanding that the Minister of Energy happens to be the same person who has the answer to a question previously asked.

Mr. Sargent: This time take the marbles out of your mouth.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if he can understand the minister—is there something the matter with the sound system or something more seriously and personally wrong with me? I cannot understand him.

An hon. member: Half the time he doesn't know what he's saying either.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I sometimes need it myself, Mr. Speaker, as some people have suspected for some time.

Mr. McClellan: Try reading it upside down.

HYDRO LOAD FORECASTS

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have an answer to a question posed by the member for Ottawa Centre last Friday.

The question was: "Does the minister, therefore, reject the Ministry of Energy forecast which indicates very clearly that if oil and gas supplies are uncertain that will, in fact, lower the rate of growth for electricity demand to a rate even lower than the ministry already forecasts?"

The ministry's energy demand model was developed to help assess how long-term energy demand would be affected by changes in population, economic conditions, technology, or governmental policy. The ministry

used the model for three scenarios—current trends, low energy use, uncertain oil and gas—which were developed to assess the potential for energy conservation and substitution—

Mr. Sargent: Throw in a couple of stories.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and not to provide a peak electrical load forecast as the basis for planning Ontario Hydro's generation program.

Mr. Makarchuk: Let us know when you get to the punch line.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As the honourable members are aware, the ministry recently presented forecasts for those three scenarios to the select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs. The scenario referred to as current trends, forecasts annual growth in electrical energy demand as 3.7 per cent from 1976 to 1985. "The uncertain oil and gas scenario" referred to by the honourable member—

Mr. Martel: I surrender.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —was only one-twentieth of one per cent lower to 1985 and it was based on a stringent energy conservation assumption. This scenario did not assume actual shortages of oil or gas which could have significant effects on electricity demand. For the comparable period, the same 1976-85 period, Ontario Hydro's 1979 forecast of peak electricity demand indicates an annual growth of 4.1 per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Time, Mr. Speaker. Time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Taking into account the different approaches and purposes they are, in fact, quite close.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister saying that in fact the Ministry of Energy forecast is a nice idea which gives some general indications but is not to be relied on? Because if that's the case, why did they do it at all; and will we ever get some accurate forecasts of future energy requirements from the Ministry of Energy which can be used in order to give clear indications of government policy to Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really think I covered that when I said there were three different scenarios looking at three different possibilities.

Mr. Kerrio: Take your pick.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We were looking at different sets of circumstances—

Mr. Kerrio: Oh, yes. They pump in circumstances like you wouldn't believe.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and using different assumptions, as I said the other day; some 1,500 to 2,000 assumptions.

Mr. Kerrio: Half are high and half are low. You're laughing.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I just want to repeat that this was not second-guessing Hydro; we were looking at quite different possibilities.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, the member for Halton-Burlington.

Mr. J. Reed: A point of clarification, Mr. Speaker: The minister used the figure 4.1 per cent, and I believe that the Hydro load forecast, if I remember correctly, was 4.7 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, for the period from 1976 to 1985, Hydro was looking at a longer period, as I recall.

NIAGARA RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if he is aware of the details in the planning of a dump site for Lewiston, New York, that would add poisons to the Niagara River including many dangerous chemicals—I won't list them here. I wonder if the minister is aware that the mayor himself, the mayor of Niagara-on-the-Lake and many citizens on the American and Canadian sides are most concerned. I wonder what involvement the minister has with the very, very dangerous situation which would exist if they put in place this plan to pump an additional two million gallons into the lower Niagara River, actually above the intake of Niagara-on-the-Lake. Presumably, if that were to happen, the member from there might have to get bottled water.

Mr. Makarchuk: They would probably bottle it and sell it as Ontario wine.

Mr. Speaker: That was directed to the Minister of the Environment, you said?

Mr. Kerrio: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: But you weren't looking at him.

Mr. Kerrio: No. I never do.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my hair cut on the weekend and I had a shower this morning; I really don't understand. In that case, I should address the member for Humber or somebody down here in reply.

Mr. Sweeney: It's called discrimination.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Yes, we are aware of that situation, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the member let me say that we are very interested. There are a few mistakes that the member over there has made—wherever he is. Oh, I'm sorry, there he is.

May I be serious on this item, because it is one of importance? I would like to back up just a little bit. The member used

a couple of words that I think I would have to ask him to reconsider a little bit. They are treated wastes. That's awfully important: they are treated wastes.

Mr. Kerrio: Poorly treated, like the Love Canal. Questionably treated.

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Secondly, those treated wastes have been analysed. Before the company is allowed to discharge them into the stream, they will receive approvals. So we have a treated waste that will be analysed and then permission given. It will not be permitted to go into the waters until those permissions have been granted. I think that is awfully important.

Thirdly, we are looking at specific limits for certain chemicals. In other words, we will do a one-by-one analysis to make sure. We are in close contact with officials from New York State. I can assure the member we will be very sure that we do not negotiate away any of his health or the health of the citizens. Let me put that clearly on the line. We will be closely monitoring what is being done and we will assure him we will not tolerate anything but treated and analysed waste going into our water.

Mr. Kerrio: I certainly realize that the affluent is what is being discharged, but what we are talking about—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not the affluent, it is the effluent.

Mr. Kerrio: The water that runs out after it has been treated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's what you still are. You are affluent.

Mr. McClellan: He's always been a little guy.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary question?

Mr. Kerrio: It is very difficult with all the interjections over there. The concern that I have is that while the treated waste—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are just all jealous over here at your affluence.

Mr. Martel: That is where some of them belong.

Mr. Kerrio: I will start over again. Does the minister realize that 10 to 20 times more than the accepted levels of chemicals would go into the water? What we are concerned about are the accepted levels of the chemicals entering the water. The problem is the minister is going to consider just isolated areas, but if he keeps adding them together—

Mr. MacDonald: The water will sink.

Mr. Kerrio: —he has to realize that only 25 years ago there was commercial fishing in the Niagara River but it doesn't exist any longer because every one of them has been subjected to minimal—

Mr. MacDonald: You could walk on the water.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There has been no question so far.

Mr. Kerrio: The question then is—

Mr. Speaker: You had your opportunity.

Mr. Kerrio: The question is serious.

Mr. Ashe: Sit down.

CANADA METAL COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. I refer to the lead levels of Canada Metal's plant on Eastern Avenue in Riverdale riding, as reported in the ministry's reports for January and February and as reported in the *Globe and Mail* last Friday. My question is probably in four parts:

1. What lead level readings has the minister in his March report with respect to Canada Metal?

2. Why is there such a long delay, of anywhere from four to six months before his reports are issued with respect to the lead level readings?

3. What steps is the minister taking to enforce his standards or to penalize the company for having breached those standards as a result of the information shown in his reports?

4. What, in the minister's direct assessment and judgement is the continuing health hazard in Riverdale riding which has existed for so long about this plant?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I'll have to take some of that and reply to the member because part of the question, or one part at least, was certainly very specific. I'll try to be specific in reply.

The levels vary a great deal, as I'm sure the member is well aware. At the moment, we're convinced that the high levels—or the higher than desirable levels—are pretty well confined to the industrial park. So, regarding the member's question relative to the residents: I think we can assure him that the residents are in no hazard whatsoever. Very seldom is the reading in the residential portion of Riverdale riding at any level that would cause concern.

However, the level in the industrial park is an equal concern, so I'm not suggesting to the member that we're not concerned about that part of it.

We're finding that a good deal of the problem is in the operation of the plant and our staff is meeting with the company today, as a matter of fact. I guess the meeting's going on right now.

We met with them some time ago and we have had a good deal of discussion with the plant operators. We feel that a lot of it is in the operation of the plant itself. So we're meeting today to try to come to a firmer position with the company regarding better operation of their plant. I'll be glad to report the outcome of that meeting—plus the information that I should give you, as part of the question that I have not responded to—in the next day or two.

Mr. Renwick: I have a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that a block meeting of residents was held with a representative of his ministry on December 12, at which the latest information available to that meeting were the readings in April and May of last year? Is he aware that at that meeting there was assurance given that, in fact, the matter was under control, and yet the ministry's January and February reports indicate that the standard of five was exceeded at least eight times and was over the maximum of eight in those readings that are referred to in those reports?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think the problem is, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the member, that the necessary controls are there.

In theory, there should be no problem, but that doesn't prove to be the case, so again it makes what I was saying earlier true: that the problem is not with the equipment itself but how it is operating. Therefore, I think it was reasonable to say it's under control. It should be under control because the necessary equipment to do so is there, but making sure that there are no levels exceeding our standards is proving to be somewhat difficult.

We are meeting again—and I underline the word again—with the company and I will report on that. I will take what the member says very much to our concern because we share that concern that the operation of that plant should guarantee that we don't have the ups and downs of the levels that we have been experiencing.

TURKEY QUOTAS

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Further to my representations on behalf of some of the farmers in my area to the minister, and I suppose it reflects concern from other farmers throughout the province, farmers who have been precluded from

buying small numbers of turkey poults for their own use or for family use, prohibited by the turkey marketing board, could the minister bring us up to date on the situation as to how it stands at the present time?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe this was brought to my attention and I want to thank the honourable member and some of the other members who have brought it to my attention.

An hon. member: There are some real turkeys over there.

Hon. W. Newman: Keep it up.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Sounds like another resources answer.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the turkey marketing board met last Thursday I believe, or Friday—I can't remember which—and made a ruling that they will give a free quota of 25 birds to any individual farmer in the province of Ontario who would like to raise birds. The Farm Products Marketing Board has declined that recommendation of the turkey board and will be back to the turkey board. It's not that they don't want a farmer to raise a few turkeys in his own yard, but there is some doubt about whether he should have to have a permit of any kind if he only wants to raise them for his home use.

Mr. Nixon: That's what happens with Tories.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

PETITION

CO-PAYMENT FEES

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I would like to present today with the names of nearly 6,000 people from Windsor—5,942 to be exact—who oppose the \$9.80 deterrent fee to chronic care patients. I think it's fair to say that the people of Windsor, through this petition, are saying to the government that they do not want a deterrent fee. They want universal accessibility to our health care system and a chronic home care program.

Mr. Wildman: We have never supported senior citizens losing their homes.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE MEETING

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing general government committee be authorized to meet concurrently with the House this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that on Thursday, March 15, the House will adjourn at 6 p.m. and stand adjourned until 2 p.m., Tuesday, March 27.

Motion agreed to.

[3:15]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

PORTUGUESE CLUB OF LONDON INCORPORATED ACT

Mr. Peterson moved first reading of Bill Pr2, An Act to revive the Portuguese Club of London Incorporated.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Nixon: You're losing the Portuguese vote.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S THEATRE ACT

Mrs. Campbell moved first reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Young People's Theatre.

Motion agreed to.

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill 10, An Act to Relieve Persons from Liability in respect of Voluntary Emergency, Medical and First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency, first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Watson moved that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege for me to have the opportunity

of moving this speech from the throne of this third session of the 31st Parliament.

I would first, at the outset, like to say a word on behalf of all the members of the House in expressing appreciation to the Lieutenant Governor's gracious acceptance of a year's extension of her term. The people of Ontario have derived substantial benefits from her happy and compassionate dedication to her responsibilities and we are grateful for her continuing efforts on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a sincere word of appreciation to you as Speaker of this House, for the efficient and competent manner in which the role has been carried out and for your personal guidance and encouragement to one who is a newly elected member of this Legislature.

The speech from the throne represents in broad terms the philosophy which this government, of which I am pleased to be a part, plans to follow during the coming session. Although I am a relative rookie to this Legislature, I am indeed pleased that I am able to accept and promote the philosophy carried out in the presentation made to us on Tuesday last.

I am particularly pleased to endorse the thoughts regarding Canadian unity and the part that Ontario will be playing in this unfolding development. It has been a source of pride and encouragement to all the people of Ontario to have recently witnessed the excellent leadership provided by the Honourable William G. Davis, Premier of this province, with regard to Canadian unity and with regard to explaining the position of Ontario to our neighbours to the south.

There can surely be no disagreement in this House on this province's stand on Canadian unity and it is good that our government and our leader have taken a firm position on a crucial question of Canadian unity.

Mr. Haggerty: Thirty years too late.

Mr. Watson: I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the example set by the Premier of this province in the recent meetings where Canadian unity was being discussed serves only as an example of the leadership capabilities of the Premier.

I am aware that it was some 20 years ago that the present Premier had the honour of moving the speech from the throne. I am aware that our Premier must have had some of the same feelings that I have when I come to this Legislature, as he was elected to replace one T. L. Kennedy, who for many years was Minister of Agriculture in this province and was for a short period Premier.

Mr. Cureatz: A great man.

Mr. Watson: I can identify with that feeling because I have the pleasure of representing the riding of Chatham-Kent in this Legislature, which for 15 years was held by the Honourable Darcy McKeough whose ability and philosophy are well known to all members of this House.

I therefore deem it a great pleasure to represent the riding of Chatham-Kent in this Legislature, realizing that I have a large pair of shoes to fill, just as I know the Premier of this province must have felt when he came to this Legislature knowing that he had a large pair of shoes to fill. I am certainly both pleased and proud to be a member of the government of this side of the House and to be able to stand in this Legislature as part of the team under the capable leadership of Premier William Davis.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne not only represents the thoughts and philosophy of our Premier, but the various cabinet ministers who make up the present government. I should like to acknowledge the leadership given this province by the various ministers of this government and also to extend my sincere personal appreciation for the co-operation given to me over the past few months as I have become aware of the activities here at Queen's Park.

When I first spoke in this House last December I referred to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism slogan, "We treat you royally." I referred to that because of the fact that I felt the entire Legislature had given me that kind of treatment after having been elected here.

Mr. Haggerty: First time Royal Crown has been seen for a number of years.

Mr. Watson: I have not changed my opinion on that particular fact and perhaps it is somewhat of interest that I note that in the speech from the throne we are going to have phase two of "We treat you royally," and I hope that phase two can be extended to me in the coming months.

Mr. Haggerty: What happened to the trillium?

Mr. Wildman: Just ask Westinghouse.

Mr. Watson: I also would like to have it, as noted in the indication in the speech from the throne, that our tourist-oriented people can accept this spirit of goodwill and acceptance that I have experienced here.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we will be dealing during the coming session with both matters of economics and social services. It appears to me that at a time when we all concur that we are in need of restraint in government that we must strike a delicate

balance between those things which we might consider to be economic and those things which we might consider to be social.

It seems to me that common sense would tell us that to emphasize one without the other would be a mistake. We must also appreciate that all of these programs must be conducted within the overall general restraint program to which government is committed. Someone once said that money isn't everything, but it's away ahead of whatever is in second place, and I well realize that if we did not have any constraints on the budget expenditures it would be easier for everyone—

Mr. Nixon: Something else was on that list.

Mr. Watson: —to be a more popular politician in this province and in this country.

I am pleased that the government, as a matter of priority, will be taking specific measures to ensure the Ontario economy continues to expand in a positive and productive fashion. I represent an area of Ontario where this process has already begun. The initiative by this government to conclude the proposal whereby the Ford Motor Company located its new engine plant in southwestern Ontario is already paying off. Because the main Ford plant expansion is to be in Windsor, there have already been additional announcements by Ford for further expansion in the area of a casting plant.

I would like to point out that the second plant was located without any government assistance, and that there is little doubt that the location was decided by the fact the major plant was to be in Windsor. Similar examples in the economy can be cited throughout all of southwestern Ontario as suppliers to the automotive industry, both large and small, are thinking positively in terms of expansion and growth. This of course means growth of the economy in this province.

I was particularly pleased, in the speech from the throne, to see the apprenticeship and skilled trades programs were being revamped in the province. This development, to me, goes hand in hand with the encouragement for industries to locate in this province.

Mr. Haggerty: More talk, no action.

Mr. Watson: As a nation, we are told about the unemployed. As a politician in southwestern Ontario, I am told about the need for skilled tradesmen.

Mr. Haggerty: All talk, no action.

Mr. Watson: I am therefore pleased the emphasis is to be placed on this type of program. It will lower our unemployment rate

in this province and in the country, and at the same time train people for jobs which will be available as our economy expands.

I would like to concur with the government in the speech from the throne when it refers to the efforts that are being made to have the federal-provincial programs renewed with regard to the ARDA and other similar programs. It is a fact in my riding that much of the land would be swamp and bullrushes if it were not for the drainage program and those kinds of projects.

Mr. Wildman: You have come out of the swamp.

Mr. Watson: Some of this land is in danger because the rebuilding of the dikes along the St. Clair, the Sydenham, and the Thames rivers has not been completed. In the township of Dover, which I represent, approximately 30,000 acres have to be pumped at the present time. When I left the riding of Chatham-Kent this morning, approximately 8,000 of those acres were covered with water. Part of the blame for this has to be attached to the fact that the diking project was not completed. We are told it is not going to be completed because the federal government has seen fit not to provide enough funds.

Mr. Wildman: That's restraint for you.

Mr. Watson: The flooding itself was very extensive. The flooding is the worst in the memories of many people who live in that area. I visited a house yesterday with at least five feet of water in it, up to the middle of the windows.

The cattle—at one farm it is difficult to get an accurate assessment of how many have died. I circled the area in the Ontario Provincial Police helicopter on Saturday. They have a large pile of ensilage and the cattle were crowded onto the top of that as thick as they could be. You could just see the tops of the posts in the fence-line feeders.

We have had all kinds of estimates: it would appear that 70 to 100 cattle lost is the most realistic estimate that I have heard. To show how rumours move, I have heard all the way from 40 to 700 lost; I prefer to think in terms of 70 to 100. But they do have over 1,000 cattle in that particular feed lot.

Mr. Riddell: Is that the Bradley estate?

Mr. Watson: That is the Bradley establishment.

I think it is terrible that this sort of thing would happen in one's riding. We have to make the best of things. One thing it points out to the people in Ottawa undoubtedly is the fact that this diking project has to be

completed to prevent such things from happening again in the future.

As the member for Chatham-Kent, where the agricultural industry is so extremely important, I am pleased to endorse the policies outlined in the speech from the throne with regard to the promotion and eating of Ontario-grown food. Food prices are a topic for discussion in almost any group, and information to be provided to the consumers regarding food prices as outlined in the speech from the throne will be useful.

[3:30]

I think it should be pointed out to this assembly, and to the people of Ontario, that past programs of this government have been extremely useful in helping to maintain reasonable food prices. I am very sure there are those here, and certainly across Ontario, who consider beef prices much too high today. But I would like to point out there is no doubt in my mind that the price of beef would have been higher in Ontario today if it had not been for this government's cow-calf program back in 1975, 1976 and 1977.

This government had a program which allowed farmers to hang on, if I could use that expression, and protected them from the need to market their cows at that particular time. There is little doubt that because the price of beef at that time was ridiculously low farmers would have sold their cows and the steers and heifers that are presently coming to market would never have been born in this province. I am certainly well aware that the price of beef has gone up dramatically, but perhaps it is of some consolation to the consumer that the price would have been even higher if the government had not undertaken this cow-calf program in the past. I would hope that the examples set in the past will be continued in the future, as required by the situation.

I was also particularly pleased to note in the speech from the throne—and I would endorse them—the programs regarding the foodland guidelines, and as well an indication of a program for soil and water conservation. Perhaps it is a motherhood statement to say that we should be saving farm land. This statement can be interpreted in several ways. We can save farm land from urban encroachment, or we can save farm land from washing or blowing away.

I endorse the foodland guidelines which encourage the common sense use of land, which is our basic resource. I believe it would be a mistake to say that we should never take any farm land for other uses; but good planning can and will ensure that land that must be taken is put to its best use.

I could refer specifically to the problems in my immediate area. It doesn't matter which direction you go from Chatham or Wallaceburg, you are surrounded by excellent farm land in that area. It is, therefore, really not a viable argument to say that the lands on which cities must expand are the poor lands. We must, however, ensure that where annexation or industrial use of land does take place it is done in such a manner as to minimize the loss of our farm land in this province.

In a similar way, we know that land is being lost across this province by wind and by water erosion. The changing crop programs have had their economic benefit; but they are making our soil more prone to erosion from natural phenomena. I believe, therefore, that it is in the best interests of the agricultural community as a whole, in this province, to promote activities which would save our farm land; not only from urban encroachment where this is a problem in some cases, but in areas where soil is lost due to wind and water.

I believe that if the people of this province would think of our agricultural areas as a factory it might be put into some perspective for them. If we can think of each crop-producing acre—or hectare as some people now want to call it, and that's not a very popular term in the rural community—if we can think of each specific area as a factory we can have many points illustrated that were outlined in the speech from the throne.

There is a concern over the conservation of energies related to this factory, because this factory uses as a source of energy the sun; which was there yesterday, is there today and will be there tomorrow.

The process of producing food by means of this energy source is renewable and continuous from year to year. Contrary to many energy sources which are becoming depleted, our scientists, in co-operation with the agricultural community, are learning how to produce more food from an acre of land by means of this ultimate energy supplied by the sun. We do use some inputs—some help from commercial fertilizers, some machines to till the soil and the like—but I am pleased that reference was made in the speech from the throne to the fact that legislation would be considered to protect some of these very large investments in farm machinery which farmers must make by way of some kind of protection regarding warranties.

Our agricultural open-air factories in Ontario are very efficient. I like to think that these open-air factories in the riding of Chatham-Kent are the most effective and

efficient in Canada. I am pleased that the government of this province will be supporting the agricultural industry and I would hope that, by recognizing how important our green-acre factories are all across this province, due consideration will be given by all ministries whenever their programs touch this very basic and important industry.

We do appreciate the efforts of the conservation authorities—and I did mention the one locally this past weekend—but in particular I would mention the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority and the progress to date of the W. Darcy McKeough Dam, which will allow the town of Wallaceburg to breathe somewhat easier every time the river rises.

Mr. Nixon: I haven't heard those words in that order for a long time.

Mr. Wildman: Did you say "Damn Darcy McKeough"?

Mr. Watson: I said the Darcy McKeough Dam.

I am reminded at this point of the two fellows in Florida at this particular time of the year who were discussing how they were there. One fellow said to the other, "I'm here because I had a fire." The other fellow sat back and said, "I'm here because I had a flood." There was a long silence and finally the other chap came back and said, "Say, how do you have a flood?" Well, some of the projects that are going on down our way by way of the W. Darcy McKeough Dam will let the people in Wallaceburg breathe a little easier during flood seasons.

As one who came to this Legislature from the public service of Ontario, I was personally pleased with the reference in Her Honour's address to the fact that attention is to be given to the matter of public servants in this province who serve the public. It is and was my personal philosophy that when an individual is given a satisfactory explanation regarding any decision or policy, the individual will at least appreciate the public servant involved, even though the decision may not be entirely as the individual would have liked it.

It is when people do not have access to information or individuals who make decisions that the bond of trust which should exist between citizens of this province and the public servants of this province starts to break down. I therefore heartily support the intention of this government to foster programs which will encourage mutual trust between people and the government.

I was proud to be a civil servant in this province for 20 years, and I know that there are many others in the public sector who are

equally proud of their work and accomplishments in serving the government and serving the people. I therefore am convinced that programs to encourage trust between people and the government will be appreciated by those who are dedicated public servants in this province.

I would like at this time to refer specifically to the Ontario Provincial Police and their actions in my particular riding this past weekend. They came out as shining examples of public servants, in my opinion. They were there to do the helicopter lifts that were necessary. They were there with their boats late on Friday night—I was out where they were taking off from—prepared to go up and down the concession roads with the boats to take people out. They patrolled the area on a 24-hour basis to keep anybody out who had no business being there.

I would like it recorded that the people of Chatham-Kent, and in particular the people of Dover township who were affected, particularly appreciated the efforts of the Ontario Provincial Police in this disaster that we had.

I was particularly pleased to hear in the speech from the throne, and it was later outlined by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow), that because of the success of the special transit services for the physically disabled in five communities across Ontario that services are to be made permanent and introduced on a gradual basis to other communities without delay.

Chatham was one of the five communities in which the pilot project was based. It was well received and considered worthwhile in our community. It was a program which considers the special difficulties encountered by the physically handicapped or disabled people. It is particularly gratifying to know that it will become permanent.

While addressing this assembly today, I should like to issue to everyone an invitation to visit Kent county, including the riding of Chatham-Kent and the riding of Kent-Elgin. I hope the member for Kent-Elgin (Mr. McGuigan) is paying attention to this because I want to give him a little credit here. We want members to visit our riding between September 25 and September 29, 1979, when Kent county is hosting the International Ploughing Match and farm machinery show. If they accept my invitation, they will be among approximately a quarter of a million visitors who will be visiting Kent county this September.

Those in this assembly who represent urban areas will have an opportunity to see

the best farms in Canada first-hand. They will have an opportunity to see 130 acres of tented city with the latest in farm equipment on display. Farming has become an extremely big business. This event will be an event where all members can see the tremendous equipment that is used on our farms today. It has been 60 years since the International Ploughing Match was in Kent county.

With regard to the event, I have compared Kent county to the expectant mother. Kent county is an expectant mother. There were a few problems in the conception of this particular thing. There was a bit of morning sickness but that is all over. The thing is now organized. There will likely be a few last-minute labour pains. I want to tell members that when the 1979 International Ploughing Match is born in Kent county on September 25, 1979, it is going to be the biggest and best baby that was ever produced in Kent county. It's going to be perfect in every way. All the parents, grandparents, cousins and anybody else who had anything to do with the bringing of this baby to Kent county are going to be awfully anxious to show it off. Therefore, members are invited to come to Kent county in southwestern Ontario and see our crops at their best.

The symbol for the Kent county International Ploughing Match this year is the To-Be Co-Be, which is a figure that has a tomato head, a chest of beef, a body of corn and feet of beans. I want to assure members those are only four of the products produced in Kent county for which we are known across this country. I want to assure them also that the International Ploughing Match this year is the outstanding outdoor farm equipment show in Canada. I do hope they will come and see us at that particular time.

I think it worthwhile to point out at this time that the city of Chatham has initiated a proposal under the downtown revitalization program that could serve as a shining example for downtown redevelopment across Ontario. The proposal includes the development of a nine-acre block of land in the downtown core of the city of Chatham. It is my hope that this government, through the Ministry of Housing and the downtown revitalization program, will see fit to lend funds to the city of Chatham under this program so that this project can be undertaken.

I would like to point out that the city of Chatham has already spent over \$6 million without special government assistance on rebuilding its downtown section by way of a new civic centre and by way of an entirely

renovated King Street, which is the main street in Chatham. The inclusion of the city of Chatham in the downtown redevelopment program will certainly enhance the downtown area of our city and serve as an example to other centres as to what can be done with the downtown area of a community.

The riding of Chatham-Kent has a great deal to offer for both work and pleasure. I mentioned earlier the spirit of optimism in our industrial community which prevails in my particular riding. Those who want to enjoy recreation might appreciate the duck hunting or ice fishing that Lake St. Clair is noted for. Several of our tourist establishments, such as the Wheels Inn in Chatham or the Oaks Inn in Wallaceburg, have special package programs for those who want to come and enjoy the recreational facilities that are available in our area.

As one drives through our rich farm land one cannot help but be impressed with the wall-to-wall crops that exist in our particular area, the ones that are so neatly tended and well produced. I am particularly proud to represent the citizens of the riding of Chatham-Kent in this Legislature and have been equally pleased and proud to be the mover of the speech from the throne.

[3:45]

In summary, I would like to say that the speech from the throne has many attributes with which I can identify. There is an element of share. This element of share, to me, means that we are going to give attention and resources to both economic matters and social problems.

There is an element of care. The matters discussed in Her Honour's speech from the throne indicate this government's concern for many matters, and particularly for those who are less fortunate than some of us who are able to operate on our own.

I also note with interest that there is an element of being fair—that's spelled f-a-i-r not f-a-r-e, by the way.

In an overall economic climate, or an overall climate where this government will, and is continuing, to practice restraint involving the use of public funds, there must be some type of rationing. The attribute of being fair expressed in this address will, therefore, make the proposals acceptable to the people of this province, and therefore I'm sure acceptable to the members of this Legislature.

In these elements of share, of care and of being fair, Her Honour's address is made acceptable to me, and I'm sure to the Legislature. I hope the legislation resulting from the ideas expressed in this speech from the

throne will benefit the people of this province. Thank you.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege for me to second the motion that a humble address be presented to Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

I rise at this time, in this House, with mixed feelings. Any pride or personal satisfaction or excitement is tempered substantially by the set of tragic and unfortunate circumstances that led to a by-election in Sault Ste. Marie through the untimely passing of an associate of mine, and a colleague of yours, who graced this Legislative Assembly and the government of this province with such a high measure of dedication, competency and wit.

I am sure I will find no dissenters when I refer to his distinguished career in public service, as first an alderman and then mayor of Sault Ste. Marie; and then his tenure as a member of this House, as a backbencher, a parliamentary assistant and the holder of three different portfolios. The Honourable John Rhodes had far too much to offer his riding, this province and this country when he was so suddenly taken from us.

He had maintained an excellent tradition of representation of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie established by Arthur Wishart, a former Attorney General of this government, and his predecessor as the member for Sault Ste. Marie the late Harry Lyons; I follow in their footsteps with a great deal of humility.

As the late Mr. Rhodes held this House, its traditions, its responsibilities and its members on both sides with great respect, I do likewise. I have observed the mechanisms of government, and both the achievements and the frustrations of this House, for many years. I have held in awe those men, regardless of their party affiliation, who seek public office and who, if successful, work diligently, usually at considerable personal sacrifice, to maintain the strength and character of a parliamentary system that is the equal of any in the world today.

I am reminded of the words of the late Indian leader Gandhi, who once stated that there are seven great sins existing in the world today: wealth without work; pleasure without conscience; knowledge without character; commerce without morality; science without humanity; worship without sacrifice; and politics without principle.

I understand that it is traditional for a member in his maiden appearance before this House to refer to his home riding. I will attempt to be brief, although there is much of a positive nature that could be said for the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

For those who have never been to our city and might think that we are far removed from the city of Toronto, let me point out that we are only 55 minutes away by air and are serviced by four flights daily each way. We are actually south of many areas in the United States.

US Interstate Highway 75 begins at the south end of the International Bridge at Sault Ste. Marie, and we can travel to Windsor, Ontario, over a four-lane express highway and nary a stop light along the way, in a trip normally no longer than five hours.

We are blessed with a community of many cultures, a city surrounded by the finest countryside and the clearest waters that one could hope to find anywhere in this great country today; and a city that has progressed so rapidly and has made so many exciting improvements, thanks to a municipal government and administration that has been far-sighted and the assistance of senior levels of government. Our waterfront on historic St. Mary's River has been almost completely reclaimed from the docks, oil tanks and marine operations that once occupied it. It now serves as the site for one of the finest civic centres in the country, a magnificent library; and a blend of commercial development, high-rise office accommodation, residential and senior citizen housing and a modern hotel.

We are blessed with an outstanding educational system from kindergarten throughout some of the finest secondary schools in the province, culminating in a highly successful community college and a struggling but productive university college. In fact, two distinguished members of this House, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) and the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman), taught in our secondary school systems.

Mr. Nixon: For \$2,800 a year.

Mr. Turner: You were overpaid and underworked.

Hon. W. Newman: How much did you pay in taxes?

Mr. Ramsay: Recreational facilities, both natural and constructed, are the envy of any city our size in the province. Our little theatre groups, our musical comedy guilds, our operetta and opera societies and our art galleries, all maintain a level of excellence that consistently results in recognition across this country.

We are blessed with a buoyant economy, largely attributable to the existence of one of the world's most efficient steel mills, the Algoma Steel Corporation Limited, which in turn is indebted to some of the most

productive workers on the North American continent. Since 1973 Algoma has spent \$325 million on expansion and modernization. In addition, \$25 million has been spent in the same period of time on air and water quality control. Algoma Steel has continually turned its profits back into its operations and has recently announced expansion and modernization programs to take place in the next relatively short period of time that will total over \$125 million.

While Ontario Hydro provides power to the city of Toronto at \$26 per thousand kilowatts per month—as compared to New York at \$82, Fredericton at \$57, Vancouver at \$33 and Detroit at \$41—Sault Ste. Marie gets its power even more cheaply thanks to the **Great Lakes Power Corporation Limited**, which will commence building a new hydraulic power plant within our city limits next month at a cost of close to \$100 million. That plant will assure the industrial stability of our city.

The Algoma Central Railway, with its headquarters in Sault Ste. Marie, has over the past few years completely diversified what was once almost exclusively a rail operation. They now own the second largest fleet of self-unloaders on the Great Lakes. They own a dry dock in Collingwood, a trucking company in southwestern Ontario and a helicopter company in Ottawa. They have redeveloped many of our waterfront buildings and properties: they operate a large and modern shopping mall, a hotel, office towers and a senior citizens' complex. They are now into the same type of planned development in Elliot Lake.

With a devalued dollar, the Sault Ste. Marie plant of the Abitibi Paper Company and the Sault Ste. Marie plant of Weyerhaeuser Limited are enjoying prosperous times, but this does not obscure the fact that Abitibi in particular is operating with aged facilities. Both companies have spent considerable sums of money as their share in maintaining the environmental benefits of our area.

We are a closely knit community and we look after our own. For example, the United Way campaign is one of the most successful, percentage-wise and per capita, on the North American continent, and has been consistently so for years. Fund-raising campaigns for hospitals, YMCAs, churches and other important community amenities almost without exception reach and exceed their targets.

I would like to take just a few moments and share with members information on a

rather important natural resource our area has. It is not a secondary industry nor a primary industry. It doesn't help with our tax assessment, but we can derive a great deal of pride from it. What I am talking about is people, people who were born or raised in Sault Ste. Marie and have gone on to fame provincially, nationally and internationally.

The list is endless but I will try to point out just a very few. In the field of business and industry, Laurence Lamb is the president and general manager of Steel Rock Iron Mines at Atikokan. Jack Keith is a former president of Imperial Tobacco Limited. The late Leonard Walker was president and chief executive officer of the Bank of Montreal. Tom Rahilly is the president and chief executive officer of National Steel Car Corporation in Hamilton. Jim Hull is vice-president of manufacturing of the Litton Medical System in Chicago.

Malcolm Hamilton is a former chairman and president of Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Company. Gino Francolini is the president of Livingston Industries Limited and a director of several companies, including Air Canada. Ron Lively is the president of the Elite Life Insurance Company, with head offices in Vancouver. Right in Sault Ste. Marie, Peter Nixon, whose father served with distinction for 26 years as the Liberal member in the federal House, is group vice-president of manufacturing and mining at Algoma Steel. Carson Weeks is senior vice-president of the same company. Jack Barber has recently retired as vice-chairman and vice-president of Algoma Steel.

Simpson Hollingsworth is chairman of the board and former president of the largest lumber co-op in Canada, Allont of Canada Limited.

In the field of art, Ken Danby, is renowned around the world and many other artists and craftsmen have won respect and recognition of their work, such as Jean Burke, Bob Carmichael, Ken Bradford and Ken McDougall.

Bill Mahoney is the former long-time Canadian president of United Steelworkers of America. Jack O'Driscoll is an Ontario Supreme Court Justice. Dr. Norman Bethune achieved prominence in the Spanish Civil War as a pioneer in battlefield transfusion techniques and is revered by the Chinese nation as the doctor saint of their revolution.

Ron Ianni is dean of law at the University of Windsor. David Johnston, a former All-American, in hockey at Harvard University, is the dean of law at Western and this fall will take over the responsibilities of principal

and vice-chancellor at McGill University and he has yet to reach his 37th birthday.

Dr. Temple Kingston is the principal of Canterbury College in Windsor. Alfred Eddy is president of the bar association in New Brunswick. Wilfred Greaves is a former Canadian consul-general in New York City. Abe Rosenthal is the editor of the prestigious New York Times. His older sister is the senior editor of one of the Sunday supplements of the same newspaper.

Fred Rounthwaite was the architect who designed the new CNE stadium, Don Sims is chairman of the Ontario censor board. Bruce Smith, who retired to all sorts of accolades a month or so ago here in Toronto from the CBC is another Sault boy.

Gary Buck was named the top country music star in Canada in 1975. Donna Ramsay—regrettably, from my point of view, no relation—is a household word in country music circles and a star of the Tommy Hunter Show.

Eric Wild is a director of the CBC program Hymn Sing and conductor of various professional music groups in Winnipeg, including the Winnipeg Symphony. Doreen Hume is one renowned as a singer in both Canada and England. Sister Barbara Ianni is a member of the Toronto Opera Society.

The late Harry Hamilton, as the Liberal member of Parliament from Sault Ste. Marie, responded to the throne speech with the September 1939 resolution that Canada declare war on Germany.

C. T. Murphy is a past president of the North Atlantic Assembly. Gordon Cunningham is a past president of the Ontario Hospital Association, currently president of the Ontario Cancer Treatment Research Foundation and a director of Princess Margaret Hospital.

Charles Cliffe is the campaign chairman for the Ontario division of the Canadian Cancer Society. Stan Kurisko is past president of the Ontario Society for the Mentally Retarded. Dr. Ken Miller is vice-president of the National Council of YMCAs and Reverend Clifton McKay is a former moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.

No brother combination in any sport in the history of the world has captured more honours than Tony and Phil Esposito.

The list of local boys who starred in the NHL is long and impressive: Jerry Korab, Lou Nanne, Gene Ubriaco, Matt Ravlich, Don Grosso, Marty Pavelich, Bill Coutu, Babe Donnelly, Bill Phillips, Ivan Boldirev, Chico and Wayne Maki, Joe Klukay. In fact, Lou Nanne is now the general manager of the Minnesota North Stars.

[4:00]

Joe Zaharko was one of the greatest badminton players in North America. Alex Denman was the only two-time winner of the Jeff Russel trophy in the eastern conference of the Canadian football championships. Mike Novick, Junior, is one of the finest harness racing drivers in the United States. Benita Rope was the coach of the Canadian gymnastic team in the recent Commonwealth Games.

Morley Torgov wrote a book about Sault Ste. Marie a few years ago, and he won the Stephen Leacock award for humour. Chapters of the book have since been adapted for television. The book's title, *A Good Place to Come From*, sums up my feelings completely about Sault Ste. Marie.

While I am proud of Sault Ste. Marie, and while I extol its successes and its features and virtues, I also have to admit to many worries about the community in particular and northern Ontario in general. We truly enjoy the good life in Sault Ste. Marie, but there are areas less fortunate than ours in northern Ontario; there are deficiencies and serious concerns that have to be considered by the members of this House.

Important areas that have to be continually reviewed and assessed include the following:

1. The establishment of secondary industry;
2. The development of natural resources;
3. The further processing of natural resources;
4. Realistic transportation policies;
5. Greater input into decision-making at the provincial level by northern Ontario people and, conversely, less interference in northern Ontario affairs by pressure groups and individuals resident outside of northern Ontario;
6. We require a study of total government receipts from all sources in northern Ontario and a study of total government expenditures in northern Ontario in relation to southern Ontario revenues and expenditures;
7. We have to look at agriculture; do we continue, discontinue or specialize, and in what areas, to serve our markets?
8. We have to improve the ratio of doctors and dentists in northern Ontario;
9. We have to concern ourselves about the exodus of university-trained people from northern Ontario because of the lack of job opportunities;
10. We have to worry ourselves about the problems of skilled and unskilled help for remote areas; and

11. We have to worry ourselves about the enlargement of cultural opportunities in northern Ontario.

I would go back to secondary industry for a moment. I do not know of any item which is discussed more, demanded more or suggested as the complete solution for all the problems for northern Ontario. Every city, town and village wants secondary industry. There are major criteria, though, that we have to look at if we are realistic, and we have to ask these questions:

Is there a major industry present or close by? If so, can it be enlarged or extended or further manufacture existing products? Can byproducts of such industry be further processed to provide additional business and job opportunities?

Can secondary industry be developed, making use of primary products manufactured in northern Ontario?

Can completely new products be developed that are not now available in necessary quantities for present markets?

Can we manufacture a percentage of articles of high value and little weight to overcome the problems of rate charges?

We all have to be concerned about the further development of natural resources. Many of our communities in northern Ontario are based on resource industries to provide a livelihood for the people living nearby. The pulp and paper industry is one example of an industry that provides jobs for dozens of small communities in northern Ontario, but it is an industry with antiquated plants. While they are benefiting now by the devalued dollar, in normal times they are no longer competitive.

While I endorse completely the philosophy of proper environment, is it right that people who reside in Toronto, and who have never been north of Orillia, make the decisions as to whether a town in northern Ontario is going to disappear because of excessive environmental standards?

Right now, many of the industries and mines resident in northern Ontario are spending enormous amounts for developments in other jurisdictions because it is not as viable a proposition to extend operations here. Algoma Steel is investing in an iron ore mine in Michigan. Abitibi is investing in plants in the United States. Inco, as we all know, is investing in Guatemala and overseas.

Mr. Philip: Thanks to this government they are.

Mr. Havrot: That's an idiotic statement.

Mr. Ramsay: Let us remember that the majority of markets for our products are out-

side the province. If southern Ontario were taking all of our products, then they should have a large say. However, that's not the case.

To provide more jobs and opportunities for job improvement, we have to demand extension of and more enlightened public policies conducive to the further processing of the products of our natural resource industries. The first consideration should be development of public policies which give first priority to the benefits to be obtained by the people in the area of the resource. In many cases in the past the primary consideration, and sometimes the only consideration, was how much tax will we or can we as a province receive. Government has to give first consideration to people most directly affected and then work towards policies which will encourage further processing.

We have to concern ourselves about transportation policies. Rates in Ontario are second only to Quebec as the highest in Canada. That's a tremendously serious problem to us in the north because of our distance from the primary markets.

I was not amused at all to learn of the petition presented by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Blundy) requesting a subsidized motor vehicle licence fee of \$10 similar to that now enjoyed by the residents in northern Ontario. We pay more for our vehicles to begin with; our gasoline costs are higher; our maintenance and parts costs are higher; and we are confronted with the need for such accessories as snow tires. The \$10 licence fee which we enjoy is small compensation indeed for the substantially higher cost of operating a motor vehicle in northern Ontario as compared to southern Ontario. I can't help wondering whether or not this petition represents a new policy of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Warner: Check in tomorrow.

Mr. Ramsay: Northern Ontario has only 15 members in the Legislature out of a total of 125, yet we have over 80 per cent of the area of this province. As individuals and groups, we in northern Ontario have to start asserting our views, requesting that they be considered and if necessary demanding it. We have a responsibility in northern Ontario, in concert with government, to have our area develop at a rate where young people will at least have a choice of where they wish to work.

Having enunciated these concerns, I must indicate a sense of encouragement in listening to and studying the throne speech, by the establishment of an employment development fund, the monitoring of shifting of

economic priorities and the co-ordination of job creation programs. All of these can only help the north.

Further, the acknowledgement that the present educational structure does not meet fully today's needs for highly skilled persons in the manufacturing and service industries and the implementation of new emphasis on these problems, including the new role of the Minister of Labour, is also most encouraging.

Coming from a labour-oriented market, I am pleased to note the proposed amendments to the Labour Relations Act designed to reduce the cost of arbitration, to provide third party assistance in resolving grievances prior to arbitration and generally to enable the process to be carried out in the fairest and best possible manner.

I was happy to learn that tourism, which is invaluable to northern Ontario and which experienced a 16 per cent growth in revenue last year, is to receive renewed emphasis by the government in 1979. That can only provide great assistance to the north.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services, together with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications have indicated in the throne speech they will take steps to make permanent a pilot project that has been providing special transportation services for the physically disabled in five communities. One of those pilot communities is Sault Ste. Marie and I am delighted to note the continuance of these programs.

The consideration of a local services board act to address the needs of communities in northern Ontario that lack municipal organization is perhaps long overdue.

I was pleased to note the Ministry of Northern Affairs will seek ways to provide a greater range of television services for remote areas in northern Ontario. This has no bearing whatsoever on my riding, in that we enjoy television services as diversified as any in southern Ontario. However, I have been working personally for several years in concert with the late John Rhodes, and the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) who has also worked diligently in this respect, and with the Minister of Northern Affairs and with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, as well as local town councils, in a continuing effort to resolve the problems of inadequate and unreliable television service in remote areas in northern Ontario.

These are just a few examples of positive measures relative to northern Ontario that have been revealed in the Speech from the Throne. There are many others, but time does not permit me the opportunity to review

them or to go into any detail on those that I have already commented on.

Mr. Ruston: There's lots of time.

Mr. Ramsay: In conclusion, while I spoke in some detail earlier about the continuing concerns for secondary industry in northern Ontario, I am delighted to announce that I have been advised by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier), that \$718,000 has been put aside in his budget for 1979-80 to assist in the assembly, servicing and development of phase II of our industrial park in Sault Ste. Marie. It will be of great assistance to the municipality of Sault Ste. Marie in attracting and encouraging new industry to our area, as well as the development and diversification of existing industry which requires property for expansion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and the members a story that I have used on many occasions because I think it's most appropriate today. It relates to a father and his young son.

The boy was restless and his father wanted to watch the Saturday afternoon football game with some degree of peace and quiet. In order to occupy the youngster he took a map of the world and tore it up into little pieces, thinking that this would keep the boy busy for quite some time.

Much to his surprise the young lad returned in a relatively short period of time with the task accomplished. The dad asked how he had been able to do it so quickly. The boy replied, "Well, it was easy, dad. You see, on the back of the map there is a photograph of a man; I got the man right and that made the world right, too."

Let me paraphrase that story just a bit. If all of us, you and I and many others, concern ourselves with and work toward good government and service to our fellow man, then we stand a much better chance of getting the world right, too.

On motion by Mr. Nixon, the debate was adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House may I take this opportunity to indicate the order of business for tomorrow and for Thursday.

Tomorrow afternoon we will continue with this debate and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) will be making his contribution to it. When the honourable Leader of the Opposition has completed and if there is still some time between then and 6 p.m. we will then go back to Bills 74 and 75 in committee of the whole House. Then tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock we will take into consideration private member's motion

No. 1 standing in the name of the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy)—

Mr. Nixon: But that matter has been settled.

Mr. Ashe: What a waste of time.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —with a division tomorrow night some time around 10:20 p.m. The House will not sit in the assembly on

Wednesday; and on Thursday afternoon we will carry on with the first order, at that time hearing from the leader of the New Democratic Party and, of course, rising at 6 o'clock as we have already provided for in an earlier motion.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch the House adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 12, 1979

Use of herbicides, statement by Mr. Parrott	101
Westinghouse Canada, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Cassidy	101
Thames River flooding, questions of Mr. Brunelle and Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Watson	104
Thames River flooding, statement by Mr. Auld	105
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy	106
Rideau Regional Centre, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Mackenzie	108
Resource equalization grants, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cooke	109
Co-payment fees, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Wildman, Mr. S. Smith	110
Grand River flooding, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Makarchuk	111
Hydro load forecasts, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. J. Reed	112
Niagara River pollution, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Kerrio	113
Canada Metal Company Limited, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Renwick	114
Turkey quotas, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. G. E. Smith	114
Petition re co-payment fees, Mr. Cooke	115
Motion re general government committee meeting, Mr. Welch, agreed to	115
Motion re sittings of House, Mr. Welch, agreed to	115
Portuguese Club of London Incorporated Act, Mr. Peterson, first reading	115
Young People's Theatre Act, Mrs. Campbell, first reading	115
Good Samaritan Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	115
Throne speech debate, Mr. Watson, Mr. Ramsay	115
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	125
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	126

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Ramsay, R. H. (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
(York Mills PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, G. (Simcoe Centre PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 5

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I know that a couple of my colleagues have statements. They have been detained, obviously.

Mr. McClellan: Better put on the whips over there.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Actually they just wanted to make sure everything was up to date; so they are waiting until the last moment.

Mr. Breagh: Is this an acknowledgement that you really are bankrupt over there?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the House, perhaps we could carry on with the question period and revert to statements when my colleagues with statements arrive.

Mr. S. Smith: No, we will wait. What do you have—26 cabinet ministers?

Mr. Hennessy: You tell him, Stuart.

Mr. S. Smith: Mickey's here, look at that; Jim Taylor is here.

Mr. Nixon: Jim never misses prayers.

Mr. Makarchuk: Did you tell him when the big hand is on 12 and the little hand is on two that's when the House starts?

An hon. member: It is about time, Larry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has been a very busy morning.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

WESTINGHOUSE CANADA

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for the delay and I thank the members of the House for their forbearance. We were working until just a moment or two ago to finish our work on the Westinghouse Canada situation in Hamilton.

To that end, I might say that I would expect the members opposite are just now receiving copies of my statement, which they will know from dealing with me in the past is not a usual situation. Usually copies are there well in advance but, because of these circumstances, we have been delayed until now. Also, I am out of breath for those reasons.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) raised the question concerning the possible closing of the Aberdeen Avenue plant of Westinghouse Canada in Hamilton. Yesterday, he referred to—and I quote from Hansard—"a study undertaken by Westinghouse Canada which may well result in putting 700 production employees out of work in Hamilton."

Yet I understand that by 11 o'clock last night, after doing some research, he discovered that the layoffs might not in fact occur. His original, unresearched statement raised, I think, unnecessary concerns for all employees in Westinghouse and elsewhere.

This House will therefore be interested in facts concerning Westinghouse instead of unresearched speculation.

Mr. Sargent: I'm sure glad you're around here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You should try it more often yourself, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Glad to see you here too, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My officials met with the Westinghouse Canada executive—the president, vice-president and their staff—last November 15. The meeting was indeed to have been held as early as October 13 but had to be postponed.

Westinghouse told us then of their long-range plans for their Canadian operations and how they were conducting an evaluation of all their manufacturing so they could build for a profitable future in Canada. They told us frankly that unprofitable lines, not surprisingly, would probably have to be discontinued, and that their policy was to convert from a branch plant to an organization set up to service local needs. They discussed the changing pattern in their industry and how they must respond.

I am, as I stated yesterday, frankly disappointed that they did not tell us earlier of the specific study which involves the Aberdeen Avenue plant, but I must remind the House that this is still at the study stage and the conclusions will not be made until the study is complete. My staff has discussed this matter with Westinghouse officials who anticipate that the first part of the study, the

first part only, will be completed by June and the rest of the study finalized by October.

If any layoffs do result, and this will not be known until the study is complete, those layoffs will indeed be phased in over a period of three years. Even so, the company feels there is a good possibility that, with increased employment in other Hamilton operations and with normal attrition, the 700 employees who might otherwise be affected could be absorbed elsewhere.

Mr. S. Smith: That's still 700 jobs whether it's the same people or not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wish to stress that any decisions affecting Westinghouse Canada Limited will be made in Hamilton and nowhere else. In our discussions with Westinghouse it has become apparent that they feel the reaction through the press and their own elected representatives has been much greater than the situation warrants.

Westinghouse has been in Canada since 1903 and there have been tremendous changes in the entire electrical industry in Canada and in the rest of the world, quite obviously, in that time. The company at present employs more than 7,000 people in Canada, plus a further 2,300 people who were recently transferred to CAMCO at the time of that merger.

Westinghouse Canada has not been content to stay as just a branch plant. They have been successful in introducing the world product mandate concept by which the Canadian company is the exclusive manufacturing plant and conducts product research and development for certain products which are sold world-wide.

Mr. M. N. Davison: How many products?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One of these products is gas turbines which have been sold successfully against aggressive foreign competition into many world markets. They are able to do this in part because they are a multinational, and because they can use the world-wide facilities of their company. This rationalization process is one that benefits Canada and one that we are encouraging in other companies.

Mr. M. N. Davison: How many other products?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The product mandating buffers them against foreign-made decisions.

Mr. McClellan: Give us another product.

Mr. M. N. Davison: How many more products?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's what these studies are all about. That's precisely the process that's going on now.

On the whole question of multinationals, I think all persons, including the Leader of the Opposition, must take a mature and responsible attitude.

Mr. Cassidy: What does that mean?

Mr. Warner: For the minister that means bow and scrape.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are many examples of successful multinational operations in Canada providing substantial employment to our citizens.

Mr. Warner: Where?

Mr. Cassidy: Like Inco?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm going to tell the members where. If I may quote a speech I delivered in the great city of Cambridge on March 1:

"A great deal of our economy is dominated by branch plants of multinational firms. There's a lot of nonsense talked about multinationals. On one side people say they are all bad; others talk as if they raise no problems at all. The truth is somewhere in the middle"—I would say to the Leader of the Opposition—"but I think it's high time we started to work in a deliberate way to maximize the benefits we can get from the activities of multinational firms in Canada." That was on March 1.

I suspect, I would note to the Leader of the Opposition, that notwithstanding yesterday's performance, many people in—just to name three communities—Sarnia, Kitchener and St. Catharines—are happy to have major multinationals creating very substantial employment in their communities.

I have stated over the past several weeks that we must do what we can to rationalize the branch plants that are operating in Canada. Product mandating is one way of encouraging efficiency of operations, and decision-making in Canada is part of that scheme. We must do what we can—I say to the Leader of the Opposition—to develop a mature and responsible attitude to the whole subject of multinationals in Ontario.

While we are on the subject of maturity and multinationals—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am going to quote from the Leader of the Opposition in a minute—I want to discuss the comments of the Leader of the Opposition this past weekend.

Mr. Kerrio: There has to be something sensible in there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: My friend will find out.

On March 12 the Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the *Toronto Star* as saying—

Mr. S. Smith: That was an inaccurate quotation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Another one? Are you on the conservative or liberal side of the party?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Leader of the Opposition says it was inaccurate. We will find out whether he means this year's or last year's statement.

Mr. S. Smith: We will read the correct statement to you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "The Tories believe the way to do things is to provide giveaways to American companies while totally ignoring our own industrial potential. The Conservatives gave away"—

Mr. S. Smith: We said you had to do it that once but not to make a fetish of it. That's what we said. Do it once but don't go down the slippery slope.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If we are going to have orderly proceedings, only one person should be heard at a time. We are at the point in our routine proceedings where we are listening to a ministerial statement. There will be ample opportunity to respond to the statement during question period.

Mr. S. Smith: It's an inaccurate quotation.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I say to the Leader of the Opposition to wait until he hears all of his statements and then pick the ones he wants to disallow.

I continue to quote from the Leader of the Opposition: "The Conservatives gave away millions to the Ford Motor Company to build a plant in Ontario and the real reason was the vision of ribbon-cutting ceremonies in the minds of Tory cabinet ministers"

Mr. Speaker, I would now call the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to his comments in the Legislature—

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: It happens to be that the minister is reading a statement from the *Toronto Star* which statement itself was not a correct quotation from my speech. I would like to set the record straight by reading the exact quotation, and a tape recording is available if the minister and other members of the press would like to hear it. I now quote from the speech:

"They sort of stumbled into the Ford deal in Windsor. They were dragged into it by the feds—most of the money was federal—and the provincial government stumbled into it"—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith:—"and got some good publicity. Suddenly they realized that here was an opportunity for them to look as though they were doing something. Visions of ribbon-cutting danced in the heads of Tory cabinet ministers as the notion struck them that all you have to do is give away the taxpayers' money and someone might open a plant. They will claim that the reason they are opening the plant is because you gave them the money; then you can stand back at the ribbon-cutting ceremony and talk about what a great economic strategy you have in Ontario."

[2:15]

An hon. member: What's the point of privilege?

Mr. Hennessy: What's the punch line?

Mr. S. Smith: You will recall that, at the time of the Ford deal, we recognized that this was—and I called it at the time—"a slippery slope." Those were the words that I used.

Mr. Nixon: Exactly right.

Mr. S. Smith: I am still quoting, Mr. Speaker, from my statement from the weekend. If the Premier would like to hear the actual statement, I said: "We were being blackmailed and had no choice but to give in, in that one particular instance."

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is incorrect.

Mr. S. Smith: "It was like applying a tourniquet when a haemorrhage is occurring. You don't normally use tourniquets as a regular way of maintaining people's health, but it was a necessary thing to do at the time. We made it plain at the time that it had to be regarded as an exception, as something that we were forced to do because we were desperate for the jobs, but that we had to use the intervening time after that to develop a genuine industrial strategy. What did the government do? It repeated the experience on a smaller scale with the Hayes Dana Corporation of New Jersey." And I went on to discuss the Hayes Dana matter.

Let's be very clear on this matter. The minister should get his facts straight in the future.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister will please continue his statement, uninterrupted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has risen on a point of order to explain what he said. He has asked for a retraction. May I say that I am sure he would have written a letter

to the editor of the Star explaining what he did say. May I say, secondly, that he has indicated to me just now that he indicated in his speech—and I look forward to receiving a copy—that we were dragged into it by the federal government.

Mr. S. Smith: I said we were going to lose the deal.

Mr. Speaker: Order. As I drew to your attention before, we are in the process of listening to ministerial statements. Any editorializing, or anything in response to what is said over here is not permitted at this time. If the minister would just complete his statement, let's get on with the business of this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, to respond—

Mr. Speaker: No. Just continue with the statement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With respect, the Leader of the Opposition has asked that I withdraw a portion of my statement, and I ought to either withdraw a portion of that statement or respond to his point of order as to why I should not withdraw that portion of my statement.

Mr. S. Smith: I didn't ask the minister to withdraw a thing. Let him leave it on the record. Let him leave his distortions on the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Rather than taking up the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will distribute to any persons who are interested, including the Leader of the Opposition, a copy of the Leader of the Opposition's letter to the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, dated June 21, 1978, which will show that we were not dragged into it by the federal government.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister knows I favoured it at the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Leader of the Opposition pleaded with the federal government to give us some money to go and get the deal. That's what he did. Here it is.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: What is wrong with the minister? He was in the House. Everybody knows that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In his letter to the editor he can draw that to his attention too.

To continue with the statement, Mr. Speaker: I want to call the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to his comment in this assembly on June 23, 1978.

Mr. S. Smith: When you guys were about to lose the deal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I see! "We need 2,600 jobs in the province." Here is what he said: "Why stop at \$17.5 million when, for another \$17.5 million or so, we can get the \$500-million plant on Ontario soil and create the 2,600 jobs?"

Mr. S. Smith: Or you would lose the deal; that's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the member ready for what he said next? "I'm proud to say that is the policy of the Ontario Liberal Party."

Mr. Havrot: Talk about red faces now.

Mr. Mackenzie: Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, to sum up: It is always easy to beat up on multinationals, but the plain fact is that this country, like many, has always needed a certain amount of foreign capital to be able to meet the aspirations and the job demands of its people.

A mature approach is needed when speaking of both domestic and international capital, and jurisdictions which operate on cheap politics or immature sabre-rattling have no credibility and will be left behind.

Although the Leader of the Opposition may have difficulty deciding on his party's industrial policy, we have no difficulty in developing and following our own. We intend to take every opportunity to develop Ontario industry, to work with the facts that exist and to be concerned for the potential for industrial growth and employment in this province.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Speaker: The honourable the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked to table the figures for physician options on a county-by-county basis; today I will read those figures into the record.

I may say, sir, that the statement will be distributed later in the day, inasmuch as I got the draft statement as I left the CBC after talking to my friend from Oshawa and certain changes have been made by myself. Before I give the figures, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put them into context.

Almost since the inception of the plan in its present form, the province's doctors have had the option of billing the plan directly or billing the patient directly; in the latter case the plan reimburses the patient. In fact for the first approximately seven years of the plan approximately one doctor in eight have billed patients directly.

As I have said, sir, on many occasions, we in the ministry expected an increase in physicians opting out of the plan as the Anti-Inflation Board regulations were lifted at the end of 1978; and that, Mr. Speaker, is precisely what has occurred.

Before reading the figures for the counties, regions and districts, I would like to apprise members of the following figures. First of all, the matter of the number of physicians opting out by effective date: On November 1, 1978, 36 physicians opted out; December 1, 1978, 31; January 1, 1979, 205; February 1, 1979, 116; March 1, 1979, 77; coming up on April 1, 1979, 71; and on May 1, 1979, two.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I said I felt we had seen the peak of opting out and these figures confirm my view. These figures are firm and final and no more than two physicians can opt out in the month of May because of the three-month notification period.

Mr. Roy: Don't count on it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is also noteworthy, sir, that since 1973 there has been a steady growth of the utilization of health services. In 1973-74 the average number of claims per insured resident of Ontario was 5.3, and by 1977-78 that had risen to 6.7.

What this indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that despite an increase in opting out by physicians there has been a steady growth in usage of the services; in other words, there would appear to be no threat to the acceptability of medical care.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it should be of interest to members to see that the ratio of opted-in physicians in the province has improved significantly in the past six years. The figures, which are based on Statistics Canada population estimates, are for March of each year. I will start with 1973 when there was 907 population per opt-in physician in the province; 1974, 869; 1975, 838; 1976, 824; 1977, 803; 1978, 812, and once we have the March 1979 data I will release that as well, although I obviously expect a slight increase in that ratio but well below the figure at which we started in 1973 when the records started to be kept.

To reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any threat to the universality of the health plan in Ontario at this time. Universality is the cornerstone of the plan and we are constantly monitoring it.

Now as I promised, here are the figures for physicians billing the plan directly for the end of February, 1978. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that these figures include the total number of physicians who have signified their intention of opting out, whether their effective date has arrived yet or not. They

also represent physicians who are actually billing the plan, as opposed to the much larger number of physicians registered with the plan but who are not presently billing for one reason or another. These are by county, region, or district, and the percentage of doctors who are billing the plan directly, that is, who are opted in:

Brant county, 97.5 per cent; Bruce, 100 per cent; Dufferin, 94.7 per cent; Elgin, 96.8 per cent; Essex, 89.8 per cent; Frontenac, 94.2 per cent; Grey, 90.5 per cent; Haldimand-Norfolk, 93 per cent; Haliburton, 100 per cent; Halton, 71.1 per cent; Hastings, 99.2 per cent; Huron, 95.7 per cent; Kent, 98.9 per cent; Lambton, 78.1 per cent; Lanark, 100 per cent; Leeds and Grenville, 89.7 per cent; Lennox and Addington, 100 per cent; Metropolitan Toronto, 76.3 per cent;

Middlesex, 79.8 per cent; Muskoka, 100 per cent; Niagara, 80.3 per cent; Northumberland, 98.3 per cent; Durham, 100 per cent; Ottawa-Carleton, 82 per cent; Oxford, 89.4 per cent; Peel, 78.6 per cent; Perth, 70.7 per cent; Peterborough, 52.8 per cent; Prescott and Russell, 100 per cent; Prince Edward, 94.3 per cent; Renfrew, 97.8 per cent; Simcoe, 74.8 per cent; Stormont-Dundas-Glenora, 98 per cent; Victoria, 100 per cent; Waterloo, 74.5 per cent; Wellington, 71.4 per cent; Hamilton-Wentworth, 88.1 per cent; York, 59.3 per cent;

Algoma, 99.2 per cent; Cochrane, 97.4 per cent; Kenora, 100 per cent; Manitoulin, 100 per cent; Nipissing, 82.9 per cent; Parry Sound, 100 per cent; Rainy River, 100 per cent; Sudbury, 91.8 per cent; Thunder Bay, 97.1 per cent; Timiskaming, 100 per cent; and out of the province—there is a group of physicians who bill from out of the province—95.4 per cent.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, I see no threat to the principle of universality in this province.

Mr. Warner: You wouldn't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, if you got grades like this you would have passed.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What is of great importance is the fact that we in the ministry are constantly seeking ways to improve our dealings with physicians.

Mr. Warner: You sit idly by and watch the thing being destroyed.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have a lot more to discuss with the OMA and we have been setting up mechanisms to discover and to dispatch minor irritations with bureaucratic procedures, and to review the means whereby the schedule of benefits is arrived at so that the results of such negotiations not only are

fair to the public and to the profession but are seen to be fair.

ORAL QUESTIONS

WESTINGHOUSE CANADA

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Given that his own officials have now spoken with Westinghouse and seem to confirm that, as said in today's *Spectator*, there is little hope that the 700 jobs will stay—even although some of the jobs lost will be lost by the process of attrition and therefore actual employee layoffs in some instances may not happen, the city will lose the 700 jobs very likely—what is the explanation that the minister is able to accept for this?

Is he aware that the reasoning being offered by the company, which accepts that the switch gear and control plant on Aberdeen Avenue is profitable, is that they wish to replace this older plant with a number of smaller, decentralized plants all around the country? Does this make much sense to the minister, does he accept that particular reasoning; and is he not concerned with a statement made by the president of Westinghouse some time ago in which he spoke of the benefits of these small, more-automated, decentralized plants which are non-union? Does the minister feel that the reasoning may be an effort on the part of the company to avoid the union?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I suspect the company wouldn't have to conduct a study which it has well publicized, let its employees know about, and indeed let the public know about, if all it was trying to do was to get away from a union.

That study will be available to our ministry, I am sure; and with the consent of the persons doing the study and that of Westinghouse, we would be happy to make it available to the Leader of the Opposition and to the third party, and to anyone else who wishes it. Therefore, I would tend to discount at this time, on the evidence we have at hand, an attempt to avoid the union.

Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition refers once again to the *Hamilton Spectator*, from which apparently he concludes there is little hope of the jobs being saved. I should say that as a result of our discussions with them they have indicated to very senior officials in my ministry there is some hope for a lot of those jobs.

I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that, as he should know, there are

currently some 4,300 persons employed by Westinghouse in the Hamilton area, and that many of those 700 or so workers might well be absorbed into some of the other activities of Westinghouse in Hamilton. I would reflect that Westinghouse has made a substantial contribution to the Hamilton area and is not about to take what I suspect would be an unusual step; that is to walk away from its labour force there and those parts of its operation there which seem to work well.

I would also remind the Leader of the Opposition that when Westinghouse talks of getting into diversified plants and smaller operations they are not only talking about other parts of Canada. Indeed in our conversations they have indicated—the member for Quinte (Mr. O'Neil) will be interested—some talk about moving some parts of their operation to eastern Ontario.

These are alternatives which Westinghouse and Canadian-owned plants, plants all over Ontario and everywhere else, do look at from time to time. I am happy to say that Westinghouse is not following a high-handed approach of simply closing the plant, giving layoff notices and moving its operation to another country or even another part of this country. Rather they are conducting a study, and the bottom line of it is as I believe the Leader of the Opposition indicated to some persons either out there or on the media last night, I think he reflected that this was free enterprise, and one of the things that is going to happen is that free enterprise operations are going to assess their operations from time to time to see if they can develop more profitable ways of carrying on business than those currently in use.

My concern is that they do not abandon a community for reasons other than good, businesslike reasons, and that they have given every opportunity to this government to assist them in relocating the work force, and given the workers and community involved every chance to adjust to that change.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: Given the fact that the Aberdeen plant has been quite profitable, that they intend to continue making their switch gear and control products in Canada—it's not something they are willing to admit they are going to take back to the United States when the tariffs go—is the minister convinced that it makes sense to have a bunch of small plants all around the place when he is always speaking of the economies of scale and so on? Is the minister convinced that it makes more sense to do that? Isn't he the least bit suspicious as to the reasons for that, given Mr. Tyaack's address to the Conference Board of Canada

in which he praised the small, decentralized non-union plants as the way of the future?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Again, I think it would not be helpful to the long-range prospects for Westinghouse, which does employ 4,300 persons in the fine city of Hamilton, to invite speculation, based upon a speech made earlier and upon a study it is conducting, that Westinghouse is acting in a high-handed, unreasonable fashion. As I have indicated earlier, I just don't think that premature speculation is a type of attitude which is conducive to attracting the type of confident investment decisions made by Westinghouse and other people.

I do acknowledge, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, that it is politically attractive to jump on Westinghouse and accuse them of having plans and motives.

Mr. S. Smith: Do small plants make sense to you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must say to the Leader of the Opposition, whether a diversification into those operations makes sense or not I would prefer to wait until I have had the opportunity of seeing the results of the study which they are carrying on. Obviously, Westinghouse feels that it hasn't got enough information to make a decision on the Aberdeen plant without a study.

If Westinghouse feels that way, I must humbly say to the Leader of the Opposition that I obviously do not have the information either to make that assessment without at least having the opportunity of looking at that study. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition feels he does not need the advantages of that study to make that business decision. I myself do not have that capability, nor apparently does Westinghouse.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I have had the opportunity to talk both to the company and to the union in the last 24 hours. Can the minister explain his confidence that he will have access to the study and that he will be able to share it with members of the opposition when the company specifically informed me at 9:45 this morning that they were not prepared to open their books either to me or to the workers who are concerned about the future of their jobs? Is the government prepared to insist that Westinghouse Canada open the books on its switch gear operations so that the workers, the community and this Legislature can judge whether this is a sound, business-like decision or whether this is yet another example of a multinational corporation pushing Canadians around?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must say I wonder whether the leader of the third party would be taking the same attitude if it were a Canadian-owned company making the same assessment of its business as the American multinational is. I suspect he would find it a little harder to beat up on them than he does on the multinational.

Mr. McClellan: Inco perhaps.

Mr. Makarchuk: We just want to make them responsible, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Secondly, may I say I don't apologize for the fact that in this country we do believe that businesses have the right to keep their records confidential and to make their own decisions as to which portions of their records—

Mr. Cassidy: So we won't get the study, or it will be meaningless.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —are going to be open to the public and which are not, the same as the members opposite have that opportunity, the same as the unions have that opportunity to make that decision, the same as any ordinary worker or any union member has the opportunity to decide whether—

Mr. Cassidy: No, they don't.

Mr. McClellan: You are not answering the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —his or her own personal affairs are matters which are going to be open to the public.

Mr. S. Smith: Not when you're shutting a plant down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it is a very crucial thing to decide on the floor of this House as to whether this government believes that a firm, deciding it is going to close its plant, is required to open all of its records and all of its books to government with the logical conclusion that government can or should force it to maintain an unprofitable operation.

Mr. S. Smith: How do you know it's unprofitable if you can't look at the books?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I say that the record of my ministry in dealing with very many firms throughout the length and breadth of this province is that the good and responsible firms co-operate on a confidential basis with my very excellent staff to do everything they can to protect the work force that suffers from a layoff or a plant closure. I would expect, though I can't be sure and one can never be, that Westinghouse would follow the now-established procedure of working with my staff and myself, showing us the details of their operation and permitting us

to comment with them on a confidential basis with regard to the long-term prospects for that particular operation.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, does not the minister feel, given the infrastructure which the people of an area have to put in when an industry locates there—the houses that are built, the schools as a consequence, the streets, the water, the sewage—that an industry has a responsibility to a community, and that before it can just walk away from a plant it at least ought to be able to show that no viable alternatives exist? Doesn't the minister think the day of treating industries as though they were kings and could walk away or come in at will without any responsibility to the community is over in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must say that I wonder whether that was part of the Leader of the Opposition's feelings when in the Prescott Journal he was quoted as saying he would encourage industry to leave the golden horseshoe by lowering energy rates and upgrading transportation services in other places. Is that what he was thinking about when he said he would encourage industry to move out of the golden horseshoe?

Mr. Riddell: Don't be so political, get on with the answer; it is getting a little tiresome.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's precisely what it said: Prescott Journal, August 23, 1978.

Mr. S. Smith: You want to keep it all out of northern and eastern Ontario; you want it all in St. Andrew-St. Patrick, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But of course the member was in Prescott that day, he wasn't in Hamilton. If he wants to encourage industries to move out of Hamilton, as he told them in Prescott, then let him stand up and say that in Hamilton, not just in Prescott.

Mr. M. N. Davison: I would like the minister to inform the House as to when his officials last met with representatives of Local 504, United Electrical Workers, in Hamilton to discuss this matter; and furthermore, I would like to know why he and the officials in his ministry are sitting so quietly on the sidelines while Westinghouse continues to try to get rid of and bust up Local 504 UEW in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member has any evidence that that is occurring then perhaps he will send it across to us and I will work on that with my colleague the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie). I am sure if the member has any evidence that that has occurred he has already referred it

to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Has he?

Mr. M. N. Davison: Open your eyes. Look at the record.

ILLEGAL DUMPING OF LIQUID WASTE

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Minister of the Environment: Has the minister now spoken with the three staff of his ministry who were originally involved in denying that a meeting took place in December of 1976 in which his regional staff was made aware of certain illegal dumping going on at the Upper Ottawa Street site in Hamilton? Has he spoken with his staff now that a member of his Stoney Creek regional office has admitted that he and two other ministry staff met with certain haulers and were told at that time that liquid wastes were being dumped illegally?

What kind of disciplinary action is the minister going to take with his staff? Does he have results from the samples that were presented to his staff in December of 1976 when they were told of illegalities, and what exact action has he taken since the matter has finally been revealed in the newspapers, even though he himself never was able to find out about it?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, obviously I expected this question, or one of related concern, and it would be easy for me, sir, to stand and say that since there are 139 charges laid on this particular instance, it is sub judice and I should refrain from comment. However, I think that that would not be fair to this House and I won't do so. On the other hand—

Mr. S. Smith: That is rubbish and you know it. Just be honest.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let him speak.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Are you ready to listen to the answer or have you continually got your mouth in motion before you're ready to listen?

Mr. S. Smith: Just stop congratulating yourself for something you should know anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Yakabuski: Slippery Stuart's had a bad day. Go easy on him.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: What I was going to suggest to the leader of the Liberal Party was that we have heard a great deal on this subject, and indeed a great deal from the member himself. I think it's time that two things happened. One, in the next day or two, perhaps Thursday or Friday morning, I will give a carefully considered response to his question, a response that will reflect not only our concern but a statement of the facts,

and make sure that I do not make any utterances that would prejudice the fair trial of this case.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much from the leader of the Liberal Party on this particular item of a hearsay type of evidence—like for instance, if I might make the case, material in a Coca-Cola bottle presented to our regional office—which really, as he well knows, would not stand one second in a court of law. It is one thing to be suspicious, it's another thing to have the kind of evidence that will stand up in a court of law.

As the leader knows, I have asked him in the name of the public interest on this significant issue to come forward with factual information; and I would say, since there are 139 charges pending, it would be a darn good idea for him to come forward now, not with hearsay evidence but with factual information that we could take to the courts. On Thursday or Friday I will make a much more detailed statement on the question.

[2:45]

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that a member of his own office in Stoney Creek has now publicly admitted that such a meeting took place; the meeting at which the sample in the Coke bottle, whatever he wants to call it, was in fact handed over? He has admitted this publicly in the newspapers. Has he not found out about that? And will he check and find out just who was at the meeting; what the sample, if any, contained; what report was made following that meeting; and can he explain to me why it is he's still talking of hearsay when the matter has been confirmed from within his own ministry?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: The Leader of the Opposition does us all a great disservice by confusing it so much. Is he prepared, on a matter of principle—

Mr. Roy: Try to answer the question. If you want to ask them, get out of there.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —that someone should be able to bring in an unidentified, unmarked, unsworn piece of evidence and say that's enough to take a court action on any particular company?

Mr. S. Smith: Court action? What court action?

Mrs. Campbell: What court action?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Is that his concept of justice? That's precisely what happened, precisely what happened.

Of course I know of that meeting, and of course I followed in great detail—

Mr. S. Smith: Why did they deny it happened at first?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —those accusations the member has made. But he's talking about something that concerns all of us, concerns us a great deal. I don't think it's very wise of the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. S. Smith: Why didn't they follow up?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —to threaten the things he has threatened in this province in the name of gaining something politically.

Mr. S. Smith: Why didn't they follow up on it? Two years—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. S. Smith: You've turned a blind eye on it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I rise on a point of privilege. I ask—

Mrs. Campbell: No, it isn't.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: No, I won't ask. I guess that's not my privilege. Surely, when we have 139 charges—

Mr. S. Smith: Those are minor waybill matters that came out of your report, for heaven's sake.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —on this issue, no one can say we have turned a blind eye.

Ms. Bryden: I have a supplementary question of the Minister of the Environment.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Bryden: I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment, since he is taking court action, when is he going to bring in legislation to increase the fines for illegal dumping and such practices as are being alleged in connection with this affair?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I answered that question some time ago in committee, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure we're going to do it this session of the Legislature. I did tell committee that we're seriously considering that possibility. We'll be bringing in spill legislation—not related, I know, but it's perhaps a time when we can consider the type of penalties that should be imposed for those who pollute and are found in violation of our acts.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Minister of Health, arising out of his statement today about the opting out of physicians from OHIP. Now that the minister has tabled figures that indicate that 29 per cent of the doctors in Halton county, 30 per cent of the

doctors in Perth, 29 per cent of the doctors in Wellington county, 41 per cent of the doctors in the county of York, and 47 per cent of the doctors in the county of Peterborough have opted out of the OHIP plan; now that we have had information from the OHIP administrators themselves that 70 per cent of the doctors in the city of Peterborough itself, as well as in Orillia, have opted out of the plan; does the minister not believe that there are real obstacles to universal accessibility to insured medical services in many regions and cities of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say on this question of the calculation by individual city I had a chat with the member's friend from Oshawa at noon hour, over radio, and I will check with my staff on those figures, inasmuch as to my knowledge we have not been keeping them by city. We have been keeping them by county, region and district, inasmuch as all our planning is by county, region or district, or by hospital centre. But I'll check that.

As I said in my statement, we have been monitoring the situation very closely and there is no indication that the universality or accessibility of the system is in fact threatened at this point. It is something we are watching very closely. The member will see from the figures I read out today that the situation varies from community to community. It seems to me that the most effective way to deal with this situation is to deal with the major problems that are of concern to the medical profession and deal with them head on.

Based on my discussions with a great many physicians around the province over the last year or so, I would have to say that they are concerned about whether or not the administrative procedures of the health insurance plan are unduly bureaucratic—

Mr. McClellan: And they are.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the expression that is used from time to time is "bureaucratic harassment"—and there is a perception on the part of some of the profession that the schedule of benefits is not fair.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) remember when she was president of the OMA? Those were the good old days. The government knew what to do then.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let me deal with the latter first. There have been all kinds of studies written from various points of view on the question of physician compensation,

and you can find a study to support just about any point of view you want to expound. It is pointless to try to settle that today. What I have asked the medical association to do, and it has agreed on this, is to work with us to see if we can find a way to improve the existing structure for the negotiation of the OHIP schedule of benefits—

Mr. Nixon: Where is Richard Potter now that we need him?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —so that it not only is fair, both to the taxpayers who through their premiums and taxes are footing the bills and to the profession in compensation for its training and its skills, but also so that it is seen to be fair.

(To deal with the second issue, the question of what is from time to time referred to as bureaucratic harassment, we have for the last six or eight months been working with the medical association reviewing all of the administrative procedures, because I put the challenge to them that I would like them to identify where they feel we are being unduly or unnecessarily bureaucratic. If in fact we can satisfy our mandate as described by the legislation and as overseen by the Legislature, we're prepared to change our administrative procedures if we can make the day-to-day practice of medicine less bound by tape, forms and bureaucracy.)

I think it's better, looking at the whole province, to tackle those problems head on. I say to the member again that I feel the question of opting out has peaked inasmuch as we know that with the expiration of the Anti-Inflation Board controls there would be an increase. That has been borne out by the figures I gave members today.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since a review of the structure of the OHIP fees was a recommendation of the select committee that met a year ago but was rejected by the Minister of Health, is the Minister of Health now prepared to stop any further opting out from OHIP until those discussions with the medical association have taken place? If not, can the minister explain what specific individuals and specific communities should do when they are faced with almost a solid wall of opted-out doctors?

Specifically, for example, what should people do in the southeastern end of Essex county where all six doctors in Amherstburg have opted out and where three of the four doctors in La Salle have also opted out, leaving only one out of 10 doctors in the region in OHIP? What should people in the Hamilton area do where 100 doctors opted out of OHIP on January 1, and where doctors in

the Stoney Creek area are apparently not accepting patients who want to transfer from opted-out doctors? What should those specific individuals do in those specific situations when they find that the ministry's averages don't apply to them and they have not got universal access to insured medical services?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, both Hamilton-Wentworth and Essex are well below the provincial average of opting out or well above the provincial average of opting in, depending on your point of view.

Mr. McClellan: Let them eat averages.

Mr. Cassidy: Let them eat averages. Tell them that in Amherstburg. Where are their transit services to Windsor?

Mr. Bounsall: Answer the question. What about Amherstburg?

Mr. Warner: You're distorting again.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The provincial average is 82.1 per cent of doctors billing the plan directly—

Mr. Cooke: Answer the question.

Mr. Warner: Try answering the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and in Hamilton-Wentworth it's 88.1 per cent, and in Essex it's 89.8 per cent.

Mr. Cooke: What about Amherstburg?

Mr. Cassidy: What about Amherstburg? What about those people?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In those particular cases, and in any situation initially of course, we expect that the doctors and the patients will discuss the fees.

Mr. Warner: You don't intend to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member knows, of course, that not every opted-out doctor charges above the OHIP schedule. In fact, in many cases, they charge only what OHIP would reimburse, depending on the individual circumstances.

If the member knows—well, obviously, the member has come across these particular cases. We will take them up with the medical association to see if something can be done.

Mr. Swart: Half a man. Cap in hand.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would have to say though that inasmuch as I have not heard—and I will check my files to verify this—complaints from that area, people are apparently finding that it is not depriving them of medical care. They are able to work this out with the physicians in the community or they are travelling to other centres.

Mr. McClellan: Why would they write to you? You won't do anything anyway.

Ms. Gigantes: You have told them it is no use complaining.

Mr. McClellan: So much for the principle of access.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker: Accepting the minister's premise that on a province-wide basis the universality of a plan is not threatened; and accepting the premise that in many situations in most areas of the province, if a patient is faced with a doctor who has opted out he can go elsewhere: can the minister explain the basis for saying universality is not threatened, in the case of a particular city and a particular county—how far does universality go?

Is the minister suggesting, for instance, that if one can't get the services of a specialist in Peterborough, the choice is to come to Toronto or Ottawa or elsewhere? Where does the minister draw the line on this famous principle of universality?

Secondly, would the minister tell us—he has been Minister of Health for a while—why he has not resolved the problem with the doctors on the question of bureaucratic weight, red tape and so on?

Why has the minister not resolved the problem of certain specialties within the profession? They apparently are getting more than their fair share of the fees, whereas the general practitioner is the one who is not being treated fairly.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If I may deal with that last point first, in fact in the last two rounds of negotiations with the medical association—first the negotiations which resulted in the average 6.25 per cent increase last May 1, and then the negotiations which resulted in the average 6.6 per cent increase on January 1 of this year—

Mr. Cassidy: That is more than you gave the hospital workers, too.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the general practitioner was, in fact, given more than the average. In 1978 that was done by introducing what is known as the intermediate assessment and in 1979 by a further weighting of the increase.

The average increase for the GP will thus be somewhere around eight per cent plus increasing utilization, plus the increase in population; it will be well beyond the eight per cent.

In the last couple of years, in fact, that direction has been very clear. We want to see more directed towards the general practitioner. This was a point, I think, raised by the member for Ottawa Centre. That was a point made by the select committee when

they reported in October and a point with which we agreed.

Regarding the question of bureaucratic harassment: that committee first got going last June or July. They met on a number of occasions. They met as recently as this morning. I would anticipate resolving, in the not-too-distant future, some of the issues they have currently reviewed before they go on to some others. So we are making good progress there.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health how he can say in the case of a single-parent mother in Amherstburg or a senior citizen living in Amherstburg who doesn't have transportation to Windsor, that their access to the health care system in this province is not threatened. The fact is that no doctor in Amherstburg, and only one doctor in Lasalle, is in the OHIP system in this province. How can the minister possibly say that in specific pockets of this province, like Amherstburg, accessibility is not threatened?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On two grounds, I guess: first, on looking at the larger picture and the growth and the use of the health care system it certainly does not indicate that people are being deterred from using it; and, secondly, on the basis of what people tell us.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: How do you know we have had a 70 per cent increase in opting out?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have not been hearing from many people about problems of access; in fact, very few.

WESTINGHOUSE CANADA

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism.

Given the fact that all evidence indicates that the Westinghouse switchgear operation in Hamilton is profitable; that the company was investing substantially in new facilities in that operation on Aberdeen Avenue up until three or four weeks ago; and that productivity is as high in Hamilton as in the counterpart United States plants: Will the minister at least undertake to ensure that the 700 Hamilton workers in that plant who are affected by the threat of layoff will be able to participate fully in the studies that the company is now undertaking; that they will have access, not just to public relations figures but to all the books on that operation so as to be able to determine how it can be kept going as a viable operation?

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, obviously, as the leader of the third party knows, I can't ensure that any company, any union, any private individual in this country, must turn over bank accounts, private books and records to anyone else in this free democratic society. I'm not about to stand up—and, for good political reasons, that happens to strike the fancy of the leader of the third party—offer to change that fundamental principle, as we see it in this party, for this particular situation.

Mr. McClellan: Ask Norton about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not sure where the Leader of the Opposition is on this issue. I read him as saying both things during question period today. But I want to make my position perfectly clear. There's no legislation which would require them to do that at this time, nor am I contemplating any legislation that would force them to do that.

Now, a study is going on. I think it's only fair to point out that Westinghouse might have done what other firms, both multinational and Canadian, have done on other occasions: that is, begin by announcing a layoff rather than begin by announcing that a study is going on; announcing a layoff rather than begin by pointing out the good and bad parts of the current situation; and then pointing to the future in effect, saying, "Listen, there are some difficult times coming. We would like some co-operation from all those involved in this plant in this study and the study will be completed later this year."

I can also add that if Westinghouse acts the way other companies have, most of that information ultimately is made available to us on a confidential basis. I might add that I'm quite proud of the record and the member's seat mate, the member for—where is he from?—Sudbury, whatever, will be aware—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is becoming a speech rather than a direct answer to a specific question. Do you have a supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, given that the minister is not prepared to confront the multinational corporation which is threatening to take a major part of Hamilton's economy away; and given the fact that Ontario Hydro and many Ontario firms are major customers of the Westinghouse operation, is the minister prepared to bring in legislation to this House in order to prevent the switchgear operation being closed, and to compel Westinghouse Canada to make it available as an ongoing operation to some other company, if Westing-

house is not prepared to keep in the business themselves?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Really, I'll presume that was a serious question and answer no. We're not prepared to bring in legislation to stop Westinghouse from closing any particular operation. Nor am I prepared to recommend legislation which would stop any company or, indeed, any citizen of this country from changing its, his or her place of operations.

I might suggest to the leader of the third party that to be consistent he should suggest that we ought to bring in legislation prohibiting certain parts of the labour force from uprooting and moving to different communities, simply because that would cause a disruption to the labour force and the industry in that particular community. We're not going to dictate to firms and we're not going to indicate to labour people where they should work, either.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck).

Given that the Minister of Revenue invoked section 86 of the Assessment Act which equalizes assessments within classes, and which is his prerogative; given that 13 municipalities in Ontario have implemented section 86; and given that there are a great number of increases in property taxes and assessments within these municipalities—in fact, in two cases, the increases have been over 1,000 per cent—is the government giving consideration to developing a formula whereby these people, these various property owners, are going to have to increase their taxes by only a certain amount per year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there was a supplementary from the member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. McEwen) which is the first supplementary I have heard from him in my whole career here.

Mr. Riddell: Just answer the question.

Mr. Wildman: Tell us about the Argonauts, Bill.

Mr. Makarchuk: You mean there is a member there?

Mr. McEwen: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There isn't a point of order. There is nothing out of order.

Mr. McEwen: I was only interjecting that the procedure of the government side of the House is to increase each one by 1,000 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will spend the rest of the afternoon trying to sort out what the honourable member really meant by that observation.

Mr. Martel: That was a former Tory. Did he belong to you fellows at one time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am very careful, I would say to the honourable member—

Mr. Speaker: Please don't say it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, you do a terrific job here. You are quite right. I will try to direct my attention to the question.

As I recall the question, there is some suggestion that the minister invoke section whatever on the Assessment Act. I think if memory serves me correctly, the minister was requested to give the municipalities permissive opportunities to introduce this approach to market value assessment. I think the honourable member himself has, in terms of principle and philosophy, supported this. His party has been ambivalent in that maybe they want it and maybe they don't, depending on where the by-election is, et cetera, et cetera.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am being interrupted by the member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Speaker: Just ignore the interjections, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can't ignore him. I mean he's such a delightful fellow. He's probably in the conservative element of the Liberal Party. In fact that probably applies to about 80 per cent.

Mr. Martel: I was going to ask which ones weren't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know that you have any cause to suggest anything today.

Mr. Martel: Well, I don't belong to that motley group.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not familiar with the exact provisions of the act but the honourable member has pointed out one of the complexities in the introduction of market value assessment. I have been in a community where we had market value assessment introduced some 10 years ago and there is the difficulty in the first six months or a year of sorting out some of the changes that take place.

I am not sure of this but I will check with the Minister of Revenue whether the municipality has the right to phase in some of these new tax situations. I think maybe they do. But I will certainly ascertain that from the minister and have him communicate directly to the member. I have read about some of the concerns in his particular community. The

only encouraging thing for me is that he supports what is being done so enthusiastically. When we go to that great part of the province we say the local member is in favour of market value assessment and the municipality had followed his direction in seeing that it was introduced.

Mr. Roy: You might as well say that. You'll never win—

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, given that the municipality of which I speak is not one that I represent but is in the same general area, in order to correct the record, and given that the Premier on many many occasions in his speeches across the province makes the contention that his government is such a great—

Mr. Speaker: "Given" is not a question. Where, when, why, how.

Mr. Epp: In view of the fact that he contends that his government is doing such a great job in administering the affairs of this province, how does he reconcile these preposterous, these tremendous increases in these various municipalities with that kind of contention that he's a good manager of the affairs of the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will take the first "given" as the part of the question that is most relevant—where the honourable member does endorse the fact that we do a tremendous job in the governing of the affairs of the people of this province. I accept his congratulations and best wishes.

As it relates to the other part of his question, this is one of the problems that we raised in this Legislature. It's one of these matters that was discussed. It's interesting to see the leader of his own party wandering in to Scarborough West where his candidate can't be elected, according to him, as a Liberal candidate; he has to run as an independant.

He is talking about the province imposing real property assessment when some of these members were in support of moving it ahead. Some of them were not, but I think it's really a little bit strange to hear him come into this House now and tell us of the difficulties. We know of them and it's up to the municipalities and ourselves to work together to see how we can assist in this rather complex issue. We have never minimized them. That's why we didn't move ahead on a province-wide basis, in spite of the fact that some people opposite have suggested we should in some areas of the province.

Mr. M. Davidson: Supplementary: Is the Premier aware that in the city of Kitchener alone taxes on some small businesses have increased by as much as 1,200 per cent, and municipal land held by the city of Cambridge

in one instance rose by some 11,000 per cent? All of this in itself is imposing a great deal of hardship, not only on the community which must set its own tax base, but within the residential community on senior citizens who have been hit by maybe not quite as large an impact as that, but by a great percentage increase in many cases.

Rather than ask the minister as to whether or not there is a means whereby municipalities can implement the increase over a period of time, would the Premier suggest to the minister perhaps that where the situations are so serious he should be informing the municipalities that they should bring those increases in over a period of time rather than through a sudden increase?

Mr. Worton: Tell him how high is high.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just want to make one thing very clear so that there is no misunderstanding. I'm sure the member didn't mean to imply this in his initial question, but it wasn't a case of the minister invoking or insisting. We were requested by the municipalities, which are presently faced with these difficulties to move into this at their initiative. It was their initiative.

I think the very distinguished member who asked me the question in the first place was perhaps part of a delegation that came to see us about it. I think I'm correct in that. Certainly he gave it his support; I can recall that.

Mr. Epp: That's because the government froze assessments for eight years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No one ever suggested there wouldn't be some of these very obvious difficulties that have been related both in the press and here.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm sure the minister and his officials will be delighted to sit down with the municipalities to see what means can be developed to mitigate some of the major increases or escalations that take place. But the members opposite should understand that it's great to talk in terms of principle and it's great to be critical of us with respect to real property assessment or market value assessment, but it is incorrect, when the crunch comes, when we have done it on a voluntary basis, to come in here and try to tell us that we should have done it on a universal basis, or that we didn't warn people as to the difficulties that are inherent in this.

Everybody talks about real property tax reform. A lot of people are in support of it, but it's a very complex issue and one where I think we are wise in having certain municipalities move ahead to see what the prob-

lems are and see how we can assist them in straightening them out. I can assure the members the minister will be more than pleased to sit down with the heads of the municipalities and some of their officials to see in what ways we can be helpful. I lived through this for two years in my own area. I know some of the problems and they are not easy, although ultimately we were able, at least in that great region, to sort the vast majority of them out.

CO-PAYMENT FEES

Mr. Warner: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Since the decision regarding the placement of a patient should be based on a medical judgement, and for a chronically ill person that judgement should involve consideration of a chronic-care wing of a hospital, nursing home or a home-care program, and since this government has not provided these three basic types of care throughout the province, will the minister now withdraw his punitive \$9.80 daily charge on those who are chronically ill?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I never cease to be amazed—

An hon. member: By trash.

Mr. Cassidy: We get amazed at the minister.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —at the antics of that party opposite, a party which in October—

Mr. Pope: Page 46.

Mr. Cooke: Read the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —page 46, thank you very much—caucused over the then draft select committee report. Finally, the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere and the member for Hamilton East on behalf of their caucus signed the report, which recommended that there be a per diem charge in chronic facilities to equalize the burdens of nursing homes.

In fact, we didn't take their recommendation, inasmuch as it would have had the effect of charging from day one regardless of ability to pay, as in the case in some other provinces where, if one can't pay, one goes on welfare.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the NDP Magna Carta.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Instead, we've come up with a system for chronic units or a chronic hospital which provides for a number of exemptions, particularly for those who are going to be rehabilitated back to the community, and is equitable and fair in comparison to a nursing home.

[3:15]

Mr. Riddell: That recommendation was made on the basis that there were other facilities.

Mr. Cooke: Or that there would be.

Mr. Warner: Continue with your distortion. Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In those cases, as we have said repeatedly, we are prepared to approve additional chronic or extended care beds where the need is identified through the local planning process. That has come to being in Ottawa where recently we announced the approval for the conversion of the Ottawa General Hospital for 200 chronic beds; it has come about in Windsor where, through the agreement of the hospitals with the health council, additional chronic care facilities are being provided; and it will come about in a great many more areas as soon as the need is identified.

We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, as well, as was indicated in the speech from the throne, to expand the chronic home care programs this year in a number of areas. I will have more to say on that later in this session.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: To the minister who refused to debate the report on the select committee on health care costs, does the minister realize that the committee agreed unanimously on page 37, and I quote, "that user fees by definition shift costs to those who are sick and therefore undermine one of the basic foundations of the scheme, but the committee contends to further penalize those who are sick, usually a condition beyond the control of the patient, would have a very adverse compounding effect upon what are already unfortunate circumstances"? And, further, the committee realized and agreed that there is no need for this callous penny pinching binge that the minister is on, since the committee agreed unanimously that our health costs in Ontario are not out of line, in particular when compared with the United States—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. Warner: —they are considerably less, because we have a public health care system and they have a private one—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. Warner: —but the minister is out to try to destroy it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this grand con job on the member's part isn't going to work. He knows as well as I do—

Mr. Cassidy: Don't you speak of a con job.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: He knows as well as I do that that section of the report was referring to the various submissions the com-

mittee had had, that it recommended a dollar per service—a couple of dollars per service and real user fees.

Mr. Cooke: Read the whole report.

Mr. Warner: You never even read the report.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member cannot escape the fact that the committee, after due consideration, and the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere in particular and his colleague, after caucusing the report, recommended that there be a per diem charge in chronic facilities.

Mr. Riddell: If other facilities were made available.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Warner: The minister continues to twist and distort. Twisting and distorting isn't going to win you anything.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Read the report.

Mr. Mackenzie: On a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Warner: You know it was done in the context—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere sit down?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: And resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Does the honourable member for Hamilton East have a point of privilege?

Mr. Mackenzie: I think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eaton: Trying to get out of what he signed now.

Mr. Mackenzie: Well, we will find out. I think it is a point of privilege, because I consider a slur on my position on that committee the comments just made by the Minister of Health.

Mr. Eaton: You signed something you didn't really mean to sign.

Mr. Mackenzie: If the Minister of Health has discussed with his colleagues on that committee he will understand that the discussion on that \$9.80—and there was never a figure on it—that went on in that committee dealt very specifically with what was a loophole in the legislation that allows a family to put into an active treatment bed a person who should be in a nursing care bed when there are not enough facilities for those beds and get away with pocketing the money. That was the context of the argument and he should understand it.

Interjections.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That's not true.

Mr. Speaker. Order. Order.

I am sure that the honourable member and all honourable members realize that when a member rises on a point of privilege he has a responsibility to indicate which of his privileges have been abrogated. I fail to see that you have.

FARM TARIFF CUTS

Mr. Rollins: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the announcement of the federal government on reducing tariffs on farm commodities, what consideration will be given to the producers in the province of Ontario?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Jean Chretien released the tariff report in Ottawa. There were some reductions. It is quite interesting to note that, not because of any particular time limit, the reductions became effective as of midnight last night.

It is also interesting to note that the tariff equities that we have been fighting for for three and a half years are going to be changed from a cents per pound or fixed rate to a percentage. We do commend the federal government for that.

In tariff reference 152 and the tariff board recommendations there were almost 300 recommendations put on the bargaining table. I have not had a chance to look at the 300 recommendations. I do know that some of them were not adopted by the government of Canada and it did not live up to the recommendations that it put on the bargaining table, but until I have had a chance to look at the total package, to analyse it and see what it will do for the horticulture industry in this province, I wouldn't want to comment in depth on that.

On the reductions, I only have to look at today's paper: "Tariff Cuts May Squeeze One Cent Off US Orange Juice." May I remind members we are interested here, in Canada and in Ontario, in selling our products. When we find our products, like carrots, selling at half the price of imported carrots today, apples at almost half the price of imported apples, onions at about half the price of imported onions, that is the sort of thing they should be working on, and we should all be drinking apple juice, tomato juice, or grape juice here in this province.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Can the minister inform the House if the other side of the federal announcement—that is, increases in certain tariffs—will be made applicable to protect some of the tender fruits and particularly the strawberry industry here? It is

interesting to note that 90 days from now, unless something is done, the strawberry crop in this province will be lost unless there is some tariff protection. Is the minister using his good offices to apply this new policy to protect our own farmers?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it is just unfortunate, as I said, the announcement last night said the reductions took place at midnight last night. The new increased protection or equities that we are asking for will not become effective until October 1, and will have to be done by legislation. So there will be less protection for our horticulture industry in the province of Ontario this summer than we had last summer. I think that is atrocious—

Mr. Nixon: I do, too.

Hon. W. Newman: —when we have been fighting for this thing for three and a half years.

JOB CREATION

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, as it relates to the mineral policy paper number 4, put out by the Ministry of Natural Resources, Towards Nickel Policy for the Province of Ontario. There are a number of proposals that were recommended by the study; seven in all. I want to know for example, if the minister has given any consideration to implementing some of them, such as to “encourage the refining in Ontario or Canada of the by-product platinum group metals,” and to “intensify diversification of the Sudbury manufacturing base by encouraging the importation of Inco subsidiaries’ technical and nickel manufacturing expertise acquired through recent diversification, not now employed in Canada, for the purpose of creating new industry and employment in Sudbury”? Has the minister accepted any of these proposals, or when can we look to the minister to implement some of these recommendations to create jobs in the Sudbury basin?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will be discussing the matter further with my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld), and I would expect he would have more to say to the House on that subject at a later time.

HOTEL DIEU HOSPITAL

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Is the minister aware of the fact that on February 21 of this year 14 patients in Windsor had to stay overnight

in Hotel Dieu’s emergency room because there were no beds available in the hospital, and that in order to get rooms available the following day other patients had to be released before they were ready to be released? Further, is the minister aware that in the opinion of Dr. Frank L. Manforton, president of the Hotel Dieu medical staff, medical and legal risks are being taken in sending patients home prematurely, as well as in not admitting patients who should be admitted? Is this what the Minister of Health calls restraint of spending without a decrease in the quality of care?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The honourable member will know that at this particular time of the year, during the winter period, many hospitals experience their peak utilization of any point during the year.

Any decision to discharge a patient must be based on medical judgement. Of course, no physician is going to put a person in jeopardy. Likewise, the decision to detain a person in emergency overnight would be based on the best interests of that patient. But I ask the member to recognize that at this time of the year we do face these peaks in utilization that will result in some inconveniences—

Mr. Wildman: What about reserve capacity?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —however, I am confident that the quality of the system is, in fact, being maintained.

MEDICAL SCHOOL ACCESS

Mr. Pope: My question is directed to the Minister of Education and Colleges and Universities. It arises from the Ontario medical school application service instruction booklet for the 1979 entering class, which is a guide for applicants to all medical schools in Ontario.

Of the five schools, three of them have geographical preferences. These preferences are set out in this pamphlet and in their own calendar material. The University of Ottawa openly gives preference to students who reside in the Ottawa-Outaouais area—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Pope: McMaster University gives preference—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Pope: My question is, how long has this open and co-ordinated discrimination existed against otherwise qualified students who reside in Ontario from Barrie to Moosonee and throughout most of eastern Ontario? Will the minister end it? Will the ministry compensate areas which have not

had such favoured status by implementing compensatory geographical weighting factors of its own? Will the minister ascertain, along with the Minister of Health, whether or not these policies have had an effect on the availability of trained medical personnel in northern Ontario, eastern Ontario and central Ontario?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: We will certainly attempt to determine whether, in fact, the policies which are enunciated now in these brochures have had any such effect.

I am aware that the University of Toronto and Queen's University have no specific geographical policy in terms of the regions of Ontario affected.

It is my understanding that the universities, through the council of faculties of medicine, have attempted to ensure that there would be equal access to faculties of medicine for all students within the province by arranging that their catchment areas would be those designated within the document mentioned by my honourable colleague.

The University of Western Ontario specifically serves southwestern Ontario initially, then the remainder of the province. The university at Hamilton, known as McMaster, serves the Hamilton area, specifically, first and then northwestern Ontario. The University of Ottawa specifically serves the Ottawa-Outaouais region, which means, of course, that it is looking specifically as well at some students outside the province of Ontario. The faculties of medicine at the University of Toronto and Queen's University state that they are to serve all of the students within the province of Ontario, with certain provisions made for some students from outside the province of Ontario.

If this in any way has proved to be an inhibition to the possibility of medical education for students from north-central Ontario and northeastern Ontario, we shall most certainly report this to the House. We will undertake that study.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired. I would just like to call members' attention to the fact that we spent 43 minutes today on leaders' questions and supplementaries.

Mr. T. P. Reid: How much on the answers?

Mr. Riddell: Is that the reason I can't get a question on?

Mr. Speaker: That's probably the main reason.

Mr. Eaton: Better get rid of your leader.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FAMILY BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Peterson moved first reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act.

Motion agreed to.

[3:30]

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister is going to support this because it is something we feel very strongly about on this side of the House. It is a bill to provide equal status under the Family Benefits Act for men and for women who are parents of dependent children. We have an anachronistic law now and unfortunately, my bill does not clean up all of the irregularities in the Family Benefits Act by a long shot, Mr. Speaker, but it does go to address a specific one. There are a number of specific cases in this province at this time that need this help and I feel very confident the minister will address his mind to this and will support it because it is just and it is equitable and it is the only fair thing in the circumstances.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Warner moved first reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is one with which the committee agrees unanimously. It is to ensure that a landlord cannot prevent tenants from using a common room in order to meet with political candidates nor their representatives or those who are elected to office. It is introduced—

Mr. Eaton: We already did that in the act, what are you trying to pull?

Mr. Warner: —because the present bill will not be through the House until after the by-elections. We ask that this bill be put on the order paper and dealt with by Friday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(Continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne contained, as we have come

to expect over the last several years, very little of direction, very little that is new, and very little to indicate to us the government has a sense of what's wrong in Ontario and a plan for how to cope with it.

One could, of course, speak at length on a great many issues touching almost every aspect of life in the province and certainly every ministry but surely, in the amount of time that is reasonably at our disposal, the public would be better served and this House would be better served if in reply to the motion and in reply to the speech if we were to focus in greater depth on one or two matters rather than try to cover the broad waterfront of issues that affect us all.

I think the two matters which I would particularly like to share with this House, the matters on which I have some thoughts to present at this time, are fundamentally to do both with the industries upon which we all depend in Ontario; and the second matter, to do with the matter of electrical generation, the situation of Ontario Hydro.

Let us deal first of all with the question of our industrial situation in this province. We know that Ontario is the manufacturing heartland of this country and yet we know also that we have been losing manufacturing jobs in Ontario at an enormous rate. The thousands and thousands of jobs that are leaving Ontario and that are disappearing from the manufacturing sector have been well documented by the Science Council of Canada in recent studies. There seems to have been a kind of de-industrialization, about which I spoke in last year's speech, in similar circumstances to those we find ourselves in today.

This de-industrialization finds us relying more and more, as a nation, on our raw resources and less and less able to compete in the world in the field of high technology manufacturing—any kind of manufacturing for that matter. This is a very disturbing matter for Ontarians in particular, because we are, after all, the province that depends mostly on manufacturing.

It is interesting that as we have been sort of churning through this heavy going on industrial strategy, we have finally come to a real parting of the ways between the government of Ontario and the party which I have the honour to lead. We find two fundamental issues upon which we have very important differences of opinion and of policy. The first has to do with what I call corporate responsibility.

Let me take you back for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the fundamental question of what is a corporation. A corporation is not a per-

son. It should not be regarded as having the human attributes that each person has, each of us sitting here would have, each person going about his daily work would have. A corporation is a device, it is a means to an end; the end, of course, is the more efficient production of goods and services in a society and one hopes, ultimately, their fairer distribution as well.

But the means to the end is, of course, the corporation by which we permit large aggregations of capital to occur with certain protections by law, certain protections with regard to tax, with regard to liability, and we allow these capital aggregations to come together with expertise, with initiative, with labour, to produce goods and services efficiently in a competitive enterprise for the good of society.

Let's remember that. It must be for the good of society, and what we in the Liberal Party have said, for lo, these many years, is that there has to be an element of corporate responsibility, that the notion that corporations are fundamentally out to maximize profits for their shareholders is an accurate statement of how a system works and how, if you will, it is fuelled. That's the motive source but it's not the purpose of the system. The purpose of the system must still be the efficient production of goods and services and their rational and fair distribution in the society.

Mr. Wildman: In order to maximize profits.

Mr. S. Smith: My friends in the NDP feel profit is the end of corporations and I would suspect it is the only goal that would probably be seen by the Conservatives as well, but I don't believe that. I believe the corporation is a device that serves society, and I believe that the seeking of profit, which is an excellent motive, is the motive force which allows corporations to, in fact, produce more and be efficient. If they did not seek profit then there would be no incentive to be efficient.

Having said that corporate responsibility is one of the things that divides the Liberal Party from the Conservative Party in Ontario, I want to expand on that a bit. We see corporate responsibility in a number of areas, but primarily four.

The first is responsibility, of course, to the planet, to the environment. It would be unthinkable that corporations should be allowed to despoil the planet, to render inhospitable the very means of existence, the very surroundings upon which we expect our children and their children to depend for life and for sustenance. So clearly corporations must have environmental responsibility as, for that matter, must all citizens.

Secondly, and this was at issue during our discussion during the question period and the ministerial statements today, there must be a community responsibility on the part of corporations. The tremendous investment which communities must make when corporations locate there are much clearer to see in small towns, in one- or two-industry towns, where, as we all know, the sewers and roads have to be put in, houses have to be built for the workers, schools and playgrounds have to be built for the workers' children, and so on.

We can see very plainly in the one- or two-industry towns the enormous public investment that exists in a corporation. Of course, one can become a little more abstract and refer also to the educational endowment which is given to corporations, inasmuch as the people working there have been educated at the expense of the community. It is not difficult to see.

Sometimes, when you get into larger cities and when the infrastructure seems almost to exist separately from the industrial needs, it is not as easy to see that there is a community investment in each corporation. But there is indeed.

There are times in free enterprise when it is necessary to abandon a factory, when it is necessary even to abandon a whole industry. These are very unfortunate times, but they happen. If you did not have a free enterprise system which permitted this to happen, you would artificially try to keep alive enterprises which in fact were not producing well for society, and no one would be the long-term gainer in that situation.

None the less, there must be an accounting. There must be a way in which the investment of a community in a factory can be calculated and compared to the differences in profit that might accrue by closing down a plant in one place and opening it in another.

To take an extreme example, it would not be sensible to move a plant to make an extra \$1 million for a corporation if it is clearly going to cost society \$50 million to have that move occur. There has to be some kind of an accounting, some way that we rationalize these matters.

We see, therefore, that the time has come to recognize that communities have responsibilities to their corporations; that governments have responsibilities to treat corporations fairly, to recognize how the system works and to help them prosper; but also that corporations have responsibilities to communities. That is a very important matter. When the time comes that a corporation feels it must close a major plant, the day should be over

when it can do that simply as a corporate decision, without any consideration for the community responsibilities which exist.

A third responsibility of corporations must surely be the responsibility to the labour force of the corporation. Over the years I have seen the barricade mentality by which the workers on one side and management on the other view each other with distrust and use whatever kind of protective and offensive devices they seem able to obtain by means of law or by means of persuasion. I find it very sad.

If this country is ever going to survive internationally, particularly in manufacturing—upon which Ontario depends—there is going to have to be a sense of partnership, a sense of mutual loyalty, between corporation management and worker. That is not going to come when corporations feel they can just shut down a plant and ignore the investment which individual working people have made throughout their lives in that corporation and in that plant.

Similarly, it is not going to come if labouring people insist on always being counted out and counted as outsiders when it comes to having to make some tough decisions to keep corporations viable. There must be a sense of mutual involvement. Part of that can be sharing information with the representatives of workers. Part of that can be profit-sharing. Part of that can be share distribution. Part of that can be seats on decision-making boards and so on.

But surely the government ought to start to take some initiative to break down the barriers and to create an atmosphere of more mutual work, rather than antagonistic concern.

[3:45]

The fourth responsibility of corporations, I'm not ashamed to say, must surely be a patriotic responsibility. It must surely be a responsibility to the nation in which the corporation is attempting to prosper. It grieves me to see what has happened in that regard, but I'll have more to say about that in a little while.

I said, at the outset, that there were two very important differences between the Conservative Party of Ontario and the Liberal Party of Ontario. The first is our sense of corporate responsibility. The second is the degree to which we are very deeply worried about, and very determined to do something about, the extent of foreign domination of our economy. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it has never been clearer that there is a very major difference between the government of Ontario and ourselves.

I have made some statements in recent days concerning the need for a code of behaviour for corporations, so that foreign-owned corporations would conduct themselves in a manner conducive to the benefit of Canada and of Ontario. These have been regarded with some derision and some fear on the part of the government, the fear being that—and I quote the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman)—“in the international community, we will not be able to attract more branch plants to Ontario.”

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we do not need to attract more branch plants to Ontario; we need to help the Canadian companies that are struggling here now to get on their feet and become corporate enterprises that can compete in Ontario, in Canada and in the world.

Everyone knows it would make a lot of sense for this country to have a policy of lower interest rates so as to encourage more investment, so as to encourage more renewal of plants, so as to encourage more construction of housing and so on. We all know the benefits lower interest rates would bring; yet we're locked into a situation where we have to have, over and over again, higher interest rates. What is the reason for that?

The reason given by the governor of the Bank of Canada is that our balance of payments deficit is so great that the only way we could keep from having a massive run on the dollar would be to raise our interest rates sufficiently that foreign money, mostly American, would come into the country to take advantage of these high interest rates, and, in coming into the country, would temporarily restore a balance which otherwise runs against this country in terms of our current accounts.

Yet why is money leaving this country so rapidly year by year that we require high interest rates to bring money in to balance that? What is the reason for the outflow of the money in the first place, the outflow that prevents us from having the kind of economic policy that would help us grow?

The reason is not a trade deficit because in trade at the moment we're running a small surplus. Unfortunately we export mostly raw materials and that's not good for the future of the country; but still, it's a small surplus.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There's a slight tourism deficit.

Mr. S. Smith: There's a slight tourism deficit, indeed. There is indeed. People are fond of referring to it; it certainly is a problem, but it's nothing like the real problem—

Mr. Nixon: All those Fort Lauderdale condominiums.

Mr. S. Smith: —which is approximately \$5 billion leaving this country in dividends, interest and service charges, management fees and other service charges, and profits, and going to those who own the bulk of industry but who are not themselves Canadians. That is the main drain on the economy of this country.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are going to end up voting for Joe. You really are.

Mr. Nixon: You may end up voting against him, if you know what's good for you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I read Mel's speech to your convention on the weekend. I said to myself: “The Liberal Party of Ontario now appears to support the Tories federally.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Roy: Not quite.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did you read what he said?

Mr. Roy: The federal Tories have no economic policy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on. It was all directed at the government of Canada.

Mr. Young: Bill, he is just trying to separate himself from the federal Liberals; that's all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: The \$5 billion which is being drained out of this country year by year will increase as each year goes by, so that added billions will be leaving our country. In order to make up for that, we will have to have massive trade surpluses or, of course, continue to increase our interest rates—hurting our economy—to attract more and more short-term or medium-term capital to temporarily balance the flow.

The investment we once needed in this country now has grown to the point where we are being drained daily by our foreign owners. We have come to the sad state of affairs where we must hope to raise our own interest rates high enough that the people to whom we owe all that money will be willing to lend some of it back to us temporarily so we will look okay on the balance sheet for the moment, knowing full well that means we will owe them even more a few years down the road. That is the terrible downward spiral that our country and our province are on.

Ontario, as a manufacturing centre, suffers the most from these high interest rates and from this drain on our economy. Ontario should therefore not be encouraging more branch plants in the province, but should be encouraging Canadian-owned enterprises to grow and to prosper.

These are two very vital differences between the government and the official opposition in Ontario: corporate responsibility and our attitude towards foreign domination of the economy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on. This is 90 per cent of the bailiwick of the government of Canada. It may be the position of the Liberal Party of Ontario, but not of Canada.

Mr. S. Smith: Yesterday I spoke of the need to have a code of corporate behaviour. I was told by the Minister of Industry and Tourism that he would like to see such a code. Such a code, said he, is just some type of silliness which would frighten away foreign investment. Heaven knows, we have enough foreign investment; but he does not want to frighten it away. He feels that kind of code would make us uncompetitive in seeking branch plants—and he likes branch plants.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You don't like branch plants, but I tell you there are a lot of people in Brampton who are delighted to be working at American Motors.

Mr. S. Smith: I will present to you today, Mr. Speaker, that code of behaviour for corporations.

The Premier went to Japan, and he came back terribly enthusiastic because Panasonic, if I remember correctly, was going to assemble a few pieces and possibly put them in a package in Ontario. He thought that was a wonderful thing: "Think of the jobs it would create."

There are all kinds of Ontario industries dying to get the kind of backing and support so that they can go out and make an assault on the markets of the world, and they don't get the support of the Premier. But Panasonic thrilled him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We didn't give them a nickel.

Mr. S. Smith: Unfortunately, he is not ahead of his time; he is well behind the times.

I want to set out today some of the main elements of our approach to economic policy. The first is to reiterate the industrial strategy which our finance critic, the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson), and I have been speaking about for years now, from one end of the province to the other and in the Legislature.

There are nine major points and, at the risk of repeating some of the material that was in Hansard a year ago and two years ago, I am going to underline the nine major points of the industrial strategy which we are recommending.

First of all, we believe there must be, as I was saying earlier, support for Canadian-owned business. We must favour Canadian-owned business. If we are giving out money, it should be to Canadian enterprises. It should be for the clear purpose of making these Canadian enterprises truly competitive and making them the kinds of enterprises that will provide a future for our children. That's the first element.

Secondly, there must be a code of behaviour. If foreign-owned companies are to be part of a general industrial strategy, then they must abide by a code of behaviour in which they act as Canadian companies should act. I'll give an example, Honeywell has discovered and invented in Canada a certain device that has to do with lighting and lighting intensity. They can market that device throughout the world. Their parent company is apparently willing to do the research here, to let them do their own product development and market the product back into the United States and around the world.

If they're willing to do that, then I would feel that they are acting in the Canadian interest with regard to that product. Under such circumstances, I am prepared to treat Honeywell or any other foreign-owned company on the same basis as a Canadian-owned firm. The key element for me is that the foreign-owned company would have to abide by a set of criteria which would indicate that its behaviour would be that of a Canadian-owned corporation. I'll set out these criteria in a moment.

The third aspect of the industrial strategy concerns purchasing policies. The government of Ontario must adopt purchasing policies which are "buy Canadian." I don't simply mean putting up signs saying, "Shop Canadian" or "Turn Over a New Leaf." That's not the issue. The issue is to use the purchasing power of this government, Ontario Hydro, the municipalities, hospitals and school boards to buy Canadian.

Furthermore, we should also use the power we have over large mining corporations and large paper companies to make them buy Canadian pollution control equipment, and to make them buy Canadian in their pulp and paper equipment wherever possible. Give them whatever incentives are required to make them buy Canadian because it's a good deal for us. In fact, the Canadian Science Council recently released a study to indicate that even if the product cost 76 per cent more, it's more

advantageous to the society as a whole to purchase the Canadian product than the foreign-made product. Their figures may be out, but it's obviously a good deal to buy Canadian.

Look for a moment at what we're losing. A billion dollars is going to be spent this year on pulp and paper to renovate old plants and to buy new equipment. Yet about half of that money will go outside the country. Why should we have to import equipment for the forestry industry? Why should we have to import mining equipment, as we now do with regard to almost every large piece of mining equipment, when we used to export on a large scale? What happened to these industries in Ontario? How could the Conservatives for the last 36 years sit back and watch us lose industry after industry in the manufacturing sector in Ontario and still claim to be economic managers? We must purchase in Canada.

Fourthly, our industrial strategy must allow for specialization. We're not going to get anywhere by simply supporting every kind of corporation in every kind of area. We must specialize in those things that we can do well in this country. To begin with, we should choose those for which there is a large domestic market. We're a small country in terms of population but we have a large domestic market in mining, forestry, agriculture, communications and transportation. There are large domestic markets in areas related to energy, to fisheries, to oceanography and to aeronautics. In areas such as those, we must focus our strategy.

Fifthly, there is research and development. We must protect a certain portion of our home market for labour-intensive industry. But in terms of world competition the Third World will almost always be able to beat us in a labour-intensive sector. What we must concentrate on is technology-intensive industry. That means a vast increase in research and development. That is where we should be putting government money. We must bring together the universities, the research establishments and the large companies with the potential suppliers to those large companies. Bring together Inco with the pollution control manufacturers. Bring together Texasgulf with the mining-machinery maker. Bring the universities in so they can do their research the way that fits our industrial strategy.

[4:00]

Sixthly, we have education and manpower planning. There is no point getting into manufacturing if we don't have the people to do it. What an abject failure of the system

of education in Ontario it is that even for the manufacturing jobs that are available today there aren't the people available to fill those jobs, while hundreds of thousands of people are without work in Ontario. What an ironic tribute to the man who is now Premier and was Minister of Education that the education system that has cost us billions and billions of dollars has not prepared the people for the jobs that we knew perfectly well would exist. That's what has happened.

We have spoken about apprenticeship. We've spoken about on-the-job training. We've spoken about the need for skilled trades and the need for polytechnic education where one can have a job-oriented education at the same time one is getting a good, reasonable, liberal arts type of education. What's happened? We have one polytechnic in Ontario at a time when high-technology industries should be our salvation. We have one polytechnic at Ryerson. It is now seriously threatened in terms of its financial viability by the shortsightedness of the Davis government.

The seventh point has to do with financing. We must have a program that encourages our financial institutions to lend money to small and medium-sized Canadian enterprises. I hear so many times about the Canadian company that gets a loan to start up a business of \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$25,000. They work really hard at it. They finally develop a business, refine a product line, start to make contacts, get the feel of where they're going and see an opportunity for their product. Then they go back to the bank and say: "I've got to get into production. I need \$150,000 or \$250,000."

The bank says: "My goodness, you already owe so much, and you don't have much in the way of assets that you can borrow against. Really, you don't have a track record. Frankly, what have you ever done? You don't have a great record of achievement, and that's a pretty risky thing. I'll tell you what, my friend, why don't you get some managerial expertise?" For which we may read, get an American buyer.

He comes back with a big American purchaser—sometimes a Canadian purchaser, but more often an American—who is willing to guarantee the loan. The loan is given to the American company, using Canadian money to buy out the Canadian company, so that this guy can finally get into production. At that point, if anything good comes of the product, it's taken back home by the American company and further developed in the American home industry. That has happened

time and time again. That is the story of industrial development in Ontario.

The province of Ontario has not so much as lifted one finger to do anything to get the financial institutions of this province to start to favour the new enterprises that are Canadian—

Mr. Cassidy: How about the federal Liberals who revised the Bank Act?

Mr. Bounsall: That's the Liberals' fault.

Mr. S. Smith: —and the small and medium-sized Canadian enterprises. They have done absolutely zero. They have not so much as spoken to the financial institutions about it, let alone introduce tax changes or other changes that might have encouraged the banks and trust companies to start to take a different attitude towards emerging Canadian businesses.

Mr. Cassidy: Why don't you confront the Liberals up in Ottawa?

Mr. Eaton: They are the ones who control the Bank Act.

Mr. S. Smith: The eighth point has to do with an attitude—

Mr. M. N. Davison: Why leave the seventh point so quickly?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, you were doing so well.

Mr. Kerrio: My God, they are awake.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are not many of them but they are at least awake.

Mr. Watson: Seven is a lucky number.

An hon. member: Who wants to talk to Jack Horner?

Mr. Eaton: Some of your pals are falling asleep back there.

Mr. S. Smith: I take it that the members of the other two parties have detected that there's a certain difference between the policy I'm putting forward and the policy that has been adopted by successive federal governments over the years. They're quite right. There is, in fact, a difference. There is no doubt that the comments I've made about foreign domination of the economy represent a certain difference, but they most certainly also represent a very severe difference that we have with the government of Ontario.

There were the comments of the Minister of Industry and Tourism who was worried about whether or not the international investment community would take offence at a code of corporate ethics and perhaps not locate branch plants here. He expressed that worry only yesterday. There is a very severe difference between us.

If I may get to the eighth point in our industrial strategy—and this point is a little

less easy for us to deal with in government—it has to do with the attitude of Canadians.

Nothing got me angrier in the last little while than the fact that, one week after the United States recognized the People's Republic of China, they had Coca-Cola trucks there; they had an agreement to put in satellites and to teach them how to open up educational television channels.

What have we managed to do with China in the eight years since we recognized them? Sell them wheat. It would take a pretty inept individual to be unable to sell wheat to a hungry person.

What have we done? What has the government of Ontario done in its Ministry of Industry and Tourism? What has happened? Why could we not be opening up educational television channels in China? We have the expertise; we have trained teachers looking for things to do because of declining enrolment. We have lots of things we could have been selling to China, but we have not been doing it.

We have not been aggressive enough. It did not take the Americans a week before they were in there with all their products. They will have a McDonald's in China pretty soon.

In Ontario, we are somehow just not in the game. A lot of that is attitude.

Maybe some of it is a reflection of a school system that has downgraded the idea of competition and produces people who think of themselves mainly as having a future working for large corporations, government, and service industries, rather than as entrepreneurs. Even our business schools hardly ever produce entrepreneurs in this province and in this country.

We could see this happening to us, and yet in our educational system we have done pitifully little in Ontario. We have not given guidance to people to lead them into entrepreneurial and aggressive, competitive kinds of occupations. We have been quite content to sit and bask in the enjoyment of this beautiful province without ever thinking about the future.

The ninth point has to do with labour-management relations. As I have said earlier, we have to change our system of labour relations. Employees have to be brought in so that they truly understand the financial position of the company they are working for. We cannot expect unions to settle for low wage increases on the basis that the company needs to be competitive, if the union members do not believe what the company is telling them and if the union members

have never had the opportunity to be given reason to believe what they are being told. Unions should have a stake. Workers should be represented; they should have access to genuine information.

We should all be getting away from the barricades which, as I said earlier, have operated in the labour-management field. Neither unions nor management wish to do this. Many of the unions say they will be co-opted; they would rather be on the outside and fighting. Many management people say they do not want union people messing about with the decision-making of a company.

Today there is even an editorial in the *Spectator* saying that such a suggestion that working people might actually have a say in the affairs of a company is tantamount to socialism. In fact, they say I should apologize to the leader of the third party for stealing what they consider to be his ground.

Mr. Cassidy: When you come to the crunch, you never stand with the workers; everybody knows that.

Mr. S. Smith: There. You have just heard from the leader of the NDP—did you hear that?—if it comes to the crunch, will you stand with the workers? The old barricade mentality. Neither of the other parties and neither management nor labour seems to understand that we have to get away from the polarization; we have got to get away from the barricades. We are all in the same boat, and it is about time we started working together.

Government could give incentives to those companies that have share distribution plans, that have profit-sharing, that involve their workers in decision-making. There are things government can do in this regard.

That represents the nine points of industrial strategy which I am happy to share with the members of this House.

I promised the Minister of Industry and Tourism that I would present a code of corporate behaviour for foreign-controlled firms operating in Ontario. What I am putting before the Legislature is not intended to be a fully comprehensive code, but rather a framework in which such a code can and should be developed. The code would include at least the following components:

First of all, subsidiaries of foreign multinational corporations should at the minimum undertake research and development activities in Ontario in industries where the Canadian domestic market is large enough to justify such operations. I give as an example electrical generation, which of course we are talk-

ing about in Hamilton. Subsidiaries must be permitted to design, develop and market new products rather than only market existing products which involve no innovative research and development. That is the first sentence I would have in a code of corporate behaviour for foreign-owned corporations.

Secondly, subsidiaries should be permitted by the parent corporation to buy component parts and services under the most competitive market conditions, rather than being locked into mandatory purchasing agreements with the parent corporation. Frequently the subsidiary in Canada simply acts as a customer for the parts, components, design, services and management that are so-called expertise that it has to buy from its parent company. If the parts and components are available elsewhere, the company in Canada should not have to send large sums of money across the border unnecessarily; it should be able to buy at the most competitive price and value situation.

Thirdly, subsidiaries should be in a position to allow products developed in Ontario to be exported freely to all international markets, including the domestic market of the parent corporation. We shouldn't just have companies interested in putting things out in a mediocre way for the domestic market. If they have the talent, if they have developed the products, they should be free to market these things on behalf of Canada, for the good of Ontario, elsewhere in the world including the home market of their parent company.

Fourthly, subsidiaries should ensure that Canadians form a majority on their boards of directors.

Fifthly, subsidiaries should be prepared to plough back profits into their Canadian operations in order to assist their growth and development.

There are two additional conditions that are part of this corporate code of behaviour which would apply to foreign-controlled and Canadian corporations alike. Firstly, corporations should acknowledge their responsibility to the communities in which they are located, and recognize that those communities have a vested interest in those factories and plants that cannot be moved or shut down with impunity. I spoke about that at the beginning of my response to the speech from the throne when I started earlier this afternoon.

Secondly, corporations should also acknowledge their responsibility to their work forces. Corporations contemplating disruptions to their work forces should be obliged to discuss any changes with their workers. They

should not be allowed simply to announce layoffs or cutbacks, even in accordance with the law, and assume no responsibility for the impact of their decision.

Those seven points—five that apply particularly to foreign-owned corporations and two that apply to both kinds of corporations, foreign-owned and Canadian—represent for me the outline of a code of corporate behaviour, something the Minister of Industry and Tourism may scoff at but which I say is long overdue in Ontario.

All of the components I have outlined and possibly others could be worked out in consultation with labour and business leaders to ensure an environment is created that will provide the greatest benefit to the economy of this province.

Compliance with this code of corporate behaviour would be sought first through the use of moral suasion. I hope most foreign-owned corporations in Ontario have a large enough stake in this province to want to fulfil their role as good corporate citizens.

However, secondly, the government of Ontario must have a meaningful buy-Canadian policy. Non-Canadian firms would only be eligible under this policy if they demonstrated their willingness to behave like Canadian companies. In other words, if a company failed to adopt the corporate code I am recommending, then the government would not give it the favourable treatment it ought to be according to Canadian corporations, and which it would accord to such corporations under the industrial strategy I outlined a little earlier.

[4:15]

If the foreign-owned corporations are to participate in any of the benefits—any of the investment changes, any of the tax changes, any of the purchasing policies—then they will have to abide by the corporate code of behaviour. That is reasonable.

After so many years as a client state, surely the time has come for this country and this province to stand on their own feet and say to these people, who seem to own so much of our industry, particularly in manufacturing, "Look, we appreciate that you came in with your capital when we needed it. Now we want to work together. But we want you to act like good corporate citizens of this country and to take your responsibilities very seriously, indeed."

Mr. Nixon: Come on, Jim, you agree with that.

Mr. S. Smith: An economic strategy for Ontario must be based, of course, on good government management—

Mr. M. N. Davison: What happens when they ignore your code?

Mr. S. Smith: —of those economic and industrial resources under its direct control.

Mr. M. N. Davison: What happens when they ignore the code, Stuart?

Mr. S. Smith: I am being asked a question, Mr. Speaker, by one of the members of the third party. He wants to know what happens if they ignore the code. Basically, I thought I answered that question. But, for his edification and clarification, and because I appreciate his interest, I will simply say this: If they ignore the code, they carry on doing business, but they cannot get any of the benefits I am suggesting will accrue to Canadian-owned corporations as a result of a "buy-Canadian" policy. They cannot get any of the benefits in financing which will accrue as a consequence of our policies. They would not get any outright grants or any particularly favourable loans from the government of the province—

Mr. Watson: The Liberals would cut them out of the ballpark.

Mr. S. Smith: —they would, in fact, continue to do business as it is everyone's freedom and right to do; but they will, in fact—

Mr. M. N. Davison: Larry Grossman has nothing to worry about, then. That's not going to scare anyone.

Mr. S. Smith: —they will in fact not get the benefits that I have outlined.

The member says the Minister of Industry and Tourism will have nothing to worry about. He is quite right. Since there is no policy in the government of Ontario to favour Canadian businesses, there is no reason in the world why a multinational branch plant should have to worry about the government's opinion of it. But, once you have a proper "buy Canadian," "favour Canadian," "support Canadian" industry policy, it becomes meaningful to be classified with those particular corporations. Then, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the branch plants will be happy to respond to a proper code of behaviour. If they do not do so, they are on their own. They can expect nothing in the way of special treatment that the government will offer Canadian enterprise.

I think I have shown sufficient respect in taking a little time to answer the member's question. I hope members will permit me to continue my remarks, because I want to move on to another topic.

As I say, an economic strategy for Ontario has to be based on good government management of those economic and industrial resources under its direct control. It is counter-

productive, to say the least, to try to excite and influence the private sector of the economy into certain directions if, in the public sector, the government is stumbling in the opposite direction.

As I have already indicated, the most important economic resource under the government's direct control is tax and fiscal policy. Eighteen per cent of Ontario's gross provincial product is controlled by the Premier, Treasurer and cabinet of this province. Their record, of course, is one of gross overspending in relation to revenues, and a tremendous year-over-year building up of provincial debt. It would be absurd to expect the Ontario economy to be more efficient, to be more competitive, to be more investment-oriented, to be less inflationary, as long as the government of Ontario continues to drown it in red ink.

The practice, if not the policy, of the Davis administration has been to throw life preservers with one hand while pushing us under with the other. We have had countless protestations of reform and improvement but, every year, after the propaganda fog lifts, we see that the ocean of red ink is larger than ever.

Now we have a new Treasurer and his first major initiative is to throw a \$100-million lifeline to the pulp and paper industry, an industry which, with rare exception, is enjoying good cash flow and profits, paying high dividends, and complaining that it cannot afford to modernize, to clean up its pollution and increase its productivity for the future. However, one should not, perhaps, be too harsh towards the pulp and paper industry. After all, it is only emulating the government of Ontario.

So much for the tax and fiscal policy necessary for a sound economic strategy. Let me turn now to the most important industrial resource under the government's direct control, namely Ontario Hydro. No doubt about it, Hydro is big. One wonders sometimes if it is not bigger than the government itself. It is the second largest electrical utility in the western world. Its growth, evolution and success since 1906 have been a major reason for the economic development of this province. When the Premier and his colleagues thank divine providence and themselves, not necessarily in that order, for the miracles that have been wrought over the past 50 years, they might acknowledge the fortuitous presence of Niagara Falls.

It is precisely because Hydro's success is essential to the further development of Ontario that we on this side of the House have been concerned to know what has gone wrong

with Hydro and the government's control over Hydro during the past 10 years. For something seriously has gone wrong and must be put right. It is no happenstance that a select committee of this Legislature has been exhaustively investigating Hydro's affairs over the past five years—perhaps one should say seven years, to include the Moog matter. It will no doubt be emerging from its mountain of evidence and documentation with some distilled view on what is wrong and what should be done about it. While we in the official opposition have come to some general conclusions, we await with interest the recommendations of the select committee.

Perhaps, however, I can give the House and the government some indication of how we view the problem. In that regard I can do no better than to cite some documents our research department found in our own mountain of Hydro material. These documents are rather old and I cannot say how we came by them. Presumably they arrived in one of the brown paper envelopes an opposition party receives from time to time.

The first document is apparently known somewhat notoriously within Hydro and the Ministry of Energy as "the Leighton letter." It is dated November 9, 1970, and it was written to the then Premier John P. Robarts by A. J. G. Leighton, president of Resources Engineering of Canada Limited. Mr. Leighton was a consulting engineer whose career included work with Ontario Hydro. He had become convinced of the need for a provincially-appointed public utilities review and licensing board charged with the responsibility of studying all plans for the proposed construction of major electrical generating stations and of holding public hearings in order to receive briefs.

His letter to Premier Robarts was a suggestion that the Ontario government pursue such a policy. I might say parenthetically that one can see in Mr. Leighton's argument the germ of new policy which eventually manifested itself in the Environmental Assessment Board.

Premier Robarts thought well of the idea—would that we had his leadership today—and forwarded Mr. Leighton's letter to the then Minister of Energy and Resources, the member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr), and to the then chairman of Ontario Hydro, George Gathercole, with the suggestion that it merited "very full attention." That's the quotation from Mr. Robarts.

I do not know what the minister thought of it, which is hardly surprising, nor do I know except by inference what Mr. Gather-

cole thought of it. All we got in our brown paper envelope was a copy of a memorandum to Mr. Gathercole from Douglas Gordon, then general manager of Hydro, and a copy of a draft reply to Premier Robarts prepared by Mr. Gordon for Mr. Gathercole's signature. The memorandum is brief and I shall read it to the House.

It is dated December 1, 1970, and reads: "Last Friday, I suggested that we should forward our views on the Leighton letter to the Prime Minister and the honourable George Kerr. Attached is a suggested draft. I have tried to lay it on the line because we've 'had it' if the government thinks like Leighton."

The draft letter is rather long and I shall quote only the relevant portion. Mr. Gordon proposed that Premier Robarts be told—and I quote: "There is one thing absolutely certain about Mr. Leighton's approach. To follow it would result in brownouts and blackouts in Ontario within the next 10 to 15 years, a situation which currently exists in certain areas of the United States."

I still quote from the letter: "Having let off steam, let me say that I am concerned, as I am sure you are concerned, with the problems of communication which continue to persist on Hydro matters; the changes which have taken place in the political, social and informational environment as to obscure the essentiality and achievements of Hydro, things which were a source of pride in the past. The pride which we once enjoyed in our achievement now seems to generate a negative response on the part of almost everyone, an attitude which apparently has its roots in increasing resentment and misunderstanding of our size and complexity and what we must do to continue to provide our vital service."

"There is an urgent need for Hydro and government to find a means of re-asserting the fact that Hydro expansion is absolutely vital to this province. Furthermore, we must communicate the fact that the driving force behind Hydro's growth is the economy. Slow down the economy and you slow down Hydro; the converse is also true."

Doesn't it remind you of, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country"? I'm continuing to read from the letter. I'm continuing to quote, Mr. Speaker.

"There may be some merit in having an outside body hopefully validate the objectives, policies and practices of Ontario Hydro to the satisfaction of our detractors, but we should avoid at all cost the establishment of a body to provide, as Mr. Leighton suggests, a forum to challenge every move by Ontario Hydro."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know, as I say, if this letter was ever sent. It really doesn't matter. My point in citing it is to show that the Hydro problem has been with us for a long time. Here, in a few paragraphs written in 1970 by the man who was and remains the chief bureaucrat of Hydro—a paragraph intended for the Premier of the province—are all the symptoms of Hydro paranoia which we have come to know so well: the sense of persecution; the sensitivity to criticism, real or inferred; the dedication to ever-expanding power and more power; the conviction that only Hydro knows best; the autocratic belief that what is good for Hydro is good for Ontario; and, of course, the ever-present threat that if Hydro is hamstrung in fulfilling its manifest destiny, then the lights will surely go out a few years down the road.

Well, those words, those threats of brownouts and blackouts, were written almost 10 years ago. Certainly, Hydro has been hamstrung in fulfilling its manifest destiny in all sorts of ways in recent years, although, perhaps, not in quite the ways Mr. Leighton had in mind. If there's one thing that's absolutely certain today and for the next 10 years at least, it is that there is no need for the lights to go out in Ontario because of an inability to generate sufficient electrical power.

We have, Mr. Speaker, at this moment in Ontario, an installed generating capacity of 24,500 megawatts. That is 20 per cent over and above what is needed, even after allowing for a 25 per cent safety margin above peak demand. The excess capacity amounts to 4,036 megawatts which is 38 per cent of the 10,705 megawatts added to the system between the end of 1971 and the end of last year. This situation of growth over supply is not a temporary one. It will last until 1990, 12 years away. It will only disappear then if drastic stretch outs, deferrals and, no doubt, cancellations, are effected for further expansion projects now committed or planned for the next decade.

Mr. J. Reed: The biggest mistake in the history of the province of Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: The cost of this excess generating capacity is enormous and staggering and I shall have more to say about that in a moment.

Let me first examine how the problem developed and how it was allowed to develop. The easiest and most convenient explanation, certainly from the government's point of view, is to say that the problem exists because Hydro made an understandable mistake in

its load forecast. That is to say, it over-estimated what the future consumption of electricity in Ontario would be.

These load forecasts, made at the beginning of each year for 10 years ahead, were consistently at the rate of seven per cent annual increment. The first departure from this magic figure occurred in 1977 when Hydro estimated the demand over the ensuing 10 years would increase at the rate of 6.5 per cent per year. The 1978 forecast was for 5.5 per cent; and the 1979 prediction for the next 10 years, issued a month ago, is for 4.7 per cent. It is, as I shall show, probably still too high.

[4:30]

The importance of these load forecasts is that they become the basis, the justification, and the rationale for the building of additional generating capacity, not just in the form of additional generating plants, but in the form of additional and larger transmission lines, of more transformers and switching stations, and of more administration and system infrastructure. After all, a generating station without wires hooking it into the system is a rather useless thing.

Thus, the reason we have an installed generating capacity of 24,500 megawatts today, which is 4,000 more than we need, is that Hydro estimated in 1969 that electrical demand would increase at the rate of seven per cent per year for the period 1969 to 1978, and built accordingly. In effect, it concluded that the installed capacity which existed in 1969 would have to be doubled by the end of 1978. I should, perhaps, add that the installed capacity is not quite as high as the original target because the building program has been stretched out and curtailed in recent years for a variety of reasons, one of which was that Hydro finally realized about a year or so ago that its load forecasting and expansion program are grossly over-ambitious.

How and why did this colossal mistake occur? The whole incredible story may be found if one looks hard enough for it in the mountain of evidence being piled up by the select committee on Hydro affairs. I shall attempt to cover only the salient points here.

Let me at the outset reject entirely the contention, so avidly seized on by the government, that forecasting is a seat of the pants, by guess and by God operation in which mistakes are bound to occur. Let me also reject the simpleton argument so frequently advanced by the Premier that forecasting is an esoteric, complicated business which the inept layman cannot be expected to understand.

There is nothing mysterious about linear regression analysis, to give forecasting its technical name. The statistical principles on which it is based have been known for a long, long time, and the mathematical formulae which it employs are well established. All one needs is a person trained in that branch of mathematics known as statistics and a computer to speed up the calculations. Indeed, for the more rudimentary calculations, all one needs is one of the more sophisticated pocket calculators available on the market.

Forecasting can be as simple or as complex as one wants it to be, depending on the assumptions made and the importance of the results obtained. One can, for example, assemble the peak consumption of electricity in Ontario each year for, let's say the past 10 years, correlate such data in a computer or calculator and obtain a prediction for the consumption of electricity for the current year or, indeed, for any year in the future.

One can also obtain a measurement of deviation or variance from this prediction so that one can say with a remarkably high degree of probability of being correct that the consumption of electricity in any given future year will fall within a certain range. That range will be entirely accurate and confirmed by experience as long as the assumption on which it is based remains valid, namely, that the pattern of electrical energy consumption in the past will continue into the future. That would be forecasting at its most basic level.

A more sophisticated and useful approach would be to explain the consumption of electricity in the past in terms of various factors, so that a change in these variables will produce a change in predictions for the future.

Here, one definitely needs a computer to do the mathematics, but, once again, there's nothing esoteric about it. Common sense, for example, suggests there may be a positive relationship between the consumption of electricity and the population of Ontario; between consumption and the rate of family formation; and between consumption and the number of children in classrooms. Common sense suggests there may be a negative relationship between the consumption of electricity and the price of electricity, because after all, the more expensive electricity is, the less consumers may be inclined to use it.

In fact, the list of possible variables is endless. By testing them against the recent past one can arrive at a set of variables which account for the consumption of elec-

tricity to a remarkable degree of completeness, and which permit the prediction with a very high degree of probability that a change in one or more variables will produce a certain change in the consumption of electricity.

It may be said this more complex approach to forecasting does not get us very far because you're still left with guessing how the variables may change. That is not how it works, Mr. Speaker. The correct technique is to arrive at variables with adequate lead time so that the time of their impact on the economy may be guessed at with reasonable precision.

Thus, we know when a change in the birth rate will show up in the number of children attending school. We know a new steel mill is not built overnight and a Toronto Dominion Centre is not built in a year. We have a very good idea as to when new commercial and industrial development will be coming on stream. All these things can be measured as to their effect on the future consumption of electricity, at least within the 10-year lead time Hydro needs for major generating projects.

What then was the quality of the forecasting done at Ontario Hydro? Incredible as it may seem, only the most recent forecast—the 4.74 per cent forecast for the next 10 years issued a month ago—employed sophisticated statistical analysis. It is only in the past year or so that Hydro has had an econometric model of the economy capable of making such an analysis. All the previous forecasts were based on the crude and elementary projection of past experience, the illogic being that since the consumption of electricity increased at a certain rate in the past it will increase at the same rate in the future.

Honourable members who do not sit on the select committee on Hydro may suspect that I'm exaggerating. Let me, therefore, refer them to the testimony of L.T. Higgins, Hydro's chief forecaster. It may be found in the transcript of the committee's proceedings of February 28. Mr. Higgins, I have said, now uses a more sophisticated approach. He now uses seven variables in his equation to reach a prediction of future demand. Not one of them is directly related to the population factor. Instead, Mr. Higgins uses employment as a variable to capture changes in the population.

Employment, as every economist knows, is primarily a function of economic condition, not of population change, but perhaps it doesn't matter because the load forecast

predicted by Mr. Higgins' new approach apparently doesn't matter either. That forecast, the first one done by his econometric model, came up with a prediction of an annual increase of 2.6 per cent over the next 10 years. Mr. Higgins put it up to 4.7 per cent as an arbitrary judgement call, simply because he didn't think 2.6 per cent would be right. He didn't just select a high degree of variance from the forecast of 2.6 per cent; he simply decided that the demand for electricity in the 1980s will be 80 per cent higher than the figure produced by his statistical analysis because he didn't believe what his computer was telling him.

Again, I refer honourable members to the select committee's transcript of February 28 if they feel, as I'm sure some do, that I may not be recounting Mr. Higgins' position correctly. On page HA-1220-2, they will find him saying: "I have some quite strong views about the presentation of models. I have some quite strong reservations as to how good or bad they are, and I make no apologies for making judgements."

In short, it is Alice in Wonderland. For years, Hydro based its load forecasts on a method and a reasoning that offends common sense. Then, when it has finally developed techniques more or less adequate to the task, it refuses to believe the results. Why? Surely the explanation is obvious, however unpleasant. It is that Hydro is not serious about load forecasting. It has never been serious about it. It does not want to make the best and most accurate prediction it can about the future demand for electricity. It wants, rather, to make the highest prediction it can in order to expand as much as it can.

If this sounds extreme, I invite honourable members to consider the statement issued last week by the chairman of the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning. The commission is holding hearings on the need for bulk power facilities in southwestern Ontario and, to that end, had asked Hydro for in-depth information on several factors which, in the commission's view, would be important determinants of the electrical load growth in that part of the province. Specifically, the commission wanted Hydro's analysis of population growth, housing starts, the electrical needs of industry and agriculture with special reference to new industries, and the additional electrical needs of the commercial sector. Honourable members will recall that all this would fall within what I have called the common-sense approach to load forecasting.

I quote from Dr. Porter's statement: "We concluded that the information supplied by Ontario Hydro was inadequate for our purposes on several grounds, not least because it was extremely difficult to understand, even by a former professor of electrical engineering. This view was fully endorsed by several outside consultants."

May I say parenthetically that I am sure Professor Porter has the sympathy of the members of the select committee on Hydro affairs.

The Porter commission then prepared a comprehensive set of questions for Hydro to answer. I quote from page three of Chairman Porter's statement: "Unfortunately, although the replies to the majority of the questions assist in clarifying the original submission, the reply to what the commission regards as the central question is not satisfactory."

The central question was whether Hydro uses population growth rates, housing starts and so on in its forecasting process, and if so, whether Hydro could provide such estimates to the commission. That is a reasonable question. On what does Hydro base these forecasts? Do they use housing starts and population growth, and if they do and other such reasonable estimates, would they put those assumptions in front of the chairman so he could understand them?

The chairman concluded as follows, and I quote what Chairman Porter said: "Estimates of such factors and their relationship to electrical growth represent the type of information—" Excuse me. It seems important to understand this correctly.

The chairman felt that Hydro's response was simply not satisfactory with regard to the central question and here is what Hydro's response was. The question was a simple one. What do you base it on? Do you have the estimates of housing starts, population growth and so on? Could you give them to us?

Here is what Hydro said:

"Estimates of such factors and their relationship to electrical growth represent the type of information which is useful when an end-use or explanatory approach is being used in forecasting. This has not been the approach taken by Ontario Hydro, with the result that the data gathered for Ontario Hydro's load forecasting is not of this type and has not been organized in this way.

"However, the load forecasting methodology used by Ontario Hydro does rely heavily on estimates of local load growth provided by Hydro's wholesale customers,

the municipal utilities, by direct industrial customers and by Ontario Hydro's regional offices for retail areas services directly by Ontario Hydro. Embedded in these estimates are judgements based on first-hand knowledge of the demand for electricity and local activities, factors or trends which will change these demands.

"During its participation in the regional hearings, it is intended that Ontario Hydro's regional personnel will be presenting for discussion with the commission the local information which appears most pertinent to load growth in certain key areas in southwestern Ontario."

What does that mean? They are saying they don't base their load forecasting on such reasonable factors as housing starts, population growth, family formation—none of those things. They base it on what their customers tell them they think they might need as years go by.

When one analyses that response it means simply that Hydro estimates the future demand for electricity in Ontario by asking its own people, the municipal hydro utilities and so on, by asking itself. It means that Hydro knows best.

In short, Hydro supplies what Hydro demands. If we search for the reason, I suggest it is because there has developed within Hydro, over the years, a messianic complex to save Ontario.

The House will remember what Douglas Gordon proposed to tell Premier Robarts in 1970: "There is an urgent need for Hydro and government to find a means of reasserting the fact that Hydro expansion is absolutely vital to this province. Furthermore, we must communicate the fact that the driving force behind Hydro's growth is the economy. Slow down the economy and you slow down Hydro. The converse is also true."

"The converse is also true." I invite honourable members to consider the implications of the comment. There is a certain credibility to it. No one can deny that Hydro is a colossus. It buys hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery, equipment and supplies every year. Directly and indirectly it employs thousands upon thousands of workers. It borrows billions of dollars on the credit of the province. It is not too much to say that the fate of the Canadian nuclear industry rests in its hands.

Hydro is indeed very big, very powerful. The converse is not automatically true. What is good for Hydro is not necessarily good for Ontario because we cannot afford the cost and

economic waste of having a state within a state.

[4:45]

Mr. Kerrio: Created a monster.

Mr. S. Smith: I say "economic waste" advisedly. The cost of overexpanding our electrical empire, which this government accepted, condoned and is now championing, today stands at over \$2 billion. In five years time, even with further deferrals and cutbacks, it will reach \$5 billion. This money has been raised and will have to be raised by issuing Hydro bonds. The interest cost today is of the order of \$200 million a year. In five years it will be \$500 million a year. When the bonds mature their face value will have to be rolled over by the issuance of new debt and the payment of further interest charges. No one can say precisely when, if ever, the cost of this colossal mismanagement will be liquidated and disappear from Hydro financing and from the Ontario economy.

All one can say is that the economy and the electrical consumers of Ontario have been saddled with a bill that will total billions of dollars—I repeat, billions—at the end of the road. Needless to say, the Premier and his colleagues are not admitting to that kind of blunder. They have made a virtue of necessity and are contending that two much electrical power is good for us. It is even somehow a strategic answer to the ayatollah of Iran. Besides they say it is just a "temporary" surplus of generating capacity, to quote the Treasurer, which will only cost Ontario households a few cents a day.

I must confess that I am intrigued by this strategic conflict between the Premier of Ontario and the ayatollah of Iran. I shall have something more to say about it in a moment. Let me first however, deal with this temporary surplus which is only costing us a few cents a day. The Treasurer, standing in for the Minister of Energy who was understandably absent, told the Ontario Municipal Electrical Association and the Association of Municipal Electric Utilities last week of the wonderful "security" which comes from having so much excess generating capacity, which will cost a \$100 million a year or about three cents a day for the typical residential customer in the province. He didn't say how long this \$100 million a year or three cents a day would have to be paid, but a close reading of his remarks reveals an admission that the temporary surplus will last until 1990. I trust the Premier will point that out to the ayatollah of Iran because I think the ayatollah should understand that we are protected from him for a very long time to come.

Mr. Breithaupt: An embarrassment of riches.

Mr. S. Smith: Meanwhile, back to the Treasurer and his \$100 million a year or three cents a day. Even for a government notorious for its fun with figures, even a government whose Premier didn't even know what the provincial debt was and had the nerve to criticize the opposition for telling him what the provincial debt was, even for that kind of a government and recognizing that a \$100 million a year would be cost enough, this particular figure is so blatant in its deception and hypocrisy that I'm forced to challenge it.

I do not mean merely to show that the true cost is much higher, but primarily because it provides an insight into the political problem which this Legislature faces. The Treasurer's three cents a day for a typical residential customer is simply the bottom line summary of an analysis presented by Hydro to the select committee on Hydro affairs. The analysis will be found on page 9(a) of Exhibit D-89 in the committee's record. I invite honourable members to study it carefully. The first thing they may note is that it identifies Hydro's current excess capacity to be 3,400 megawatts and they may remember I have said it is 4,036 megawatts, a rather significant difference.

My research people arrived at 4,036 megawatts by reference to information supplied by Hydro too. They obtained the current installed capacity, they obtained the peak demand this winter, they added 25 per cent reserve margin to the peak demand and they deducted the total from the installed capacity to get an excess capacity of 4,036 megawatts.

All these terms and concepts have been standard in Hydro operations for years. But when we examine Hydro's own analysis of its excess capacity, what do we find? We do not find a figure for peak demand this winter, we find a figure for something called "firm peak load." It just happens to be some 500 megawatts lower than the consumption which was actually experienced. We do not find a figure for installed capacity. We find rather a figure for something called "actual capacity." It just happens to be 1,200 megawatts less than installed capacity. Presumably there is installed capacity which is not actual—which does not exist. Perhaps then the Treasurer will assure us that, having installed it, we don't have to pay for it because it's not really there.

The member for Prince Edward-Lennox (J. A. Taylor) has a great look of relief on his face that he doesn't have to cope with Hydro when it tells him installed capacity and

actual capacity are different, even though we've got to pay the shot for the installed capacity.

Mr. Nixon: He holds Hydro bonds. That's why he's so relieved.

Mrs. Campbell: In trust.

Mr. S. Smith: By introducing new nomenclature, Hydro is able to get its excess capacity down to 3,400 megawatts, which is bad enough one may say, but hear the rest of it. Hydro then proceeds in Exhibit D-89 to estimate the cost of its excess capacity by assuming that if it had estimated current demand correctly back at the turn of the decade, it would never have built the last four units of the Nanticoke generating station.

As honourable members know, Nanticoke is a coal-fired station with lower capital cost than a nuclear station. There is, I believe, a Hydro exhibit somewhere in the select committee's record in which this cost analysis is worked out on the assumption of not having built the Bruce A nuclear station, but the end result was too costly for Hydro's taste and Nanticoke was substituting what we might call the authorized and cheaper version.

According to Exhibit D-89, the last four units of Nanticoke have a capacity of 2,100 megawatts and cost \$391 million to install. Therefore—and this is Hydro's logic, not mine—3,400 megawatts of excess capacity have cost about \$635 million. The interest, depreciation and overhead on this capital cost comes to \$101 million per year which the Treasurer has reduced, no doubt for the sake of simplicity, to \$100 million a year.

Hydro sold 9.9 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity last year, so this cost of \$100 million a year applied to last year's sales comes to 1.12 mills per kilowatt-hour. Since the typical residential user consumes about 9,600 kilowatt-hours a year his extra cost is about \$10.80 per year, or about 90 cents per month, or about three cents per day. That's what Hydro says. Even if one believed that the cost of Hydro's overexpansion is \$100 million a year, that three cents a day would represent only the residential share of the burden.

Residential sales accounted for only 26 per cent of all Hydro's sales in Ontario last year. Who then is going to pay for the remaining 74 per cent, which comes to \$74 million a year, if the total cost of \$100 million is accepted? The Treasurer didn't mention that in his speech last week. Somehow the Premier forgot about it too when he was so anxious to have the House and the voters understand that protecting us from the ayatollah would only cost "some cents per week." Obviously,

the industries, the businesses and the farms of Ontario will have to pay the \$74 million per year. Perhaps some of them will be forced to absorb it in their costs of production, in which case the Treasurer may be able to inform us as to the expected loss of corporate income tax revenues.

(We on this side of the House do not accept the government's cost estimate of \$100 million a year. The true figure is \$320 million a year. I want to put on the record just how we arrived at this cost. There is nothing mumbo-jumbo about it.)

Ontario Hydro is required to publish a financial statement every year. It is also required to publish a prospectus when it issues new bonds. These documents report for each fiscal year the value of Hydro's fixed assets at cost.

We've used these documents in estimating the costs of Hydro's overbuilding—with one addition. Since the financial statement of 1978 is not yet available, we've made use of Exhibit D-77 in the select committee's record. Exhibit D-77 is a Hydro submission which contains the value of Hydro's fixed assets at cost for the year ending last December.

Earlier in my remarks I made the point that excess generating capacity does not simply mean excess generators. It includes transmission and distribution capacity as well as administrative infrastructure. All these things come under the heading of what Hydro's financial statements call "fixed assets in service."

I also noted earlier in my remarks that between the end of 1971 and the end of last year Hydro added 10,705 megawatts of generating capacity to its system. This was a net addition. It may be easily calculated by deducting the installed capacity at the end of 1971, namely 13,795 megawatts, from the installed capacity at the end of 1978, namely 24,500 megawatts. The value at cost of Hydro's fixed assets in service at the end of 1971 was \$4,286 million. The value at cost of fixed assets in service at the end of 1978 was \$9,639 million.

We may, therefore, legitimately say that the difference, namely \$5,353 million, represents the cost of adding 10,705 megawatts of generating capacity to the system over that period of time.

I have already said that Hydro's current excess capacity is 4,036 megawatts and I have explained how this figure was arrived at. This represents 37.7 per cent of the capacity added to the system since 1971. Its cost, therefore, represents 37.7 per cent of the cost of those additions, or \$2,018 million.

The annual cost to Hydro customers of this overexpansion may, therefore, be calculated as follows: interest at approximately 10 per cent, \$202 million; depreciation of the assets on a 30-year-life basis, \$67 million; maintenance, administration and other overhead, \$51 million; total per year, \$320 million.

Mr. Peterson: Disgraceful. Terrible.

Mr. J. Reed: Shame.

Mr. S. Smith: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in calculating this amount we have used exactly the same formula as employed by Hydro in its submission to the select committee. Let's be clear on that. It's not \$100 million and \$100 million is not three cents a day. There is an additional \$74 million they don't even think about when they talk about three cents a day. It's not \$100 million anyway, it's \$320 million, and that's only the situation to this date.

What does this extra cost mean to the typical residential user of electricity in Ontario? If it were spread over all the energy sold by Hydro in the province last year it added 3.56 mills per kilowatt-hour to the bill. For the typical residential user this amounted to \$34.19 in a year, or 9.4 cents a day. The average residential hydro bill last year appears to have ranged between \$280 and \$300 for the year. The cost of the excess capacity was, therefore, about 12 per cent of the average bill, and that's just the excess capacity right now. There are other errors Hydro has made with regard to the heavy water plant. There are other errors in the excess capacity of tomorrow and some of the commitments already made and cancellation charges which we are already paying for today. That 12 per cent represents only the one error. There are many other errors and, frankly, if you put them all together it comes closer to 15 per cent.

Small wonder that hydro rates are going up—and this is just the cost of the excess capacity which is installed today. By the end of 1983, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, it will be two and a half times worse.

I shall conclude this portion of my reply with a final observation on the financial cost. Hydro's non-hydraulic generating capacity is generally capitalized and financed over a 30-year period. That means, roughly speaking, that the \$320 million annual cost of Hydro's current over-expansion will have to be borne for 25 to 30 years. We are, therefore, looking at the expenditure of \$8 million to \$9 million before the burden of this mistaken and misguided policy is lifted from the economy. During the latter part of this period we

will, hopefully, get some electrical power for our money, but for the earlier part we will not get a kilowatt because we can't use it. We don't need it and we never did. Our only hope is to sell as much as we can to our American neighbours, but it is a very faint hope because all the evidence indicates they don't need it either.

It is very amusing to think about how the government has been rushing to the defence of Hydro saying, "Isn't it great that we're overbuilt, because it's necessary security against what may happen in Iran," and then they're turning around and trying to sell firm power to the United States. But if we needed that necessary security, which of course we don't—it's a farce, the government knows we don't, they're clearly putting the best face they can on a bad situation—but if, in fact, they believed that this was a wonderful extra security we had, why are they trying to sell it to the States? However, that sort of little contradiction doesn't disturb the government of the day, of course.

[5:00]

Mr. J. Reed: Typical Tory management.

Mr. S. Smith: Anyway, our only hope is to sell as much as we can to our American neighbours, but that is a faint hope, as I say, because they don't need it either.

The Premier and his colleagues say, "Remember the ayatollah." I quote from the speech from the throne: "Foreign political instability makes it mandatory that we continue policies and programs which safeguard and enhance Ontario Hydro's production facilities as a future guarantee of domestic supplies."

What can this possibly mean, Mr. Speaker? Is there electricity coming into Ontario that might be lost because of political instability abroad? Hardly. How can the ayatollah from Iran threaten the security of Ontario's supply of electricity? It is very strange.

When the OPEC countries created the oil crisis of 1973 Ontario Hydro thought it would be good for Hydro, and of course what is good for Hydro is good for Ontario, they say. Mr. Higgins said as much about it being good for Hydro to the select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs. He said he thought the oil crisis of 1973 would stimulate the demand for electricity in Ontario and would help the Ontario economy generally. Apparently it never occurred to him that the 1973 crisis, with its staggering impact on oil prices generally, would hurt Ontario just as it hurt all the industrialized economies in the world, and that less electricity would be needed. Now we are hearing the same nonsense from the

Premier and his colleagues: "Ontario Hydro's production facilities must be safeguarded and enhanced," they say, "because the ayatollah has returned to Iran."

If there is any rationale to this ayatollah business, it appears to lie in the belief that electricity can be substituted for oil to a significant degree in the economy. The *Globe and Mail*, for example, has suggested, apparently quite seriously, that the railway system could be electrified, and asked me to place my trust with Hydro rather than with Tehran. I notice however, that the Premier and his colleagues imply in a vague way that there are great possibilities for substitution, but they never actually use the term.

By the way, just to put the rest of the question of the railways, if we are going to electrify the railways, it would be about a 30-year project. We would have all the time in the world to build the generating capacity we would need once it is decided to undertake something like that. It is ludicrous to say that we have to have billions of extra generating capacity sitting here like museums with nothing to do but drain the money out of the ordinary ratepayers of the province of Ontario because somebody, some day 30 years hence might decide to electrify railways and that this would be some kind of protection against the ayatollah from Iran. What nonsense! Never have I heard worse nonsense spoken in the Legislature of Ontario than that which the Premier has offered us on that subject in recent days.

Mr. Breithaupt: Or in the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. S. Smith: Or in the *Globe and Mail* editorial for that matter, but it wasn't spoken in the Legislature.

Mr. J. Reed: It is the Bermuda triangle again.

Mr. Martel: It is the ayatollah Loughheed.

Mr. S. Smith: You are right.

Perhaps they are aware, Mr. Speaker, of some awkward echoes from the past. On June 5, 1978, for example, the Ministry of Energy gave its views on substitution to the National Energy Board. You understand now, the Premier is telling us we need all this extra electricity to substitute it for oil we might not get. Here, on June 5 of last year, is what the Ministry of Energy said on that subject to the NEB:

"The extent to which the electrical energy can be technically or economically substituted for other energy forms in Ontario is not large, and is unlikely to substantially reduce the consumption of petroleum products." Indeed, the ministry declared the government of Ontario's vehement opposition to any fed-

eral attempt to promote the substitution of electricity for oil and gas in no uncertain terms.

I quote again: "Federal policies designed to increase the substitution of other energy forms for petroleum products which necessitate increased provincial investments such as for electrical generation and renewable energy must not interfere with provincial financial management." Provincial financial management, of course, is a sacred cow of provincial autonomy. Apparently there can be no federal interference with it. The Premier, the Treasurer, and Ontario Hydro are mismanagement enough.

The Ministry of Energy gave its view on substitution to the National Energy Board less than a year ago. It apparently does not see any reason to change them just because the ayatollah is loose in Iran. Here is the conclusion in a document entitled, substitution of Electricity for Oil Products and Natural Gas, submitted by the ministry to the select committee on Hydro affairs on February 23 last. Now, please understand, Mr. Speaker. You will remember the Premier standing in his seat to tell us that because of the problems in Iran we were lucky to have all this extra generating capacity, presumably to substitute for oil. That is the only possibility I can think of, if there is anything rational in what he said.

I have already told you, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministry of Energy in June of last year said that such substitution was unlikely. Here's what they said on February 23 of this year: "The preceding analysis deals with the potential for substituting electricity for other energy forms over the next 20 years. Despite considerable potential for such substitution in the residential, commercial and industrial sectors, there are numbers of factors that will act to constrain the degree of actual substitution: relative prices, existing infrastructure investments, including housing and conventional energy supply prospects. It can be expected"—I'm still quoting—"over the projection period that both the technology and the economics of renewable energy will improve. As a consequence, renewable energy will be in a position to meet an increasing, although still relatively limited, share of energy needs. The net effect will be a tendency to moderate the requirement for an increased use of electricity."

Now, some will say the Premier is not really concerned about the ayatollah in Iran; his concern is over the sheikh in Alberta.

Interjections.

Mr. Makarchuk: The ayatollah in Alberta as well.

Mr. Warner: Ayatollah Loughheed.

Mr. Makarchuk: Ayatollah Loughheed would be more appropriate.

Mr. Hennessy: When are you going on TV?

Mr. S. Smith: If so, you will understand that I say—

Mr. Hennessy: You and Cassidy, what a team. Starsky and Hutch.

Mr. S. Smith: I thought there was a comment from the member—for Fort William, is he? I'm afraid the member for Fort William, poor soul, has had just one too many blows to the cranium, I suspect.

Mr. Makarchuk: You should have worn your helmet, Mickey.

Mr. S. Smith: In any event, one of the advantages, of course, of having been jostled around, shall we say, in that part of the anatomy for some time is that at least he remains alert during these presentations. That's more than you can say for most of the people over there.

Mr. Eaton: That is pretty hard to do the way you have been droning on.

Mr. S. Smith: Most of them would rather not hear the facts, but at least he is willing to listen to them.

Mr. Hennessy: That's right.

Mr. S. Smith: As I say, most will realize that the Premier is not really all that concerned about Iran. His concern is over the sheikh in Alberta. If so, Mr. Speaker, you will understand if I say that in a sense I share that concern. Indeed, I think the presence of Peter Loughheed in Alberta and William Davis in Ontario is something about which every Canadian should be deeply concerned.

Mr. Hennessy: Stuart Smith in Florida.

Mr. S. Smith: The federal government appears to be concerned too, because it has introduced standby legislation to allocate oil and gas supplies. What did the Davis government do in response to that prudent move? It dispatched its newly appointed parliamentary assistant to the Ministry of Energy, the member for Durham West (Mr. Ashe), to Ottawa to foam at the mouth—something he does very well—and to castigate the federal bill as “a camouflaged War Measures Act for which there is no present need.”

It is amazing. One day the Premier stands here and says, “We've got to throw \$2 billion away because of the terrible crisis that may fall upon us at any moment due to what has happened in Iran.” Then he sends the parliamentary assistant to say, “There's no need for any kind of emergency-type legislation. What's the problem?” It's amazing how they

talk out of two sides of their face. But, then again, I suppose, they talk out of one side of each face, so it's not so bad.

Mr. J. Reed: It's been going on for a decade.

Mr. S. Smith: Did not this government support identical federal standby legislation during the energy crisis of 1973? Did it not enact parallel legislation in its own jurisdiction? What is one to make of the comment of the Minister of Energy to the press last week when he said, “The government objects to the present federal bill because it dealt primarily with electricity, whereas the 1974 bill dealt primarily with oil supplies”? What's he talking about? Has he not compared the two bills?

Does he not know that they are virtually word for word, period for period, comma for comma, the same? Does he not know that the only reference to electricity is in section 15 of both bills, identical in each instance, and if those references require provincial approval before the federal government can regulate the supply of electric power within a province, what nonsense was he talking when he gave that interview to the press?

Mr. Speaker, it's such a pity really. We had to suffer through one uninformed Energy minister after another. Finally, we have the present one who keeps a low key, who sends his assistant to Ottawa, but even he has to go to the press and make it obvious that he doesn't know the first thing about the subject he is discussing.

The policy of Hydro is a Davis policy. The blunder of Hydro is a Davis blunder. Yet today there's a bloated Hydro empire virtually out of control, costing the power users of Ontario millions of dollars for years to come, and it is because the Premier of the province allowed it to happen. He could have stopped it; he had the power to stop it; he was warned repeatedly to stop it, and he didn't stop it.

Oh, the Premier will say, “You're being wise by hindsight.” He says, “You have 20-20 vision looking backwards.” **Mr. Speaker,** I look back at the record. In June 1976 the select committee on Hydro issued its famous report, *A New Public Policy Direction for Ontario Hydro*, in which the committee expressed its conviction in numerous recommendations that Hydro's expansion program was too ambitious, too grandiose, too unnecessary.

How did the Davis government respond at that time? I quote from the government's response to the committee's recommendations: “The select committee's recommenda-

tion to reduce Hydro's system capacity even further by deferring another generating station, either Bruce B or Darlington, would result in greatly increased risk of black-outs and brownouts. The government feels this puts the consumer at too great a risk and therefore it cannot accept this recommendation."

The select committee recommended that Hydro develop a new generating plant to bring additions down to what the committee regarded as reasonable target levels. I quote from the government's response again: "The select committee has recommended that Hydro develop a new generation plant and during its discussions suggested that Hydro cancel either the Bruce B or the Darlington generation station. As described in the response to recommendation 3-23, this would greatly increase the risk to the consumer. Further postponement would have a serious effect on the economy of the province and put the consumer to considerable risk without reducing appreciably the cost of electricity."

The select committee's report of 1976 was not the first to express concern over Hydro's expansionism. Let me quote from the Ontario Energy Board's report of August 1974, entitled, *Ontario's Hydro Power System Expansion Program and Financial Policies*: "The board does not consider that Hydro has made a convincing case in respect of the amount of reserve generating capacity which it requires. No evidence was adduced by Hydro which would give the board any measure of the degree of service reliability required by its customers other than an express desire to follow an arbitrary industry standard. In the opinion of the board"—and I want you to listen to this, Mr. Speaker—"the generation reserve margins proposed by Hydro for the program period 1977 to 1982 could be reduced substantially without significantly affecting the quality of service or the choice of economically optimal alternatives." That is from a 1974 report.

"In view of the foregoing"—I continue to read from that report of the Ontario Energy Board—"the board's suggested important modifications to the reserve capacity policy of Hydro are warranted and positive action must be taken to formulate a policy regarding generation reserve which more properly reflects customer requirements."

On February 4, 1976, the Ontario Energy Board reported on Hydro's bulk power rates for 1976. I quote from the report, Ontario Energy Board, 1976: "The board is alarmed to learn that even after the reduction in reliability that resulted from the directive of

the provincial Treasurer, Ontario Hydro's planned levels of reliability over the next six years are still well in excess of its stated target of one in 2,400 which the board in 1974 and most interveners in 1975 characterized as generous. However, as the board has said that the load forecast is likely to prove if anything too high, it strongly urges Ontario Hydro to consider taking immediate steps to reduce its generating margin.

[5:15]

"The board believes that if it is being asked to sanction rate increases, a large part of which is needed to assist in the financing of future plants, then it behooves Ontario to ensure as best it can that the reserve margins resulting from the expansion program are the minimum necessary to provide adequate supply reliability.

"The board urges Ontario Hydro to adopt its 1974 recommendation that planned reserve capacity requirements be reduced."

I could quote the record ad infinitum to the same effect.

The Premier talks about hindsight. He was warned. Hydro was warned. Ontario was warned.

We in this party were concerned. Members of the NDP were concerned. The select committee was concerned. The chairman of Ontario Energy Board was concerned. All sorts of citizens were concerned very early in the game that there was and is an imperialism at work in Hydro, a determination to grow at any price which could only end, if left unchecked, in the kind of gross waste and cost we face today.

But what do we hear from the Premier? Nothing but variations of the old theme: Leave Hydro alone or the lights will go out. It is better to have too much than not enough. What is good for Hydro is good for Ontario—

An hon. member: The lights went out for you a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Fort William will realize that interjections are out of order; but it's positively out of order to interject from other than your own seat.

An hon. member: Very well; thank you.

Mr. S. Smith: The member is required to rise from his seat from time to time to give his brain a rest.

Mr. Eaton: Is that why you have been standing all this time?

Mr. S. Smith: The former Treasurer knew what Hydro was doing. In January 1976, Darcy McKeough exercised his right in law to tell Hydro they could not raise the money

for this expansionism. At the time he told them they did not need it anyway.

Perhaps I should spell that out a bit, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Energy's deputy tried to suggest before the select committee that Darcy McKeough's action of January 1976 was an approval of Hydro's load forecast at that time and a denial of the necessary funds for strictly financial reasons.

I quote from the McKeough letter of January 22, 1976, to the chairman of Ontario Hydro:

"I appreciate that the long-term electrical demand forecast by Ontario Hydro shows a trend of about seven per cent a year. After examining the province's and Hydro's financing capacity, you may decide that it is necessary to meet and discuss with the Minister of Energy the development of energy policies which would permit the expansion of load capacity in the range of, say, five to six per cent per annum."

The Deputy Minister of Energy may regard that as an approval of Hydro's load forecast if he wishes, but I think we all know what Darcy McKeough was saying. After all, he had no control over the load forecast. All he could control was the financial result of that load forecast.

But they are two sides to the same coin: load forecasting is meaningless without the money to implement it. When Darcy McKeough told Hydro it could not have the money for seven per cent, while at the same time saying Hydro should be looking at five to six per cent, he was saying that a seven per cent growth rate in electrical demand was grandiose and unnecessary.

Darcy McKeough knew what he was talking about. He had a computer. He had a ministry with a good record for tracking and predicting the impact of tax changes and other things. We now know that the Treasury had been doing some load forecasting on its own and was able to show Darcy McKeough that Hydro's forecasts of seven per cent per year were beyond the range of reasonable probability.

Those Treasury forecasts came to light in a submission to the Porter commission in May 1976. They are fascinating reading. They consist of five different scenarios, in which the variables employed were given various weights. The lowest prediction of electrical demand to the year 1995 was at a rate of increase of 3.5 per cent. The highest was at a rate of 5.5 per cent.

The Treasury made a point of noting to the Porter commission that a growth rate of 5.5 per cent a year to 1985 could only be reached by making generous adjustments for

population growth, employment and so on. Its submission contained a very pointed section on the very unlikely probability that the historical growth rate of seven per cent would continue. That could only happen, it pointed out, if there were a progressive decline in electricity prices relative to oil and gas; if there were reversal of the downtrend in birth rates; if there were increased immigration; if there were an absence of the conservation ethic, if there were a failure to develop energy-efficient technology, and so on.

We do not have to ask if Darcy McKeough pressed that evidence and that view on his cabinet colleagues, we know that he did; he was that kind of man, he was that kind of Treasurer.

I asked the Premier on Thursday last to explain why Darcy McKeough was overruled. He, of course, fobbed it off in his usual way, claiming that ultimate responsibility for load forecasting lay with Ontario Hydro. I shall deal with that point in a moment, but let me say for the record what every member in this House knows to be so, that Darcy McKeough fought Ontario Hydro and Darcy McKeough lost. He lost because the Premier overruled him, and the Premier overruled him because Hydro policy was Davis policy.

There was one man in the government of Ontario during the 1970s who knew what was wrong at Ontario Hydro and tried to stop it. I say to the Premier in words he may remember: That man is gone.

Now the Premier says it was Hydro's responsibility. The implication of that, of course, is that it was Hydro's mistake, although heaven forbid that the Premier should have made a mistake of any kind, because too much power is good for us and what is good for Hydro is good for Ontario, let's remember.

It is hardly surprising that the Premier and his colleagues are trying to work both sides of the street on this issue. On the one hand they said it was a Hydro mistake; on the other hand they say there was no mistake because we need the excess generating capacity for security of supply. They have to do this because they know they cannot try to blame Hydro alone. They know that if they tried that we would produce every order in council, every cabinet approval issued since 1973 for every aspect of Hydro's expansion program.

That, perhaps, is the nub of the matter. Under the Power Corporation Act, Hydro can operate its system and it can plan and dream as it pleases; but it cannot build, it cannot acquire, it cannot expand, without

cabinet approval. Every generation project must be authorized by order in council and every project, every step in this march to gross overexpansion, was approved by this Premier and this government.

Ah, but the Premier says the Power Corporation Act gives Hydro an arm's length independence from the government which the government must respect because the Power Corporation Act was passed by the Legislature. Well, not by this Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, not by this Liberal Party. The leader of the Liberal Party at that time, the member for—was it Brant-Haldimand-Norfolk at that time?

Mr. Nixon: Brant.

Mr. Peterson: A great guy.

Mr. Foulds: You don't even know his riding, eh?

Mr. S. Smith: The member for Brant, as it was then, and now the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, made it very clear how this party regarded the main provision of that legislation, which was to create an arm's length relationship by recreating the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission as a crown corporation.

Mr. Foulds: Why isn't there anybody in the galleries?

Mr. S. Smith: On page 3304 of Hansard for June 18, 1973, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk said: "We in the Liberal Party do not approve of that separation from government policy. We feel it should be left as a commission and the powers of the government asserted so that in fact its control over the commission will be directly responsible to this House through the appropriate minister."

Mr. T. P. Reid: He knew what he was talking about.

Mr. Eaton: Is that right? Did you say that?

Mr. Nixon: How's that for foresight?

Mr. S. Smith: The problem with Hydro even then, my colleague noted, was that it was "operating autonomously and surprisingly inefficiently." On behalf of the Liberal Party he declared: "I, for one, will never vote in favour of any further separation of that monolith from the public control of this Legislature."

Mr. Peterson: A wise man.

Mr. S. Smith: The government's response, however, was characteristically one of saying one thing and doing another. It said that Liberal concern was groundless, because while Hydro would be at arm's length from the government the new Power Corporation

Act contained many provisions whereby Hydro could be made to operate under public control and in compliance with government policy. That was the assurance given by the government then: Not to worry, not to worry; the new Power Corporation Act didn't give them all that independence, they would still have to come for various approvals. But when it suits his purposes, the Premier of Ontario stands up in this House and says: "Well, I can't take the blame for those mistakes. I didn't make all those decisions. Hydro is independent. It acts at arm's length from the Legislature." Sure, when it suits their purposes they can say that.

Mr. J. Reed: And the NDP supports them.

Mr. S. Smith: In fact, the Hydro policy has been the government's policy. That's the final conclusion, I guess, of the submission I make to the House at this time.

There was and is enough authority in the Power Corporation Act to have stopped Hydro's ambition. That authority was not used. Instead, the program of Hydro was approved every step of the way. This has, in fact, been a most serious and a most costly instance of government mismanagement in Ontario.

How has this affected the ordinary power consumer? How does it feel, at a time when people want to have more purchasing power in the hands of ordinary people so as to get the economy moving, so as to create jobs in the private sector; how reasonable is it that in fact 12 per cent to 15 per cent of the hydro bills of these people, these ordinary citizens today, can be regarded basically as an unnecessary tax which these people are paying into the coffers of government to pay for the huge unnecessary loans which were made mostly in the United States of America?

What kind of situation is it where the government talks about the joys of free enterprise, the need to have purchasing power in the hands of people and then, by condoning and by creating errors of this kind, increases the hydro bills of these people, the ordinary power users, in this way?

Apart from the errors made, there are other things which can be done, of course, in Hydro policy to help the ordinary user. Why did Hydro change its policy in front of the Ontario Energy Board when it came to the question of marginal cost pricing? Why did Hydro suddenly decide to cave in to the demands of the association of major power users and operate against the interests of the ordinary citizens when you consider the amount of time and study which went into that marginal cost pricing report? With even partial marginal cost pricing the ordinary

user would get a break, and it is about time he did have some breaks.

Again, my colleague the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) has proposed a private member's bill, which also would help the ordinary citizens—

Mr. Peterson: Great member.

Mr. Foulds: Don't let that praise go to your head, Eddie.

Mr. Roy: You should have that kind of talent on your back benches.

Mr. Sterling: I wish he was. Come on over.

Mr. S. Smith: —those ordinary citizens who need just a fundamental amount of electricity, just a basic amount of electricity. Instead, they are charging them more for each kilowatt hour, as now happens where the person who uses the least pays the most for each kilowatt hour; the individual just barely getting by on the bare necessities to keep body and soul together pays more per kilowatt hour than members opposite heating their swimming pools.

Mr. Foulds: What?

Mr. Sterling: I haven't got a swimming pool.

Mr. Foulds: Which of you is guilty?

Mr. S. Smith: He has suggested, and I agree, that these people should in fact have a break. They should get the cheapest electricity and there should be an adjustment of electricity rates to help people so that the domestic user can get a basic fundamental amount of electricity at the lowest price, not at the highest price; and that is something a Liberal government will do once we achieve government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone on at some considerable length dealing with basically the need for an industrial strategy in Ontario, pointing out how the manufacturing industries, which are the lifeblood of Ontario, have been allowed to deteriorate to the point where we have become deindustrialized in this province under 36 years of rule which was interested more in the Gallup Poll than it was in doing something for the future citizens of this province.

Mr. Peterson: Our children will pay.

Mr. S. Smith: Why is it that we find ourselves with jobs now going begging for trained personnel? We have spent billions on education and yet we don't have people ready to take those jobs. Why is it that with a need for high technology we have only one polytechnic in Ontario, and even that being squeezed to the point of ruin by the government of Ontario?

Why is it we have a government which is unable, apparently, to understand the degree of foreign domination in our economy and still is running about cap in hand hoping to attract more branch plants while being devoid of real programs to give incentives to Canadian industries to let them get a leg up in the world, to let them get out there and compete in our domestic market and in our world market the way they should be doing?

Why is it we have a government that still feels the corporation can somehow be encouraged to avoid the proper degree of corporate responsibility to the environment, to society generally, to the community, to labour, and of course to our country?

These are great differences, which we have pointed out in this afternoon's address Mr. Speaker, great differences between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party in Ontario.

[5:30]

We believe in corporate responsibility; we have a code of corporate behaviour and we have a feeling that corporations must serve the ends of society. We also believe that foreign domination of our corporate sector is already far too great, is a terrible drain on this economy and that we need policies to redress that dreadful situation.

We believe that Ontario Hydro has overbuilt; and we believe that the ridiculous excuses of the Premier and the various ministers suggesting that we're lucky to have this excess capacity, are nothing but stuff and nonsense which do not bear the scrutiny of reasonable, intelligent people, nor will they stand up for any length of time.

We have demonstrated the errors of Hydro go well back into the attitude and history of that utility, and in fact are the errors of this government. The fact is that they have done nothing to stop the overspending of Hydro. They have done nothing to recognize the burden which this places on the ordinary power users in the province of Ontario. And they, and they alone, must bear the responsibility for the terrible mess this has created for all Ontarians at a time when the economy of Ontario most needs stimulation and when it most needs the buildup of its private sector, they've allowed the colossus of Ontario Hydro to put this terrible drain on it.

To have to sit and listen to jingles about turning off light bulbs when they've thrown billions down the drain can only be described as grotesque. It is adding insult to injury, that's the only way to express it. Those ludicrous jingles continue at a time when conservation seems to mean one thing; when they talk about turning off light bulbs,

the only thing they're not interested in conserving at Hydro is money, they feel they have an unlimited supply of that to throw around. It would be nice if conservation began at home. It would be nice if conservation was reflected in Hydro's financial statement, and the financial statement of Hydro.

However, Hydro has the provincial government to copy; the grandiose overbuilding of various schemes and the way in which it goes into the red and builds up the provincial debt, Hydro has a good teacher in this regard.

I have been pleased to take the opportunity to discuss some of these ideas with the House in response to the speech from the throne, and I look forward to further debate on these and related matters.

Mr. Peterson: That was a great speech.

On motion by Mr. Cassidy, the debate was adjourned.

House in committee of the whole.

PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ACT

Resumption of the adjourned consideration of Bill 74, An Act to establish a Code of Procedure for Provincial Offences.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I believe when the committee last recessed we were discussing section 52. Are there any further comments, questions or amendments?

Sections 52 and 53 agreed to.

On section 54:

Mr. Lawlor: Just one word on section 54. On subsection 2, we mentioned this in committee and I mention it again, I think that in these private cases, which are not prosecutions in the strict sense at all, where a private citizen lays a charge against another private citizen and doesn't show up on two occasions the thing should be dismissed; not just maybe. I would ask that be taken into consideration.

Mr. Sterling: I think the problem that was discussed in the committee and the answer to your concern, related to the situation where a person who had laid a complaint was unable to appear because of circumstances totally beyond his control, such as sickness. It seemed unfair in those very particular situations to shut that prosecution down at that particular time. It was for those particular instances that this clause reads "may" rather than "shall dismiss the charge."

Section 54 agreed to.

Sections 55 to 63, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 64:

Mr. Lawlor: I still find a persisting if not a contradictory dichotomy between section 64 on one side and section 59, which was added subsequently, on the other side.

Section 64(1) says "The term of an imprisonment imposed by a sentence shall, unless otherwise directed in the sentence,"—that's the saving part of this thing—"commence on the day when the convicted person is taken into custody, but no time during which the convicted person is imprisoned or out on bail"—we can understand out on bail—"before sentence shall be reckoned as part of the term of imprisonment."

I would like a further explanation of this particular thing. I think it's in contradiction, to a degree, with section 59. In any event, on its merits why shouldn't the period of time in which a person has been imprisoned be taken into account? Why do you go to such great trouble to exclude it and then towards the end of the thing surreptitiously kind of bring it back in again?

Mr. Sterling: I think, basically, it was formulated in that particular way in order to allow the court to have the discretion to deal with the matter in terms of sentencing, as it should properly have. In other words, it was just formulated, with no intention of not taking into account the period of time when the accused was incarcerated prior to the trial. There was no malicious intent in drafting it in that particular way.

Mr. Lawlor: I'll leave it alone at the present time because we're all anxious to see this become law, but I think it's done backwards. The whole thing is stated inversely to the way it actually should be. I suppose that was the true intent, namely, that precisely the time taken when a convicted person is placed in prison would be taken into account at the time of sentencing. That is the central fact about the section and where the justice of the thing is. But why it goes around in the opposite way, excluding rather than including, is quite puzzling to me.

Mr. Sterling: I cite a possible problem that could arise, which would be in a very unusual circumstance where the person was in fact incarcerated for a period longer than the period of time that the offence carried as punishment. That possibility could arise.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, he should be compensated.

Mr. Sterling: I just don't know how the court would deal with that particular circumstance, if it did arise.

Mr. Lawlor: I'd send you a bill.

Section 64 agreed to.

Sections 65 to 78, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 79:

Mr. Lawlor: I have just a query arising out of section 79. Is the fact that a justice may infer the age of a person from his appearance general law? Is that true about bartenders serving stimulants or beverages to minors? My feeling is that is not normally the case, that whether they are at a particular age or not is not to be determined by their mere appearance but by their actual calendar age.

Mr. Sterling: I think the problem relates to an evidentiary problem, in terms of proving the age of a person who is not called as a witness in a particular hearing. In other words, do you require in a situation where a young person is involved and he is not to be called as a witness that he have his birth certificate? How do you prove his age if you don't have his birth certificate? Even when he's called, it's a question of hearsay. If he says, "I'm 16"; how do you know he's 16 if he doesn't have his birth certificate?

Mr. Roy: How do we do it generally?

Mr. Sterling: I guess we ask the witness. We ask the witness how old he is and we accept that, but in fact it's hearsay. It's a question of when the mother or father is not available to the courts how do you prove the age of a child?

Mr. Foulds: But you normally accept it.

Mr. Stong: Call his mother.

Mrs. Campbell: She should know.

Mr. Lawlor: I just think it's a criteria that is rather easier on justices, et cetera, than it is on bartenders. Why they should be lifted and given such an elevation? The consequences that flow from it can be very serious, as to whether or not that individual is amenable to that particular court or should be in a juvenile court instead simply because he happens to be an overgrown child.

Mr. Sterling: The section is also contained in the code, and there will be cases which have held that you can't rely on that particular subsection where other evidence is available to prove the age of the child. It was put in there for the circumstance perhaps where the parents are no longer living.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 79 stand as part of the bill? Carried?

Mr. Roy: Well, just a second. That bothers me a little bit.

Mr. Chairman: Is this on 79?

Mr. Roy: Right; on 79, yes. I am convinced there is no provision in the code

which says that a judge can infer the age of an individual. Is that provision in the code? What section of the code?

Mr. Sterling: Section 585-2 of the Criminal Code of Canada says: "In the absence of other evidence or by way of corroboration of other evidence, a jury, judge, justice or magistrate, as the case may be, may infer the age of a child or young person from his appearance."

Mr. Roy: Is that the summary conviction provision of the criminal code now?

Mr. Sterling: It has general application.

Mr. Roy: To indictable offences?

Mr. Stong: Mr. Chairman, there is one other aspect of that. The common law has defined that to be limited to where there is no other evidence or it's not readily available. There is a case that follows right under which says if there is other evidence available then you just can't go on inference from appearance. So there is a greater onus than what you have alleged in this act under the Criminal Code.

[5:45]

Mr. Sterling: I think I indicated, referring to the decision in Regina and Leonard, that the subsection under the Criminal Code cannot be relied on where evidence of the age of the child is readily available. I would submit that the same law would apply to this subsection.

Section 79 agreed to.

Sections 80 to 94, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 95:

Mr. Roy: Perhaps the parliamentary assistant can assist me here. The appeal provisions and payment of the fine, et cetera, have to be changed from what the law generally was pertaining to appeal from summary conviction. As I recall, it was not necessary to pay the fine prior to filing an appeal. As I read the section now, the notice of appeal by the defendant shall not be accepted for filing if the defendant has not paid in full the fine imposed by the decision appealed from.

Possibly you could explain why you felt it necessary to change the existing law? Having in mind that most of these decisions appealed from will come from a justice of the peace, not from a provincial judge or somebody like that who has more training in the law, I would like to hear some justification for having changed the approach. As I recall, it was not necessary that the fine be paid prior to the appeal being processed or accepted for filing.

Mr. Sterling: You are correct in pointing to the situation as it is now. Basically what has happened is we have experienced an abuse of the system in terms of motor vehicle infractions where people are filing appeals in order to postpone the payment of fine and getting points on their licences. You will notice under subsection 2 that where the convicted person can enter into a recognizance as the judge directs, it still leaves the opening where the situation is such that it would be very onerous on the convicted person to come forward and show that in fact it would be onerous while the appeal is going on. Basically it has been used to abuse the point system in terms of putting that off for a further period of time.

Mr. Roy: If I might just continue this discussion, are you saying therefore that not only do you have to pay the fine when you go to appeal, but you would be losing points in the interim period pending the appeal? That doesn't seem to make sense.

The point I am trying to make is if you felt you had proper grounds of appeal, and as an example if one was approaching the maximum number of points and in appealing he just paid his fine and lost his points—and he would lose his licence for a month or two months—then you would be frustrating the whole purpose of the appeal. He may be right in law that there was a mistake made at the lower level by the justice of the peace.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you arguing law?

Mr. Roy: Yes, I am. You wouldn't understand that; you've got a chauffeur and points aren't that important.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course not; I haven't been there for 20 years.

Mr. Roy: But to the ordinary fellow out there these appeals are pretty important.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean? For the guys like you making big fees?

Mr. Roy: For the every-day person on the street—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh come on. You are talking about your profession.

Mr. Foulds: His income is more than yours.

Mr. Roy: I think you will agree with me that it doesn't make much sense to have an appeal process if the individual has to suffer the consequences of an earlier conviction. What the parliamentary assistant has said bothers me, that there have been abuses. As I understand it there was definitely an abuse of trial de novo; but that has been taken out of the code now, you can only get a trial de novo if the court gives leave. It doesn't have to give leave to have a summary conviction

appeal but it has to give leave for a trial de novo.

I understand that with the amendments the Criminal Code has cut down a lot on the number of appeals that have been made from these summary conviction offences. My point is this: If an individual, in principle, has to suffer the consequences of an earlier sentence in appealing, we are undermining the process of appeal; that bothers me somewhat.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but as I understand your comments one would have to pay the fine; secondly, one would lose the points. There may well be some circumstances where he is suffering the consequences of an earlier sentence before he even gets a hearing on the appeal.

Mr. Sterling: The situation is such that on an appeal for any reason the points are still suspended. It is just a question of experience with the system as it now stands; where for example there have been many appeals filed in order to stay points for a period of time, six months or whatever. That, really, has been the only reason for the appeal. Many appeals are abandoned after that period of time.

Basically, this section just switches the onus more to the convicted defendant to make, we hope, a more rational decision on what he is dealing with.

Mr. Kerr: You are discouraging appeal.

Mr. Sterling: We are trying to discourage him from the use of appeal.

Mr. Roy: Either you give him the right or you don't.

Mr. Sterling: He has the right, and the section says he pays the fine.

Mr. Roy: And he loses the points.

Mr. Sterling: No, he doesn't lose the points. He stays the points until the appeal is heard; the points are stayed.

Mr. Roy: The points are stayed?

Mr. Sterling: Yes. He could still get around, or delay, the implementation of the points. But it is more difficult for him to do it, in terms of financial incentive, under this particular section.

Mr. Roy: Let me pick you up on that. As I understand it, the abuses in the appeals were not so much to avoid payment of the fine as to avoid the consequences of a conviction. That is my experience in the abuses of the appeal program as it then existed. If that is the case, and you are saying basically that the points are stayed—the imposition of the loss of points is stayed pending the appeal—then why would he have to pay the fine?

Mr. Kerr: He won't hire the lawyer twice.

Mr. Roy: What I'm trying to say to you, basically, is this: My experience hasn't been that people generally appeal just to stay the paying of a fine. Those fines, at that level, are not very big. On an average they are relatively modest. But the whole principle of an appeal process is that you set up a system whereby an individual is free, whatever the decision, to appeal. There should not be a disincentive on the part of certain defendants or accuseds to appeal.

To get back to the point: I think you are trying to curb an abuse; you are not doing it by just attacking the question of a fine. I think that the abuse, if there was any, was in relation—I can recall, for instance, in impaired cases or driving under or over .08, that those were the type of cases where there were abuses and appeals. What they were doing, in those cases, was delaying the imposition of the loss of his driver's licence. For instance, he wanted to drive during the Christmas period or something, so you appealed during that period. Six months later the appeal is heard and, come the fall or come summertime, he doesn't mind losing his licence. There were abuses there.

My concern was that in fact I had not known the experience where people were abusing the appeal process to avoid paying the fine.

Mr. Sterling: I can only reiterate what I said before in terms of trying to discourage the present abuse we are experiencing; and saying further that subsection 2 allows convicted persons to apply to a judge to alleviate any onerous fine which they are unable to pay at that particular time.

Also, under the other sections of the act it is almost automatic that they have time to pay that particular fine anyway. So that there are many other areas of the act which enable them to negotiate with the judge or justice of the peace to make the payment of the fine less onerous than it is now.

Mr. Roy: I just want to correct you again on that last point. The section states very clearly that the fine has to be paid before

there is a filing; so whether you have got time or not, I understand—

Mrs. Campbell: In full.

Mr. Roy: In full. So as I understand it that last point you made would not apply, because you have to pay the fine before they will accept your appeal.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I just go back to the type of thing we did in committee, because I felt that all too often we got ourselves off on the wrong foot on traffic matters? In order to involve some of my colleagues: what happens in the case of that very heavy penalty which I understand would apply here under the Abandoned Orchards Act? I must continue to admit I know nothing about it, but I understand it carries a very heavy penalty of several thousand dollars. Is that not correct? If that is the case, how in the world would anybody get to appeal if they had to pay that first?

Mr. Sterling: As I say, the very reason for subsection 2 is to enable the judge to determine whether the fellow is, in fact, legitimate or if he is a rotten apple.

Mrs. Campbell: Don't bring that into the abandoned orchard.

Mr. Sterling: I really do believe that the situation is such that the judge has enough discretion under subsection 2. Again, our experience is that the section is needed at this time.

Mr. Lawlor: We will never get finished with this legislation today, obviously, so I have only one other comment to make. The legislation which has been decriminalized is therefore more onerous on a so-called defendant than the crimes, because by taking an appeal you can put aside for a brief time the consequences of the act; here, you can't. So you have reached a result which is the direct contrary of what it is that you sought to reach. We did not take any great umbrage with it because this is the kind of legislation that makes opportunists of us all—I will tell you about it tomorrow.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch the committee of the Whole House reported progress.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Westinghouse Canada, statement by Mr. Grossman	131
Physicians opting out of OHIP, statement by Mr. Timbrell	134
Westinghouse Canada, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. M. N. Davison	136
Illegal dumping of liquid waste, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. S. Smith, Ms. Bryden ..	138
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roy, Mr. Cooke	139
Westinghouse Canada, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Cassidy	142
Property taxation, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Epp, Mr. M. Davidson	143
Co-payment fees, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Warner	145
Farm tariff cuts, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Rollins, Mr. Nixon	146
Job creation, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Haggerty	147
Hotel Dieu Hospital, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cooke	147
Medical school access, question of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Pope	147
Family Benefits Amendment Act, Mr. Peterson, first reading	148
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, Mr. Warner, first reading	148
Throne speech debate, Mr. S. Smith	148
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cassidy, agreed to	171
Provincial Offences Act, in committee	171
Recess	174

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Perth L)
Epp, H. (Waterloo North L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Pope, A. (Cochrane South PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rollins, C. T. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
Roy, A. J. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
(York Mills PC)
Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)



No. 6

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS PUBLIC TRANSIT POLICY

Mr. Cassidy moved motion 1:

That as the government of Ontario has refused to provide \$6 million to the Toronto Transit Commission to maintain present transit fares for one year and has failed to revise its public transit subsidy formula, thus undermining public transit in Ontario; and as this refusal reflects the government's policy to permit public transit fares to increase in the province; therefore this government no longer enjoys the confidence of the House.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, this is a motion of no confidence in the government and it arises out of the situation concerning the Toronto Transit Commission and concerning the situation of transit in the province generally. I'll read the motion for the edification of the government and in case it hasn't absorbed its import:

"That as the government of Ontario has refused to provide \$6 million to the Toronto Transit Commission to maintain present transit fares for one year and has failed to revise its public transit subsidy formula, thus undermining public transit in Ontario; and as this refusal reflects the government's policy to permit public transit fares to increase in the province; therefore this government no longer enjoys the confidence of the House."

Mr. Turner: You don't believe that, do you?

Mr. Cassidy: The New Democratic Party has brought this motion of no confidence in the government for three reasons. The first reason is that the New Democrats have had a long-standing commitment to mass transit and all it means for the health of our cities, and we could not let the Conservatives back down, not just on the city of Toronto, but also on Ottawa and London and Thunder Bay and all the other communities which have recently had fare increases, or which are facing fare increases, because of the inadequate transit subsidy formula which we have in the province of Ontario; not only

that, but all of those cities where transit is now being squeezed by rising fares and declining ridership and all that means for the future life of those particular cities.

This motion is not just about the TTC; this motion is about transit in 58 cities and towns across Ontario. In our opinion what is happening to transit is also happening to OHIP, to hospitals, to schools, to day care, to mental health centres for children, in fact to every imaginable service which is provided by government, services which in our opinion are essential to people but which have come under the axe because of the priorities of the province of Ontario. They don't put grants to Ford Motor Company and the pulp and paper industry under the axe, but they put every imaginable service which is important to the working people of this province under the sledge-hammer in 1979, and first on the list was transit when we came back into this Legislature on March 6.

Mr. Johnson: What about western Ontario?

Mr. Hennessy: This is John the Baptist.

Mr. Cassidy: When we were faced with all the cutbacks now being made to these services by the Davis government, we felt we could not stand by and let the working people of this province take it in the neck. Given the apparent determination of the Liberal Party to hang tough on this issue, we felt this was one of those rare occasions in a minority government situation where if we took the leadership we could get support from the official opposition and make the government back down on a decision which we felt was a bad decision in itself and which set a dangerous precedent as far as the future life of our cities is concerned.

We know what happened. The Liberal Party proved once again to have the backbone of a jellyfish.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Foulds: You flatter them; you flatter them too much.

Mr. Cassidy: I hope I don't exaggerate. Even last Thursday in the emergency debate they could have stood with the transit riders in Toronto and across Ontario and they could have forced the government to back down on its decision about transit fares in Toronto and

the rest of the province by announcing they would support our motion of no confidence, but they failed to do so.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that on an issue like that if both of the parties of the opposition had pushed the government, the government would in fact have changed its mind. But one of the opposition parties was not prepared to stay with the transit riders and the ordinary people of the province. In fact, the Liberals and the Conservatives combined in order to make sure that this particular motion was not debated last Friday. In the House leaders' meeting the two of them ensured that the debate would not be held until after the fares went up on Monday.

An hon. member: Do you want your crying towel now?

Mr. Cassidy: After all the crocodile tears have been shed by the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith), by Conservative Paul Godfrey, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, and by the Conservatives generally, we are now faced with a situation where the transit fares in Toronto have gone up.

We're not worried by the fact that this debate is, so-called, "after the fact," because the fact is that under the Conservative policy transit fares will continue to go up. We have been warned that TTC fares will soon go up to a dollar or so a ride. They are rising inexorably by seven and a half per cent a year, and similar formulas are being imposed on transit authorities in every other part of the province.

As far as we are concerned, therefore, this debate today is not just a debate about what happened in Toronto, it is also symbolic of whether or not we will continue to have decent public transit in our cities in the years to come. It is no different than voting in December on a budget where we move that it is a no-confidence amendment after the budget is brought down in April.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) said to me last week when we had the emergency debate that my friends in the UAW must be unhappy with what we are saying. I want the Deputy Premier to take word back to his leader that back in 1975 Dennis McDermott, then the Canadian director of the UAW, came before the Ontario government with a brief which said specifically, and I quote—

Mr. Turner: This is 1979. You are only four years behind, Mike, which is normal?

Mr. Cassidy: "Mass transit: There must be greater government subsidization of mass transit. We recommend that the province raise its subsidization of operating costs from 50 per cent to 75 per cent."

But that, he said, was not alone, because we have to change the planning of our urban system in order to ensure that it is no longer controlled just by business interests that want to give free sway to the automobile.

The UAW said that the automobile is not about to disappear. We agreed. They said what we need is an urban environment where a car is not an absolute necessity, but where we have a sane, balanced, private and public transportation system; and of course that is what we are in danger of losing in our cities because of the kinds of policies the government is pursuing at this time.

When the government could find \$300 million for Rio Algom and Denison Mines, when it can find hundreds of millions of dollars for industry of all kinds, for them to say that they could not find \$6 million out of a \$15 billion budget is rubbish.

Mr. Sterling: Only equitable, only fair.

Mr. Cassidy: It is simply not the case. As far as we are concerned, public transit benefits everybody in the province of Ontario. It saves energy. It saves capital expenditure on roads. That means we benefit if public transit is good in Ottawa and good in Thunder Bay. The people in Thunder Bay benefit if there is adequate public transportation in Toronto, in Windsor and in London.

We believe that public transit is vital for the health of our municipalities. We say, as well, that it is about time that the government looked to the needs for transit not just to people in Metropolitan Toronto and the surrounding municipalities, not just in cities like Ottawa or Thunder Bay, but also to the people in villages like Amherstburg, which we were talking about today, where there are no doctors to go to unless you can ride on the bus and there were no buses to ride because there is no transportation system in the smaller communities of this province.

We say it is not the time for Ontario to back away from transit. If the government had been willing to put some of the savings it has been realizing from its declining commitment to capital expenditures on transit into the subsidy formula this debate today would not have had to occur. If the Liberal Party had been prepared to join with the New Democratic Party in pressing the government to take action this debate would not have had to occur.

If the government had any compassion, any sense about services that are essential to people, this debate would not have had to occur. If the government had had any commitment to maintaining the life and vitality of the great city of Metropolitan Toronto and the other great cities and towns of this prov-

ince, this debate would not have had to occur.

It is therefore more in sorrow than in anger that I am moving this motion of no confidence; asking the Liberal Party to join with us, and asking the government to announce even at this late date they are prepared to recant, that they are prepared to move in now on behalf of transit riders in Metropolitan Toronto and that they are prepared to take the steps that are so essential in order to protect the life of our cities and make sure that we have public and not just private transportation in our cities over the decades to come.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Turner: Mike, you have got to be kidding.

Mr. Sterling: As a member who lives outside of an area which is serviced by public transit, I felt we should speak up at some point in the debate. Unfortunately, the other afternoon we weren't given that opportunity.

I would like to remind the House that the majority of the people in this province come from without the boundaries of Metro Toronto. It upsets many of the members from outside the boundaries of Metro Toronto that the mayor of this fine city and the council have tried to blackmail the provincial government into giving \$6 million to that particular city.

An hon. member: No, no.

Mr. Ashe: What else would you call it? It's the end of the no-down-payment party.

Mr. Sterling: Especially, Mr. Speaker, when they now receive 70 per cent of transportation subsidies that this province now pays and the rest of us, six million out of 8.4 million people, settle for 30 per cent.

Ms. Gigantes: You can't even add up the population of Ontario.

Mr. Sterling: We are discussing a nickel—

Ms. Gigantes: Can you subtract?

Mr. Hennessy: Give it to him, Evelyn.

Mr. Sterling: —a nickel per ride increase in TTC fares—

Ms. Gigantes: He added wrong.

Mr. Hennessy: Give it to him.

Mr. Sterling: —in Metro Toronto.

Mr. Haggerty: Like 90 cents a month.

Mr. Sterling: The member for Ottawa Centre has pointed out increases in other areas of the province, including a hike to the good people of Ottawa-Carleton. They are paying 60 cents per ride for OC

Transpo and OC Transpo doesn't have nearly the transportation system that Toronto has.

Ms. Gigantes: How much?

Mr. Sterling: Sixty cents per ride.

Mr. Wildman: Well then why aren't you fighting for more money for them?

Mr. Eaton: Neither one of them said anything about it. Where's Cassidy? He has been away from Ottawa so long he doesn't know what's going on there.

Mr. Sterling: Where were they on January 1? Where was the leader of the third party?

Mr. Cassidy: We were waiting for your government to bring the Legislature back, that's where we were.

Mr. Sterling: That didn't stop you from making other statements before the press.

Mr. Cassidy: You've got a Premier who could have acted.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Ottawa Centre has just spoken. I'll listen to the member for Carleton-Grenville.

Mr. Sterling: Let's examine what our government presently gives to Metro and the TTC. Since 1974, \$472.8 million in provincial subsidies have gone to Metro and the TTC out of a total of \$658.4 million, 70 per cent again. This year, in 1979, they're getting \$98.1 million. They're getting an 8.4 per cent increase in subsidies for operating deficits within their system. What does the rest of the province get? Five per cent.

Mr. Philip: They also pay for all the additional roads and expressways that we have. Are you going to abolish those also?

Mr. Ashe: Just the NDP.

Mr. Sterling: The member for Ottawa Centre, in his remarks, has said that the government is making cutbacks in the transit budget now. I submit that this isn't a cutback that we're talking about, it's an add-on.

I think the Brockville Recorder and Times has expressed how the rest of Ontario views what this Legislature is debating at this time and what it debated before in the emergency debate. This reflects on the whole Legislature. The members for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) may both talk about the whole transit situation, but that is not the way it is perceived outside of these boundaries. It's perceived as \$6 million going to Toronto.

Ms. Gigantes: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Wildman: Why aren't you correcting that perception?

Mr. Sterling: The Brockville Recorder and Times quoted the Globe and Mail as saying:

"The health of Toronto is of concern, not just to its residents but to those areas of the province which depend upon it for their wellbeing.' In our opinion, the only area in Ontario that depends on Toronto for its wellbeing is Toronto itself. The rest of the province is too often hampered by the provincial government looking out for Toronto's wellbeing."

Ms. Gigantes: That's your problem.

Mr. Sterling: Unfortunately, by raising this debate, by calling it an emergency—

Mr. Makarchuk: You sound like you should be working for Lougheed. You've got the same kind of perspective.

Mr. Sterling: —by calling it a matter of confidence, that is the kind of attitude the members opposite have engendered in the rest of the people of the province of Ontario. Those members have little support out there and I only wish we would go to a vote on this particular issue because we'd be sitting back here with more than 58 seats.

Mr. Makarchuk: Lougheed is running an election on the same basis.

Mrs. Campbell: I am really rather sad listening to the last speaker, because it does seem to me that this matter is one of importance for the whole province—

Mr. Eaton: It sure is.

Mrs. Campbell: —and I don't quite understand what I see. I see it with great regret, I may say, as a parochialism which I don't understand.

[8:15]

Mr. Sterling: That's the way Ontario looks at it.

Mrs. Campbell: In the first place, I don't know whether the member for Carleton-Grenville knows who the mayor of Toronto is or the circumstances. Of course the mayor of Toronto is concerned about his citizens, and I think that this is his right.

Mr. Eaton: He is concerned about the gay people of the province. That's what he is concerned about.

Mrs. Campbell: The fact that the Metro chairman doesn't care is a tribute to the government's influence. May I say also in this debate that the Liberal position was stated quite clearly on Thursday?

Mr. Eaton: Vote against us.

Mrs. Campbell: We asked for the emergency debate prior to the increase in the hope that we might create in the government an understanding of the problems of transit.

Mr. Johnson: In Toronto.

Mrs. Campbell: Not just in Toronto, no. We did indeed want to try to get an understanding of what we have developed. In a way something like Hydro, I suppose, we have a large operation of transit in this area which has expanded faster, without question, than the ability of the people of the city to handle it.

Mr. Johnson: Who pays?

Mrs. Campbell: Who pays? Let's get to that. In the first place, I pointed out the other day the history of this transit corporation, otherwise named. This was originally a Toronto operation and the subway was financed out of the reserves of that corporation.

Mr. Eaton: With a lot of money from the province.

Mrs. Campbell: When this government brought Metropolitan Toronto into being there was a demand for an extension of those services, which could not be met out of those reserves. That was the point at which the government came into the picture. The trouble is that quite basically what Mr. Sewell has been saying is rather well demonstrated, that is that the fare-box operation is very largely supported by the citizens of the inner city. That is not to say that others don't use it; but basically, if members look at the Spadina subway fiasco, they will understand a little bit of what we are talking about.

Mr. Hennessy: There are other fiascos too.

Mrs. Campbell: We have stated consistently that all parts of Metro ought to have a proper transportation system, but we have equally said that this should not be financed municipally to a greater extent than the financing allocated to Hamilton, to Ottawa and to other major centres. In other words—and I am open to be corrected—I believe our percentage is something like about 13.7 as against 17.5 for Hamilton, Ottawa and those other areas.

Mr. Hennessy: Thunder Bay.

Mrs. Campbell: When we went to the emergency debate, what were we asking? We were asking for time in order that a study might be done. Because of the decline in ridership which had taken place prior to this particular situation, we felt that it was important not to allow the situation to worsen while we did that study. I may say that we are very happy that we had, I think, a great role to play in the government's decision to undertake that study. We accomplished that

much in our emergency debate. It was never a nickel issue, the issue was simply the declining ridership.

Having said so, I maintain that Scarborough is as entitled to as decent a system as North York or anyone else, but I wonder why it wouldn't have been better, and certainly more logical, to deal with the percentage funding situation and then for the government to move into its special project subsidy for the Scarborough light rail transit; but that was not the way the government went.

(We concede that this is not an issue on which we are prepared to bring down this government. We do concede that the accumulation of issues is what is important to the people of this province. Those issues are emerging and will continue to emerge. So for us the stances are not the reality. The reality for us is to come to grips with the problem and to try to seek a solution to that problem. There is no reason, really, why Metropolitan Toronto should be disadvantaged on a percentage basis over other major cities.)

One of the arguments used is that other cities do not have the population on so dense a basis and, therefore, they need the additional subsidy in order to make their systems viable. I would like to say that I could understand that position if it related solely to the inner city, the city of Toronto, but it doesn't. When one gets into the suburban areas of this metropolitan area one finds very much the same conditions as prevail in these other cities to which this special consideration has been given.

Unfortunately, we did not prevail on Thursday. I would now take the position as a responsible member in this House that I personally want to see what those studies indicate. Perhaps at that point in time we will be able to reach those solutions which are imperative, in my opinion, but which, unfortunately, we cannot usefully discuss in advance of the study. Our position is that we have entered into the debate. We do not take second place to any in this House in our concern for this problem of transit. We are not being parochial about it. We do believe that Metropolitan Toronto does have an impact financially on the whole province. I am sorry other members feel that we have no such impact, but I think if you examine the record we really do put a great deal into this province; and of course so we should.

I cannot add anything further. I have stated our position as best I can and I thank you.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the no-confidence motion. I find it very regrettable that the Minister of Transporta-

tion and Communications (Mr. Snow) is not present in the House during the debate on such an important transportation matter.

Mr. Eaton: Oh come on, he was here the other day.

Mr. Sterling: Where is your leader now?

Mr. Philip: I find it even more distressful that at least those people who are close advisers to him are not even in the galleries, and I would like that on the record.

Mr. Sterling: Where is your leader now?

Mr. Philip: I would like to refer members of the House to an article contained in the February 22 issue of the *Toronto Sun*.

Mr. Eaton: Where is your leader? He is gone.

Ms. Gigantes: He is on his way back.

Mr. Philip: The headline reads: "Liberals and the TTC Hike May Bring Down the Davis Government."

Mr. Eaton: They chickened out again.

Mr. Philip: The article states that, "Liberal leader Stuart Smith does not rule out the possibility of introducing a no-confidence motion."

Mr. Eaton: That's when he was in Florida playing tennis though.

Mr. Philip: It goes on to quote the leader of the Liberal Party directly: "If the principle of public transportation is at stake, then this issue becomes a provincial one."

Mr. Van Horne: What principle are you working on now?

Mr. Philip: The issue of public transportation is at stake. This is an issue that is a provincial issue; it is a province-wide issue.

Mr. Kerrio: How come Michael Cassidy only spoke for 10 minutes about it?

Mr. Philip: I would like to refer the Minister of Transportation and Communications, if he ever does return to this House, and perhaps the Premier who also is not present, to the article in the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* for Saturday, March 3. The headline is: "Mayors Team Up to Pressure Davis."

Mr. Van Horne: You guys don't know what your target is.

Mr. Philip: The municipal politicians out there recognize that it's a provincial issue—

Mr. Eaton: How many other mayors teamed up?

Mr. Philip: —and the Davis government had better realize this. The fact is that the public in this province is a lot smarter than this government gives it credit for, or that the member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr.

Sterling) gives them credit for. In fact, there is the growing realization that the struggle tonight is not over \$6 million; it is over the government's failure to develop a systematic and cohesive transportation policy in this province.

I found it interesting that 10 days ago I was listening to a radio station in Peterborough—hardly a Toronto area—and a series of man-on-the-street interviews came up with something rather startling even to the interviewer. In fact the majority of the people interviewed in downtown Peterborough recognized the need to preserve the public transit system in Toronto and condemned the Davis government for not doing so.

Mr. Eaton: Why don't you test him at the ballot box then?

Mr. Philip: We are dealing with a government that has no identifiable transportation policy. We go from one crisis to another. As transportation critic in my party I find it difficult to watch TV or listen to the radio without being jolted out of any relaxed mood by some new transportation crisis coming over the medium.

An hon. member: Where is the crisis?

Mr. Philip: First we have the Gray Coach fiasco: there's transportation policy in this province. Then you turn on the radio and there are dump trucks parked in front of the Legislature: that's transportation policy in this province. Then there is the inquiry during the last few weeks into the transport board by the resources committee. If the minister were here—perhaps he is conferring with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) over the seizures that were made yesterday of papers owned by one Mr. Secord; perhaps that's transportation policy in this province.

Then we turn on the radio or the TV and we find out that the driving school instructors are calling for policy, because there is no policy in this province even in that field.

[8:30]

I can't even turn on my TV set on Sunday night, as I did last Sunday, but I find there is another crisis in transportation in Ontario. It is something that we have been talking about, but W-5 has to zero in on the tow truck industry and show what a rip-off the consumers are having to endure because this government has no transportation policy in that field either. The tow truck operators have not been brought under a public commercial vehicle licensing system.

There is absolutely no transportation policy in this province. That is what is wrong. It is the Minister of Transportation and

Communications who gets the no-confidence motion tonight. He is the one who should be here; he is the one who should be listening to it; he is the one who should be resigning as a result of the fiasco we have. Not only with regard to the movement of people in Toronto, but in the movement of people throughout this province and the movement of goods throughout this province there is no identifiable policy.

Thus the vote of no confidence tonight is more than a vote on the TTC issue. It is a vote on the failure of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Mr. Speaker, it is possibly because there is no policy that the Minister of Transportation and Communications does not recognize that the concept of the Toronto Transportation Commission has changed over the years. Transit is not being used now as in the past, as a means of simply moving people on a very small, local level; transit is being used as a means of influencing land-use planning. The costs related to this are bound to be higher than was experienced in the past when the TTC had the responsibility to merely provide limited local service, limited local movement of people around a limited area.

The TTC now also has the responsibility of providing what amounts to commuter service, but it hasn't provided it adequately and that is fairly obvious to anyone who lives in the Scarborough or Rexdale areas. In fact, the minister still doesn't realize that it is a greater distance to the centre core of the city—downtown Toronto—from the area of Albion Road and Highway 27 where I live, than from Port Credit GO station to downtown Toronto; yet the provincial government will subsidize a rider on that system 97 cents, while the commuter from my area, from my neighbourhood, gets a measly six cents for what amounts to a commuter transportation system.

I found the statement contained in the minister's letter to Paul Godfrey very interesting. This letter I am talking about is dated February 12. The minister states: "I am sure you would agree that the fare box should provide a realistic share of the costs." I challenge the minister to define what is a realistic share for the fare box.

In order to do so, he must first of all tell the House what his objectives are in transportation. He hasn't done so. He must tell the House how his government sees the role of the TTC and other transportations systems vis-à-vis land-use planning and development. What services they are to provide and what is their role in that area. He must tell us how he sees the TTC in terms of providing

commuter service. Until those kinds of questions are answered he cannot define what is an adequate funding.

We find a 13.75 per cent subsidy for operating costs entirely inadequate. The Minister of Transportation and Communications has no satisfactory rationale for demanding that 72 per cent of the costs be covered by the fare box. Consider the fact that 48 per cent of operating costs come from the fare box in Montreal and only 35 per cent in Vancouver; and consider, too, that most Ontario systems are facing increasing deficits. It should be abundantly clear that this system of subsidization, whereby TTC riders are expected to pay 70 per cent of the operating costs, is simply inadequate.

I was appalled to learn, again in looking at American figures, that Americans are much more generous with their public transportation systems than we are.

Mr. Eaton: Yes, but where has it got them?

Mr. Philip: If we look at Ontario, what we are talking about in terms of the fare box—

Mr. Eaton: Show me a public transportation system in any American city—

Mr. Philip: If the member will be quiet for a minute he just might learn something. He hasn't learned anything about the movement of goods, now maybe he will learn something about the movement of people.

Interjections.

Mr. Philip: This is the parliamentary assistant to the minister who wants to deregulate the trucking industry and put all that industry out of business; maybe he would like to put public transportation out of business?

Mr. Eaton: Tell us about the American city transportation systems you are talking about. If you are going to compare them, tell us about them. There is not a city in the United States that can compare with it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. M. Davidson: The city of Washington, 40 cents.

Mr. Philip: In Ontario, the fare box operating revenues in cities over one million are expected to equal 72 per cent; in cities of 200,000 to one million, 65 per cent; in cities of 150,000 to 200,000, 60 per cent.

We take a look, then, at the American figures—and I would be glad to supply this to the parliamentary assistant to the minister or to the minister. We look at New York, 52 per cent—

Mr. Eaton: Talk about the transit system in Detroit and how they get to work.

Mr. Philip: —Los Angeles, 41 per cent; Chicago, 55 per cent; Philadelphia, 48 per cent; Detroit, 45 per cent—

Mr. Eaton: How many of them have subway systems like we have?

Mr. Bounsall: You're trying to destroy it.

Mr. Philip: —San Francisco, 40 per cent; Boston, 20 per cent; Washington, 52 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the government clearly is not only interested in not providing the kinds of service, the kinds of subsidy that other Canadian cities provide, it can't even equal the American subsidy; and the Americans have hardly been the greatest advocates of public transit.

Mr. Eaton: When you're subsidizing nothing it isn't much, is it?

Mr. Philip: I found the remarks from the member for Carleton-Grenville rather amusing. I guess amusing is the only word one can use to describe them.

Ms. Gigantes: Pathetic.

Mr. Eaton: You are the only amusing thing around here, Philip.

Mr. Philip: What we have to do is to look at the history of the kinds of subsidies in this province. One of the keys to the province's big splash in transit in November 1972, the unveiling of the GO Urban, was a commitment to pay 50 per cent of the operating losses in the municipal transit system. That commitment was reinforced in John White's 1974 budget, in which the Treasurer made transit grants conditional on keeping fares constant during the 1974-75 fiscal year.

Shortly after that the commitment began to fade. The province put considerable pressure on Metro to put up fares in March 1975 and again in February 1976. In fact, the rapidly increasing deficits followed. Finally, in the fall of 1976, the province changed its support formula from 50 per cent of operating deficits to—in the case of the TTC 13.75 per cent, which is the figure we have been talking about.

The letter from the minister to Mr. Godfrey is also kind of interesting. He says, and I quote: "As you are aware, reflecting on our commitment to public transit the government of Ontario will provide substantial support for the TTC during the coming fiscal year. According to the TTC estimated needs under present subsidy arrangements, we will likely contribute \$8.7 million for demonstration program; \$21.4 million for surplus capital; \$32.8 million for rapid transit construction"—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would honourable members carrying on private conversations please refrain?

Mr. Roy: I agree with you.

Mr. Philip: Thank you, Mr. Speaker—"and \$33.5 million for operating subsidy."

For the sake of the member for Carleton-Grenville, then, I will go over those figures. I see he has left already; well those are the breaks of the game, perhaps he will read it.

Let's deal with those figures; first the \$8.76 million for demonstration program. This is the 1979 payment of 100 per cent of the cost of the 75 LRVs and fulfills an obligation the province undertook years ago. Last year, \$11.2 million was transferred under this agreement.

If we look at the \$21.4 million that is quoted for surface capital in the minister's letter, this refers to the \$16.4 million towards 75 per cent of the cost of 125 LRVs purchased by the TTC as a result of the agreement noted again just before, and \$5 million for the other surface improvements, such as escalator expansion, purchase of buses and trolleys.

Last year the amounts were \$15.8 million and \$3.2 million. So the total increase is from \$19 million to only \$21 million.

The \$32.8 million is for rapid transit construction. Again, this refers to money budgeted for subway construction, the Kipling and Kennedy extensions in the Scarborough LRT. Last year this transfer yielded \$38 million.

The \$35 million for operating subsidy was an increase from the year's subsidy of approximately \$30.9 million; and this projected transfer is what the present formula was expected to yield in 1979 and 1978. Just as the municipalities learned on the breaking of the Edmonton commitment that the commitments made by the then Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs were not to be relied on, so too they have learned that the government cannot be relied on to provide even consistent financing in transportation, let alone any kind of consistent policy.

We are facing a crisis in public transportation in this province. I find it shocking that the Liberals have decided to do another flip-flop. Just as they sold out the women in the family law reform bill and as they recently sold out condominium owners in the condominium bill, so too are they about to sell out transit riders throughout the province on this particular motion of no confidence.

Mr. Speaker, we in the NDP provided a very constructive proposal for alternatives in the brief that we made on January 9 before the Toronto Transit Commission regarding

the transit problem in Toronto. In that brief we pointed out that fewer people rode public transit last year in Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener, Mississauga, Sault Ste. Marie, Thunder Bay and at least 10 other Ontario cities.

In this time of sharply rising fuel costs it is absolutely irresponsible to allow public transit to go down the drain. Besides enriching the transportation grant formula we would encourage experimentation and innovation in transportation in this province. We suggested a fund that would grant or loan start-up money to any Ontario transit authority which presented an innovative plan to increase ridership and efficiency. That would be a lot more innovative, and a lot more constructive, than the \$55 million the Minister of Transportation and Communications poured off on some pie-in-the-sky Krauss-Maffei. It would be a lot more constructive than an awful lot of the other millions and millions of dollars that are fed to resource companies to exploit our resources and ship them to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Liberal Party to change its position. I urge the Liberal Party, for once, not to do another flip-flop, not to sell out the people in Toronto. Vote with us on this issue.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, as a member for a riding located in the newest and fourth largest city in Canada—which is quickly proving itself to be the senior partner in the Metropolitan Toronto corporation—I am pleased to participate in this emergency debate this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that without question—and I challenge any member in this House here this evening on this point—the Toronto transit system is the finest public transit system in the continent of North America. Without fear of contradiction, I say to you, that the reason this transit system is the finest in North America is because we have, without question, the most efficient system, the cleanest system, the best organized system, the most heavily-funded system anywhere in the country. You only have to talk to people visiting Toronto who will say that among the first impressions left with them of Metropolitan Toronto was that of the public transit system in this jurisdiction.

[8:45]

I must say that perhaps one of the reasons our system continues to receive awards around the country, both for safety and for efficiency—

Mr. Kerrio: Because you give all the awards.

Mr. Williams: —of operation, and for its cleanliness of operation, is because of the leadership given by the Toronto Transit Commission itself. I look back to the days of Ralph Day when he was the hard-nosed leader—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Does Michael Warren live in your riding?

Mr. Williams: —who helped bring the transit system to where it is today. I guess one could consider Ralph Day—

Mr. Eaton: Do you want an election on this?

Mr. Williams: —as the Fred Gardiner of the public transit system of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. T. P. Reid: If you ran him up in Rainy River, Bob, I would vote for him.

Mr. Williams: His successors since that day have also performed well, along with the senior administrators and staff—

Mrs. Campbell: Then there's Mr. Hurlburt.

Mr. Williams: —and operators of the transit system to make it the fine system it is today.

Obviously this is the very reason the Toronto Transit Commission has the highest per capita ridership in North America.

Mr. Riddell: What do the people of Middlesex think of the TTC, Bob?

Mr. Williams: The reason for this success is not—

Mr. Foulds: No thanks to you.

Mr. Williams: —through uncertainty or because of luck. It's been because of good planning, strong leadership and the strong financial backup of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Kerrio: And Gray Coach.

Mr. Williams: As other speakers this evening and previously have stated, this province has generously donated over 70 per cent of its total transit subsidies to the Toronto transit system.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Donated? Where the hell do you think the money comes from?

Mrs. Campbell: Not from you.

Mr. Williams: In making that extremely generous donation to Metro Toronto transit they have provided—

Mr. Kerrio: What are you talking about?

Mr. Breithaupt: Whose money is it?

Mr. Williams: —over 33 per cent of it in operating subsidies. And in so doing for this coming year, they have enriched the ante by

8.4 per cent, up from \$31 million to \$33.5 million. If that isn't a generous enrichment of the program I don't know what is.

Mr. Van Horne: Do you really believe that stuff?

Mr. Cassidy: You measure the whole world by percentage points. You've got an accountant's view of the world.

Mr. Williams: There's no doubt that Metro Toronto is not suffering; it has strong financial support from the provincial government. After the Premier (Mr. Davis) has announced there would be no further additional moneys in the—

Mr. Foulds: When was the last time you took the subway?

Mr. Williams: —amount of \$6 million forthcoming, members will recall that the mayor of the city of Toronto and some of his colleagues—

Mr. Foulds: Have you ever been on the subway?

Mr. Williams: —decided to come to a caucus of the Metro Toronto members to discuss the matter again and ask if, through them, the Premier would capitulate and reconsider. When the mayor of Toronto, with some of his members, came to the Metro caucus—

Mr. Cassidy: And you all turned your back on the people of Metropolitan Toronto; all but two of Metropolitan Toronto Conservative members.

Mr. Williams: I said to him: "Explain to us why you should be coming to us with cap in hand asking for another \$6 million—"

Mr. T. P. Reid: Did you say that to Paul Godfrey?

Mr. Williams: "—when we've already enriched the subsidy by another 8.4 per cent." And I listened carefully to what the mayor of the city of Toronto had to say.

Mr. Cassidy: Where were the Toronto Tories when the transit riders were looking for your help?

Mr. Williams: He said to me that he was there because the nickel was the issue, that there would be six million fewer riders using the TTC—

Mr. T. P. Reid: You should have understood that.

Mr. Van Horne: Was it a Blue Jay cap, John?

Mr. Williams: —if the nickel addition was put on. That was the sole reason for his coming there with cap in hand.

I said to him: "Mr. Mayor, you explain to this caucus this evening how you conclude that there will be six million fewer riders the day after the nickel increase comes about. Show me the statistics." The mayor of the city of Toronto didn't have an answer. He couldn't give me the statistics.

Mr. Bounsall: You couldn't read them anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: If you could read we would give them to you.

Mr. Lawlor: You can't give statistics in advance.

Mr. Williams: I said give it to me in black and white. "Where is the backup information from all the experts at the TTC?"

"Is this a guesstimate or is it based on cold hard facts?"

Mr. T. P. Reid: What did you say to Paul Godfrey?

Mr. Cassidy: You are not only illiterate, you are "ill-numerative."

Mr. Williams: He said there were no cold hard facts to back it up. This was a guesstimate made by the TTC.

Mr. Foulds: It's called a load forecast. If it's good enough for Hydro it's good enough for the TTC.

Mr. Williams: The interesting fact is that in 1975, when the TTC increased fares by 33 per cent not 14 per cent, the ridership went up by 10 million.

Mr. Bounsall: You supported that too.

Mr. Williams: In 1976, when they increased the fares again—

Mr. Cassidy: The ridership went down.

Mr. Williams: —by 20 per cent, the ridership went up by another three million.

Mr. Cassidy: It went down.

Mr. Williams: All refuting the statistics that the mayor of the city of Toronto was trying to give to the Metro Toronto caucus.

He could not substantiate the facts.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you ever misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. Williams: I asked: "Where are the six million riders going to go if they're not going to continue to use the TTC and pay the extra nickel?"

Mr. Cassidy: They're going to clog the roads.

Mr. Williams: He put himself right into a corner. He said: "Oh, they'll start using their cars. They'll pay to park downtown."

Mr. Kerrio: With a Tory government they don't have any cars.

Mr. Williams: The fact is that with the new increase it will cost them a dollar a day to ride back and forth to work; if they took their cars to work it would cost them twice that or three times that just to park their cars downtown, let alone pay for the increase in gas. He had no answer for that.

Mr. M. Davidson: If you guys keep going, we won't be able to afford tickets.

Mr. Havrot: Down with socialist riders.

Mr. Foulds: Maybe, like you, they'll fly.

Mr. Havrot: You guys don't know the value of a nickel.

Mr. Williams: I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the statistics just did not support the arguments they brought to the Metro caucus.

Mr. Foulds: In your private plane. Where do you park your plane?

Mr. Eaton: How do you get around the province? Who subsidizes that?

Mr. Foulds: Where does he park his plane?

Mr. Eaton: Who subsidizes that when you fly in from Thunder Bay? Who subsidizes you? Nobody.

Mr. Foulds: What are you talking about? I take the subway more than he does.

Mr. Williams: The point at issue is that it's not just a nickel issue. The mayor of the city of Toronto was looking at it with tunnel vision, when he said that it was only the matter of the nickel. The provincial government felt—and the Premier very clearly spelled it out the other day—that it was a much broader issue than simply the \$6 million and the nickel increase.

Mr. Havrot: That is a typical NDP view.

Mr. Williams: The mayor of the city of Toronto, while he was there with his cap in hand, already knew that the newspapers were going to press with his ad slanted towards putting the blame for the fare increases on the provincial government.

Mrs. Campbell: Shame on him.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's exactly where it belongs.

Mr. Van Horne: His cap was in his hand because he was a sacrificial lamb. He didn't know where the Tories were going to stick it to him next.

Mr. Williams: While he sat there talking to the Metro caucus he knew of their little scheme of trying to get the people emotionally involved and upset and go after the provincial government, instead of looking at the Metro people with whom the buck stays for looking after transportation in Metro. It backfired on him. The whole thing fell apart

because the people in this city recognized there was a broader issue and it wasn't just the nickel increase.

Mr. Van Horne: Godfrey and Davis and all your friends.

Mr. Williams: It's the old story that no matter how long you talk to the people, and try to mislead them perhaps—

Mr. Breithaupt: Mislead them?

Mr. Williams: —or give them a story that isn't totally accurate or complete, you can fool some of the people some of the time, as they say, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Mr. Van Horne: It's getting pretty thin there.

Mr. Williams: The people in Metro Toronto and beyond recognized that when they did take the mayor up on his proposal and phoned in and completely turned the tables on him.

Mr. M. N. Davison: You sure know about being foolish.

Mr. Williams: The people of this city aren't as dumb as they're made out to be by those who would suggest—

Mr. Van Horne: You're saying the people in Toronto are dumb, are you?

Mr. Cassidy: Are you calling them dumb? Are you calling your own constituents dumb?

Mr. Van Horne: Are you calling Torontonians dumb? Spell it out.

Mr. Williams: —that they could be conned by that type of proposal, that it's the nickel and only the nickel.

Mr. Van Horne: Spell it out. Are you calling them stupid?

Mr. Cassidy: Another slur on the ordinary people of this province.

Mr. Williams: The people of this city are much more astute, than they're given credit for by the mayor of the city of Toronto, let me assure you of that.

Mr. Van Horne: You didn't say that a minute ago.

Mr. Williams: In speaking of the broader perspective—

Mr. Conway: Spare us that.

Mr. Williams: —the leader of the third party touched on it when he referred to that well-known labour leader, Dennis McDermott—

Mr. Cassidy: A fine fellow.

Mr. Williams: —who said we must continue to have a balanced transportation

system within Metro Toronto, as we must have in any urban area.

Mr. Breithaupt: Does he use the TTC too?

Mr. Williams: That indeed is really the sum and substance of what this issue is all about.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Well, stop pushing the fares up every year.

Mr. Williams: We must continue to have a balanced transportation system within Metropolitan Toronto. I think it would be interesting to compare the private transportation, if you will, in Metro Toronto with the public transit system. It's interesting to note that in fact there are more miles of subway lines in Metropolitan Toronto than there are metropolitan expressways. The fact is that far more has been done to expand the public transit system in Metro Toronto in the past five years than has been done to improve or expand upon the arterial road system within Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Breithaupt: So what?

Mr. Williams: In fact, expansion of the arterial road system in Metro has virtually come to a standstill because the emphasis has gone so far the other way, to the point where this balanced transportation system that the leader of the third party talks about is starting to deteriorate; but I would suggest not negatively against the public transit system, rather perhaps against the private transit system.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: The pro-expressway faction rears its head again. Roads before cities, cars before people; you are off again. The old instincts have come to the fore, you just give them a chance, they will—

Mr. Williams: Let me point out to you what those real broad perspectives are that the opposition hasn't even considered because all they have talked about is the nickel, the nickel, the nickel.

Mr. Conway: Get out your purse, John.

Mr. Williams: And what those broad perspectives are is what the Toronto Transit Commission itself pointed out in its white paper produced in January. There, Mr. Speaker, the transit commission clearly pointed out that, while fares are important, there is no question of that, they do not alone determine ridership.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh but they do have a bearing.

Mr. Williams: In that white paper, the transit commission pointed out that in fact

three major ingredients were having a possible adverse effect on the Metro transit system. Those three major factors, as was pointed out, are these:

First, fare and fare structures, which is what this debate has been largely limited to, to date.

Mrs. Campbell: Precisely.

Mr. Williams: Second, the level of service provided; and third, external factors.

Those latter two considerations, I suggest with respect, have barely been touched upon by the other speakers in this House who have restricted themselves strictly to that five-cent image in the increased fare.

In order to give this the proper perspective, I would like to—

Mr. Ziemba: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Last week you could get seven tokens for three dollars, this week you can only get six; it is not a five-cent increase, it is a seven-cent increase.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not a point of order, it is a point of view.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is a point of information.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a fact, Mr. Speaker. If you had counted it in fact you might have voted with us.

Mr. Roy: No, no; we are not that foolish.

Mr. Williams: The transit commission has pointed out, in its white paper, that there are perhaps three options left open to it; options which the committee has agreed to undertake to review. This province is anxiously waiting to see the results.

The Premier the other day did offer to assist this study in any way possible. While the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) seems to have lost patience with this idea, I think she herself suggested that we must see the full story which will be presented by this in-depth study.

Mrs. Campbell: That's what we asked for in the emergency debate.

Mr. Williams: She herself is supporting that concept. It is the very concept that this government is proposing; that we in fact wait to see what the results of this study are so that we can see the total picture.

Mrs. Campbell: We said "before the increase" and you said "after." What is the difference?

Mr. Williams: There are three options left open to us, as pointed out by the TTC. One is to continue the status quo; another is that we favour transit more but without capital

expansion; and the third is that we favour transit more with a rapid transit grant.

What I would like to do for a moment or two is—

Mr. Haggerty: Sit down.

Mr. Williams: —to highlight to you the consequences of continuing the status quo.

Mr. Samis: When you get Ray Haggerty saying that, John, you are in trouble.

Mr. Williams: And the transit commission points out what the negative effects of doing so would be. Three of them are related to the fare and fare structure factor. They are, and I will point them out in point form:

First, the status quo would mean to continue with the 1977 financial formula, retaining a constant revenue cost ratio through incremental fare increases as operating costs increase.

Second, there would be minimal or no expansion in surface transit service.

Third, there would be no expansion of rapid transit beyond current commitments.

[9:00]

Those three status quo factors would obviously fall within the area of jurisdiction and control of the transit commission itself. But there are three other considerations that the commission points out that are of equal importance and concern, I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, and once again which have been minimized or not even touched upon in this debate.

That is, first, they point out, the status quo would mean a minimal priority for transit on the roads. Second, there would be limited transit-oriented redevelopment along rapid transit lines. Third, there would be minimal improvement to their arterial road system.

One of the major problems in making our public transportation system more efficient in Metropolitan Toronto is the fact there has been a down attitude towards improving the arterial road system within Metropolitan Toronto. Because the anti-road people can only equate the use of roads, the expansion and the improvement of roads, to the use of those roads by private vehicles.

The fact of life is the public transit vehicles have to use those roads as much as the automobiles and the commercial vehicles. That's a point that's lost sight of and never touched upon in the debate. The buses, the extended new larger vehicles that will be coming on stream in the near future, have to have adequate roads to utilize just as much as the private vehicles do themselves.

Unless we can maintain and ensure there will be an adequate arterial road system within Metropolitan Toronto that can accommo-

date the public transit vehicles, whether they be the trolley buses or the gas-driven vehicles, that system is not going to move any faster than the private motor vehicles through this city.

Anyone who suggests the whole Metro Toronto public transit system is wrapped up in the subway system has lost sight of reality, because the large bulk of our system is still tied up in the rolling stock on the surface, using the roads that a lot of the people here would like to see closed down. In fact, I think the greatest thing the mayor of Toronto would like to see is the roads in this city rolled up and everybody walking to work—

Mr. Renwick: Oh that's not fair; that's not fair, John, and you know it.

Mr. Williams: —or taking the subway.

An hon. member: Or riding a bike; he rides a bike.

Mr. Williams: The fact of the matter is the very reason—

Mr. Renwick: Don't be ridiculous. The opening of the silly season.

Mr. Williams: —that the transit system—

An hon. member: He's right on.

Mr. Williams: —cannot improve as far as the rolling stock on the surface is concerned is because of some of the bottlenecks that exist in our arterial road system. I can speak with authority on that subject having come from a riding where I've seen the detrimental effects of those who would not permit reasonable road improvements to take place for necessary road extensions to occur; or even for road widenings to take place so that bus-only lanes could be developed on existing roadways.

I point specifically to Bayview Avenue where there was a debate at the time I was on Metro council over the widening of Bayview Avenue by one foot on either side so a third lane could be accommodated and they could put a bus-only lane in. The people in that area said: "No, we don't want any improvements to our roads. It will interfere with the community. Take it away."

The people in North York didn't want the Lawrence Avenue diversion corrected, so the buses that would normally go straight along Lawrence Avenue from Scarborough-Ellesmere and from Scarborough West, and from Scarborough Centre and Oriole over to the Lawrence Avenue station, can't go that way. They have to take a two-and-a-half mile dog-leg down Leslie Street along overcrowded Eglinton Avenue to get to the Eglinton subway—

Mr. Warner: Talk to your friends at Post Road about that one.

Mr. Williams: —simply because the people in the area wouldn't permit Lawrence Avenue to be straightened out—

Mr. Warner: What people?

Mr. Williams: —and the diversion removed—

Mr. Cassidy: The working class is standing in the way of that one.

Mr. Williams: —so it could accommodate the public transit buses in Metro Toronto.

Mr. Warner: What people, John? What people?

Mr. Williams: The transit commission supported it but the people in the area would not support it.

Mr. Warner: Those rich folks on Post Road, John.

Mr. Williams: In the same fashion, Mr. Speaker, I point to the Leslie Street diversion, a road that could provide the much needed relief to the traffic congestion in northeast Metro that the Bayview extension provided many years ago.

Mr. M. Davidson: It's the workers who live in the \$100,000 homes in that area.

Mr. Williams: The Leslie Street extension wouldn't remove one existing house from stock, it would go through open lands and valley lands very much like the Don Valley Parkway does; and yet the council of the city of Toronto has continually opposed the Leslie Street extension, as have some of the radical members of the North York council. But I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, so long as there's this negative attitude not to build any roads to help accommodate and move the public transit vehicles as well as the private vehicles—

Mr. Warner: We'd build one for you; one-way south.

Mr. Williams: —then this is one of the exterior factors that the transit commission talks about that they have no control over and which they point out is going to inhibit improvement of the system. Until we start to realize those facts of life, that we have to assist the transit commission in that type of fashion—

Mr. Warner: Southward extension of Yonge Street.

Mr. Williams: —we will not be able to assist them in improving the system.

And this goes beyond providing capital dollars from the province. The Metro politicians have got to face up to these facts and

they have got to start making some of these hard-nosed decisions and realize that it's not just the bucks involved. They have got to be able to divert other energies and support to the system in dealing with these external factors over which the TTC doesn't have direct control.

Mr. Speaker, so long as the city of Toronto has got the extra \$3 million they were prepared to throw into the system, I would suggest that the mayor of the city of Toronto, in a gesture of goodwill, put that \$3 million into the building of the Leslie Street extension so we can run a decent bus line down there, so the people can take an express bus from northeast Metro to the downtown area without having to make two or three transfers to get down there.

That's the kind of improvement we need to help the Toronto Transit Commission and, Mr. Speaker, until we start waking up to these broader considerations and perspectives we are going nowhere. No matter how much we subsidize the TTC, there will undoubtedly be a loss of ridership if, when they should be at their place of business in 15 minutes, people are going to sit on a bus for half an hour because of jammed streets and incompleting roads and unwidened Bathurst Street and Leslie Street—did the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick hear that, Bathurst Street?

Mr. Cassidy: You keep going. You will diselect all of your colleagues.

Mr. Williams: I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, until these things come about and the Sam Casses and other professional traffic people can have their hands untied so they can provide the solutions they have been offering to the people of Metro Toronto for so long but who are being hamstrung by the politicians who think it's good politics to oppose these things—until this attitude changes amongst the politicians and the public at large, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be able to assist the transit commission to the full extent to which it's entitled.

Mr. Lawlor: You won't give them the money and you tell them how to spend theirs.

Mr. Williams: It's more than giving them subsidies. The Metro politicians have got to grow up and start dealing with these problems in a meaningful and mature manner. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in these few comments that I have brought a—

Mr. Van Horne: A few comments? You have talked for half an hour and said nothing.

Mr. Williams:—broader perspective to this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I have pointed out the fallacy and the mess that surrounds the debate so far that it's been strictly the nickel—

Mr. Van Horne: Gave Tom Wells a migraine.

An hon. member: It's not a nickel; it's seven cents.

Mr. Williams:—and that people are going to walk away from it because of the nickel increase.

Mr. Van Horne: We would like to walk away from you but we can't. Just sit down. Quit pointing your finger at us.

Mr. Sargent: You are almost as bad as Grossman. Why don't you sit down?

Mr. Williams: And if the member for Owen Sound had been on the transit system in Metro within the past few years, he would realize we now have a subway system in Metro Toronto, that we are heavily subsidizing.

Mr. Van Horne: How often do you ride on it?

Mr. Williams: Quite often, as a member from Metro Toronto—and I am proud to be able to use the system.

Mr. Van Horne: Most of your Tory members ride in limousines. How come you are riding in the subway?

Mr. Warner: Try riding under it.

Mr. Williams: It's the safest, cleanest transportation system on the continent and we should be supporting it in all ways, not just through the subsidy at the provincial level but the Metro politicians should be getting out there—

Mr. Van Horne: You have got more limousines flying around over there than Dodd's got kidney pills.

Mr. M. Davidson: Were you the guy who was buying up \$50 worth of tokens before Monday?

Mr. Williams:—and supporting them and in eliminating the negative exterior factors that are so clearly dealt with in the white paper issued by the transit commission. So, Mr. Speaker, if I might conclude, I would like to simply state—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you going to start all over again?

Mr. Williams: I feel encouraged, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Eaton: Don't encourage him, you guys.

Mr. Williams: All I have talked about so far, Mr. Speaker, is the option one proposal under the transit white paper—

Mr. Martel: Wind him up again.

Mr. Williams:—which is to maintain the status quo. I have pointed out many of the

negative aspects of maintaining the status quo, but if the members of the House would encourage me, I would be glad to speak further on the other two options which are favour transit more but without capital expansion; or the third option, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Makarchuk: Have you considered taking the bus yourself someplace?

An hon. member: You take a one-way, Mac.

Mr. Makarchuk: A one-way bus, John.

Mr. Williams: —or the third option, which is favour transit more with a rapid transit grid. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that's the one that I personally support; and I hope that when the study is completed the transit commission will give great emphasis and support to that third option, because we indeed do need—

Mr. Cassidy: He won't trifle over \$6 million.

Mr. Martel: Would you repeat that again?

Mr. Williams: We do, indeed, Mr. Speaker, need to give strong support to public transit in Metro. One of the ways in which we can accomplish that is by improving the rapid transit grid, as is suggested in the third option presented in the Toronto Transit Commission white paper. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm hopeful when this study does come out, as the Premier himself has stated, that we will then take a closer look at it. While it may mean that additional subsidies may be needed in the future, it will not be done without this province and the Metro politicians collaborating with this government to assist the TTC in implementing programs—

An hon. member: By increasing the fares.

Mr. Cassidy: The way Paul Godfrey collaborated for us.

Mr. Williams: —that will not only deal with the dollars but improve the delivery of the system by improving the arterial road system within Metropolitan Toronto.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I think that with the broad perspective clearly now before the House, it's clearly understood why it would be inappropriate at this time for the government of the province of Ontario to further enrich its already very generous add-on contribution this year to the operating subsidies of the Toronto Transit Commission. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Davidson: You haven't told him a thing, John.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. Kerrio: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have two or three comments to make as they relate to this debate. The first one I have to make is, naturally, that we're not supporting the asinine, no-confidence motion of the socialist party.

Mr. Martel: What did Stuart Smith say the first day?

Mr. Kerrio: And for a very good reason. Our leader made a commitment that we would not bring an election on the people of Ontario that might cost \$30 million over a \$6 million issue.

Mr. Martel: What did Stuart Smith say the other day?

Mr. Kerrio: There was no misunderstanding about that position.

Mr. Martel: What did Stuart say?

Mr. Havrot: And that's socialist financing.

Mr. Kerrio: The suggestion that we should, in fact, put some dollars into TTC, if they were willing to come up with some viable transit plan, was the way we might consider going. The problem with the people on my left is that they never face the realities of life.

Mr. M. Davidson: You had better believe we are on your left.

Mr. Bounsall: You brought it.

Mr. Kerrio: They think we can do so many grand and glorious things and then someone else will pick up the tab. The someone else happens to be the taxpayers of the province of Ontario, and they're the same people in every instance.

Mr. Martel: Margaret, are you listening to him?

Mr. Cassidy: The member for St. George doesn't agree with you.

Mr. Kerrio: I'd like to suggest to you that if this was a valid and important issue the leader of the third party would have spent a great deal more time than the few minutes he gave in trying to make his case. He didn't see fit to do that. He wants to let every one of those people get on the record so they can print 10,000 copies—

Interjections.

Mr. Kerrio: —and distribute them across this great province of ours suggesting that they're the only people interested in the transit problems of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: And your speech as well.

Mr. Kerrio: I would like to suggest something to members that might be very meaningful. Even though I'm a proponent of the free enterprise system, I would have to take

exception to something the government did that might very well have helped this whole transit system—

Mr. Eaton: Why don't we see what you have done for the people of Brantford, Mike?

Mr. Kerrio: —and it has nothing to do with taxing the people in the rest of Ontario. It has to do with the government of Ontario deciding to allow Greyhound to overrun Gray Coach runs on intercity—

Mr. Cassidy: If you keep on we will take your ferris wheel away from you.

Mr. Kerrio: —the only paying proposition in transit that the people of Ontario share. I suggest to members assembled here tonight that there was a time and the time has now passed, and I would like the government to—

Mr. Makarchuk: The CNR is making money, Vince.

Mr. Kerrio: —reconsider the position in that matter. You cannot and you should not ask the taxpayers or the people of Ontario to pick up the deficit financing of transit within the cities and give the inter-urban transit to the private carrier. That should not be done. So I say, with respect, if members want to do something meaningful, they shouldn't posture like the socialists and decide that somebody else is going to bail them out of a situation.

Ms. Gigantes: No wonder you have one seat in Toronto.

[9:15]

Mr. Kerrio: Members have to do it in a meaningful way; they have to address a situation. I think it's time, if we're going to move the people within the cities of this province at a loss, it's about time we decided that the inter-urban has to be coupled in with that so that we can move the people around the whole province and take the load off the taxpayers.

Mr. Charlton: I rise in support of this motion of no confidence tonight. Those of us in this party used to have a very sure way of knowing when we were right, namely by how loud the former member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) would yell at us when we had something to say.

Mr. Martel: The bellwether is gone.

Mr. Charlton: Thankfully, we have discovered tonight that although he's left us, we still have quite an effective way of knowing when we're right, namely by how loud the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) yells and by how much hot air comes out of the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams).

Mr. Makarchuk: It's a regional problem over there, isn't it?

Mr. Samis: It's worse than the Sudbury Inco stack.

Mr. Charlton: The motion of no confidence which we placed tonight—

Mr. Kerrio: Why don't we vote now? You know you have lost.

Mr. Charlton: —says quite clearly that not only is this government undermining public transit in Metro but in the province of Ontario as a whole. I find it quite ironic that in his speech tonight the member for Oriole spent so much time lauding the public transit system in Metro, talking about it being the best in North America, talking about it having the best ridership in North America, and then proceeding to find ways to dismantle it because ridership losses will do just that. Increased fares cause lower ridership. Lower ridership causes increased deficits and increased deficits eventually end up in increased fares again. One just gets into a cycle that never ends.

We have problems province-wide, not just here in Metro. In Hamilton, we are presently into a very difficult situation. The city council and the regional transit commission in Hamilton have done a very effective job over the past two years in keeping transit fares in Hamilton the lowest in the province, as well as implementing the best social rate structures in the province for seniors, students and so on. At present, the city of Hamilton is paying 43.7 per cent of the cost of our transit system and the province only 17.5 per cent.

The money is running out in Hamilton. This fall the fares go up. Next year they are going to go up again. That's going to mean decreased ridership in Hamilton, the same as the proposition in Metro. It is going to mean the start of the decline of a reasonably efficient transit system with the lowest fares in the province. It is going to mean the end of a serious commitment to the public in Hamilton and of the ability of the public to count on public transit, especially those who have no other form of transit to rely on. It's always those who have the least resources to provide themselves with the alternatives that get hurt the worst in these kinds of crunches.

I have a resolution from the city council in Hamilton which is requesting essentially the same thing as what Metro is requesting, that is money so that they can hold the line on fares in the transit system in the city of Hamilton, which they have been trying on their own to do substantially in the last few years, and which they are fast losing the

ability to do. This whole debate tonight is not only about Metro Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa-Carleton and all of the other major centres in this province, but is about the lack of serious commitment on the part of this government to see that we've got transit systems in those centres that are meaningful and useful.

The member for Oriole mentioned the need to substantially improve arterial roads. At the same time that this government is holding the line and cutting back on its commitment to public transit, it is also holding the line and cutting back on its commitment to municipalities and their ability to do just what he's talking about. It's all a part of the same game and it has no end except down.

Mr. Kennedy: I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak briefly to this question, though I am not sure why any of us are speaking to it here this evening.

Mr. Martel: I can tell you why; your House leader wouldn't let us bring it before the fare increase.

Mr. Warner: It should have been done on Friday.

Mr. Kennedy: Members opposite could start basically with taking a look in the dictionary and finding the definition of an emergency. This thing has been going on for a long period of time; then suddenly we have an emergency, and they push and push and push.

Mr. Martel: Don't give us nonsense.

Mr. Kennedy: I just wonder if we would be here if there wasn't a consultation over in Scarborough West in two or three weeks.

Mr. Eaton: Grandstanding is all they are doing.

Mr. Kennedy: Grandstanding is right. I think if this issue came to a vote and the government was defeated and it led to an election, it would be immediately dubbed the five-cent election.

Mr. Martel: What about two per cent?

Mr. Kennedy: Members opposite would be laughed right out of their seats because the public would realize the irresponsibility of bringing it on in this form and taking two days of the Legislature's time to deal with an issue where there is nothing left to be said.

Mr. Makarchuk: What was the election you called in 1977? You have four \$7 million members over there. It cost \$7 million a member to elect four men in 1977. Don't forget that.

Mr. Kennedy: And worth every nickel.

Mr. Riddell: If ever they lose their seats maybe we should have an election.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I would remind the House that the member for Mississauga South has the floor.

Mr. Kennedy: In full consideration of all the factors involved in this nonetheless very important debate and issue, there were two ways for the government to go when it got down to the final decision on it, either give the grant or don't give the grant.

Mr. Roy: That's pretty clear.

Mr. Kennedy: The judgement of the government in declining this—not hastily and not out of hand, but after very careful consideration—was correct, and very correct. If \$6 million were added in subsidy, what do we do next year and what do we do the year after that? Where do we go? The result would be a widening disparity between Metropolitan Toronto and the rest of Ontario. There are bus and transit systems in areas across this province other than in Metro, like Mississauga.

Mr. Kerrio: Gray Coach. That paid but you scuttled that.

Mr. Kennedy: This party has demonstrated on so many occasions its belief that there should be equality, equity and fairness for each person in this province. If one went through our great system and went through the budgets of the various ministries, one would see that one of the end points was to take into account the welfare of every individual within this province.

Mr. Kerrio: And Gray Coach.

Mr. Kennedy: As my colleague from Oriole has said, the province has been very generous with transit grants. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) said it wasn't the nickel he was concerned about, but the downward spiral in the ridership. This is one of the things that has emerged tonight. I want to deal with this for a moment from the TTC paper, which is an excellent report. A person who hadn't followed this issue in detail from day to day could read this and the Hansard of Thursday and he wouldn't require any more statistics. It is all there, there is nothing to be added. What was said in this report should be put on the record for once and for all.

"The ridership projections for mid-1977 have not been met, but at that time the optimism seemed justified. In 1975 and 1976 ridership exceeded expectations by 10 million and three million trips respectively, as apparently a fare increase in those years

affected ridership less than expected. Since 1975 there has been a steady, although small, decline in ridership, from its all-time peak of 358 million trips in 1975 to a projected 340 million in the current year without a fare increase."

Mr. McClellan: What's the deficit? Is it not 65 million bucks?

Mr. Kennedy: There have been other periods of declining ridership. Between 1954 and 1961 it dropped from 282 million to 240 million. There was also a plateau and slight decline in the 1968-71 period.

It goes on to say: "Declining ridership is not unique to the TTC. Vancouver and Montreal both had significant drops despite fare freezes, while Calgary and Edmonton have had ridership increases coincident with fare hikes. Economic growth seems to be at least as important as the fare level in determining ridership."

To say there is a downward spiral, implying that at some point down the road the transit vehicles are going to be empty or nearly empty, is not the way, evidently—

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you ride the Spadina subway and see if you can find any body on it?

Mr. Kennedy: —that historical statistics indicate. It appears there could be a cyclical nature to ridership numbers. Perhaps it is economic change. Whatever it is, I don't know; but I don't think we should draw the conclusion from this that the end of public transit is coming upon the TTC and upon the system.

Mr. Grande: What is your conclusion?

Mr. Kennedy: I want to touch on the grant system of MTC, the ministry, for a moment. We mentioned that it is very generous. It is. But I want to touch on a couple of things that have been referred to recently. One is the program for the handicapped, which again will receive substantial funding by the ministry; and of course the Easy Rider program, which is to be expanded.

I was interested in rereading the comments of the member for Riverdale. He made reference to this small amount of \$6 million. I immediately thought of the late C. D. Howe, adding significant inflation. Maybe they are both out in left field together. It may not be of great significance over there, but it certainly is to me, being a frugal individual, and it certainly is to people across the province.

Mr. Martel: Right; and in Minaki Lodge too.

Mr. Kennedy: Certainly. That's an investment.

Mr. Eaton: Wasn't that where the people ran Stephen out of?

Mr. Martel: You spent \$18 million and you still haven't got it open. You tried to give it away and nobody will take it from you.

Mr. Havrot: That's where you got beaten.

Mr. Kennedy: There is one thing that should be stated as well. My colleague the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) mentioned the economical ride that individuals using Metro transit receive, and they do. In 1973 the single zone fare for anywhere in Metro was established. One can go from Long Branch to Scarborough, from downtown as far north as the system goes—and that for five cents more than the former rate. There isn't a better bargain if one is going to use any other type of transit, unless, as the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) said, it is the bicycle or some mode such as that. It is a very good bargain.

I heard a CBC-AM program where a learned individual, editor of a transit journal or some such publication, was interviewed—by the CBC no less. He knew transit systems all over the world. He was loud in his praise of the system we have here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Also, the other night, I saw some TV man-in-the-street interviews, where the issue wasn't ridership, nor total subsidies; it wasn't the amount of deficit or any of these things. The question really was, "What about the increase, the five-cent increase?" Several were somewhat concerned about it, but two or three said that in the light of the way the economy is it seemed only reasonable. I think it says something for the common sense and intelligence of the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto.

I wanted to touch for a moment on another point.

[9:30]

Mr. Conway: Please do.

Mr. Kennedy: It is to help the members opposite. They should listen, because it involves their cousins on Capitol Hill down there.

Mr. Kerrio: You are doing the same things they are.

Mr. Eaton: The ones you want to disown.

Mr. Kennedy: The ones those members don't acknowledge. It is a couple of their sins that I want to touch on.

The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) mentioned commuter services. Members will recall the great fanfare with which the federal government, prior to 1975—1974 I guess was their last time out to consult the electorate—

was going to help out with something like \$500 million for urban transit. This was to include half of what might be needed to modify union station to help this province bring in commuters. It was to help opening up GO Transit on the CPR line out through Dixie, Cooksville, Streetsville and Malton; and to the north and to wherever that system brings riders in and converges on Toronto. The total cost was something in the order of \$58 million. We were hoping and were promised a significant contribution at that time, but later Ottawa reneged on the deal.

I just want to tell the members opposite, if they would go down there to take a look at Union Station right now, this government didn't accept that and roll over and let it lie. They allocated \$7 million, they have gone alone in the modification of Union Station to enable that commuter service to proceed and bring all those additional riders into Toronto and relieve the burden on our highways. We are going it alone; and it was \$7 million for the first phase and a total of some \$37 million committed. There was not one nickel from the feds, and that is a breach of the promise we received from them.

The only other point I want to make on this is that though this brings commuters into a central point they are not all from outside the boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto. They pick up at least from Long Branch, and then of course Scarborough, and in the north as far as Metro goes. So it is not a project to help commuters from out in the suburban areas. It's part of the integration of the whole transportation system. At the moment we're having some conversations with Ottawa in the light of an article in the Montreal Gazette on January 27.

Mr. Conway: Are you reading Quebec newspapers, Doug?

Mr. Kennedy: We are these days.

Mr. M. N. Davison: It is a clipping; dispense.

Mr. Roy: Dispense.

Mr. Kennedy: We won't dispense with anything. The fact is that article in the Gazette, with great trumpeting from Marc Lalonde, announced there would be \$63 million allocated to transit in the Montreal suburban areas. It just happens that about \$33 million of that allocated now is just about what was promised for Union Station downtown. That is what we are asking, ironically: how come they get it at this time? The \$500 million originally promised goes out the window; whole new ball game, fellows, but we're starting down in Montreal and there's nothing

for Metropolitan Toronto, and nothing for the province of Ontario. There's some answering to be done on that issue over the next few weeks.

It is my belief, as I said at the outset, the government, has made the proper judgement, the proper decision in this instance. In the knowledge of all the factors that have been brought out at this time, I am sure it will be acceptable to the riders who use the TTC in this area as a fair, just, good business decision and the very best solution to the problem with which we are confronted.

Mr. Roy: After listening to our leader's address this afternoon in reply to the throne speech and listening to an individual set out policies—in detail, alternatives to governments—

Mr. Hennessy: Leader? Charlie Chaplin.

Mr. Roy: Will I have to put up with him? Or shall we invite him to meet up with a transit boss or something?

Mr. Speaker: Just speak to me.

Mr. Eaton: He would win, Roy; he would win.

Mr. Roy: He set out the policies, he set out alternatives. I think tonight is an opportunity to bring out the bankruptcy, or to see long-term contradictions of the party on the other side, the same party whose members over the years have prided themselves as being real managers, of knowing the province, of looking to the province's future. We're seeing, as the years go by, the bankruptcy, the contradiction in these policies.

I listened to the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams). It's interesting to hear the expression used by some of these members, members of a party who have been in power 36-some years. When he talks about taxpayers' money coming from the province to the municipalities, he talks about it in terms of "donations," as though he were donating his pay cheque, something that was coming out of his pocket.

You hear it across the province, as you travel, whether it's Wintario funds or whether it's grants which should normally flow to municipalities, the people on the other side masquerade as though these funds are their funds; that they're not taxpayers' funds, that in fact they're doing this out of some altruistic gesture. They take the approach that it is their money rather than the money of the taxpayers of the province.

Mr. Havrot: We never gave you that impression.

Mr. Roy: I think it's indicative when members use words such as "donated."

He was followed by the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy).

Mr. Mancini: He was worse.

Mr. Roy: Then again, we get the old scenario of why they did not give a grant or a subsidy in this particular case.

Mr. Kennedy: Are you apologizing for Ottawa?

Mr. Roy: The approach, first of all, is Ottawa. When in trouble, blame the feds.

Mr. Kennedy: Blame the feds. Ottawa said it, we didn't say it.

Mr. Roy: It's the feds' fault.

Mr. Eaton: Isn't that what you fellows did after the election? That's why you separated your party. Why did you separate your party, Albert?

Mr. Roy: It's the old refrain. We see it all the time. If something goes wrong it's not their fault; somehow the federal government is involved in reneging—

Mr. Kennedy: That's because of Ottawa's broken promises.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At least we don't disavow our party.

Mr. Roy: —on a deal, somehow, with the municipality of Toronto, and that's why the subsidy couldn't be given. How often we've heard that refrain.

There is another refrain which is popular. I was surprised that the member should read the Montreal Gazette. One could almost predict what was coming when he mentioned the Montreal Gazette. It's just like Rene Levesque in reverse, some of the things he's saying. He's saying that not only is it the feds' fault we're not getting the money for the municipality, but the money that should generally be coming to Ontario has been given to Quebec. How often we've heard that refrain.

Mr. Kennedy: There is nothing wrong with that because that's the way it is.

Mr. Roy: How does he justify it? Poor Levesque in Quebec City has been spending the last three years convincing the people of that province that one of the reasons he wants to separate is that all the money is coming to Toronto, that all the money is coming to Ontario.

Most of us know the truth is somewhere in between, that the money is not all going to Quebec and the money is not all going to Toronto, and that in the long term there is a balance.

Mr. Rotenberg: How about sticking to the TTC?

Mr. Hennessy: What are you talking about?

Mr. Roy: It's not good enough. The people on the other side, when their policies are as bankrupt as theirs are, when there are inconsistencies and contradictions in their policies—

Mr. Rotenberg: Speak on the TTC.

Mr. Roy: —they have to accept responsibility. If they don't want to accept responsibility, they should get out and let somebody else govern.

Mr. Kennedy: Why did they say they would give it?

Mr. Villeneuve: People don't want to leave us.

Mr. Roy: The irony of this issue and this situation is that the subsidy should be refused by the same Premier who staked his whole political reputation on being a man of public transportation, of being Mr. Transportation Man of the Year.

Mr. Peterson: Hurray for him.

Mr. Roy: He follows in a long line of Premiers who started as far back as George Drew.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Great man. Great man.

Mr. Roy: I happen to have here—Mr. Speaker, you'd be interested in reading this—what is called the Constructive Platform of the Conservative Party in the Province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Walker: You got it right.

Mr. Roy: —approved at a general meeting at Toronto, July 3, 1943. It's all laid out there. My leader this afternoon talked about—

Mr. Hennessy: The ayatollah.

Mr. Roy: —the party which masquerades as managers—the same party. We talked about the economic strategy of this province. We talked about the bankruptcy in their policies vis-à-vis Ontario Hydro. Let's listen. Now we've got bankruptcies in public transportation.

George Drew, back in 1943, was saying this—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you kidding?

Mr. Roy: "It can be done wastefully or it can be done as part of a great plan." That's what he said, "part of a great plan."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is the Mitch Hepburn stuff?

Mr. Roy: He said: "We will need more power." This is what he was talking about back in 1943. "We will need more power. We will need better transportation."

Mr. Hennessy: You need more brains.

Mr. Roy: You see, it starts as far back as 1943. "We will need new buildings." My former leader, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), knows what we're talking about with these buildings. We've got one not too far away.

"Plans for all of these should be done in advance." That's to say you've got to have policies and you've got to have strategies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What are you talking about?

Mr. Roy: So the scheme is under way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What did Drew say about the subway fares?

Mr. Roy: I recall back in 1971, as a new member, seeing the transformation of Bill Davis. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this was part of the overall plan to change the image of the man. Dalton Camp and the boys were saying: "Look, Bill, your pant legs are too wide. Your hair is not quite right. You have to change the image. You have to find an issue."

Mr. Hennessy: That is not a subway train. Dalton Camp is not a subway train.

Mr. Eaton: Get back to the topic.

Mr. Roy: You recall the issue, Mr. Speaker, the Spadina Expressway. You recall the famous speech. Mr. Speaker, I think you were in the House back on June 3, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was your party's position on that? Take your week and then tell me what your position is.

Mr. Roy: He talked at that time of the Spadina Expressway in terms of a capital city, of his views on a capital city, the capital city of Ontario and what the overall plan should be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Give us Phil Givens' position on that.

Mr. Roy: It's interesting to read Hansard, page 2280.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Vern Singer.

Mr. Roy: It says: "The issue of the Spadina Expressway is not only a substantive one, but it has become symbolic among the population at large, whose legitimate concerns for the planning and development of the capital city of their province, their communities and their transportation facilities are all keenly felt, and whose interests in conserving their urban amenities and environment have become one of the highest priorities. The government of Ontario does not propose to proceed in support of the plan for the Spadina Expressway." Members will remember

that famous—I unfortunately was not here at that time—

[9:45]

Ms. Gigantes: Do you have confidence in them now?

Mr. Roy: Confidence in them? Of course not.

Ms. Gigantes: Well, vote against them; vote with us.

Mr. Cassidy: Ah, you got caught on that one, Albert; right on.

Mr. Peterson: We have less confidence in you.

Mr. Roy: It is true I don't have confidence in them. I just want to say to the member for Carleton East—

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, you got caught on that one. Do you stand with the riders in OC Transpo?

Mr. Roy: The NDP members should wait their turn. They will get their turn next.

Mr. Cassidy: We are talking about you and the buses in Ottawa.

Mr. Roy: We will talk about the bankruptcy of the policies of the people to my left. Let me finish. Don't be impatient.

Mr. Martel: You got caught, Albert.

Mr. Hennessy: Is that a promise?

Mr. Roy: And so the famous decision was made on the Spadina Expressway back in June 1971. He goes on:

"We do propose to co-operate with the appropriate municipal authorities in the development of alternative transportation facilities in which we shall offer appreciably greater provincial financial assistance for rapid transportation service."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Read me your party's position.

Mr. Sterling: Only \$7 million in the last four years.

Mr. Roy: Here is what we were getting back in 1971.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Keep reading.

Mr. Roy: I can recall it was probably the single most important decision in the Premier's whole political career.

Mr. Makarchuk: He didn't make it; it was Dalton Camp who made the decision.

Mr. Roy: He probably didn't think of it, but he obviously convinced him to make the decision. So the question that followed from that decision was, what was their alternative?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The large majority.

Mr. Roy: I can recall the famous announcement. I recall trooping over to the science centre where we were going to be given alternatives to the automobile—public transportation. Members will recall that spectacle; it was obscene. My colleague from St. George will recall that. Everybody who was anybody in the municipality was ordered to come up there and watch this film—

Mrs. Campbell: Bowed three times to Mecca.

Mr. Roy: —of the Krauss-Maffei system. At that time it was interesting that the Premier said of his Minister of Transportation and Communications—

Mr. Villeneuve: Never mind grandstanding.

Mr. Hennessy: Sit down.

Mr. Roy: —the honourable Mr. Carton—do members remember him?

Mr. Kennedy: Great fellow, we sure do.

Mr. Roy: Back in 1972 the Premier said of him, "I have a great deal to do with him. It is quite obvious after yesterday's announcement"—and that was the announcement at the science centre—"that particular minister will emerge as the foremost leader in the world as far as rapid transit is concerned."

Not only did we have to suffer the spectacle at the science centre, but they came to Ottawa-Carleton and they went down to London, I am sure, and Hamilton and all over. There was background music and all at once you would see these rapid transit vehicles—

Mr. Kerrio: Magic carpets, Albert, magic carpets.

Mr. Roy: Yes, it was fantastic. There were no wheels on these things. It was beautiful. No driver; no one driving.

Mr. Cassidy: Just like the Liberal Party; there are no wheels on your party either.

Mr. Kerrio: Just like the government.

Mr. Hennessy: Albert, you are sick.

Mr. Roy: What did I hear from that member? He's getting sick?

Mr. Makarchuk: That's one of the \$7 million members over there. By the pound he is about \$40,000 a pound.

Mr. Roy: But then things started going sour with the whole Krauss-Maffei system. Some of my colleagues have said that in a city when you are talking about public transportation you may have a problem if you have a vehicle that will not go around corners. That could be a problem in the city. Then there was some concern about

not having a driver in there. We mundane and narrow-minded people sort of like to see someone up front in charge.

Mr. Ruston: We like to see someone running the store.

Mr. Eaton: You've got nobody up front in charge of your party.

Mr. Roy: For you that may not be a problem. For us, we think it's important.

Mr. Ruston: They're used to it, Albert. They're used to nobody up front.

Mr. Roy: Anyway, it's soured, and so we've got the project now out in Kingston, as far away as possible from the Premier. You recall, I go a step further, what was it, 1972? The Premier trooping off to Florida; he got a medal.

Mr. Makarchuk: Miami.

Ms. Gigantes: What are you going to do tonight, Albert? Do you have confidence in them tonight?

Mr. Roy: Yes, transportation man of the year. So, Mr. Speaker, we have it all. You know, the chickens come home to roost. Here's the man who's built his whole reputation on public transportation. Here's the same individual who denies the city of Toronto a subsidy at a time when they are in an important phase.

Mr. Sterling: They are already getting more than anybody else.

Mr. Roy: When they have arrived at a fine line between increasing the rates and increasing the number of passengers.

Mr. Wildman: Nobody's getting enough.

Mr. Roy: It's got to be studied, it's got to be looked at. The approach that we've taken is to say, "Look, defer it for a year to allow the TTC to review the problem to see that we can have a study so that we're in a position really to chart the course of the public transportation system of this city."

The Premier is not without knowing that even in the city of Toronto possibly he may win votes on this issue and he knows full well that across the province it's a no-lose issue that he will in fact win. I think it's sad that for political reasons the very man whose reputation was made on public transportation is the one who here today or last week in fact undermined it by refusing to give a subsidy that we may chart the future of this important system for the capital of the province.

There'll be an election at some time in the future where he'll be made accountable for some of the things—on Hydro, on econo-

mic policy and on the public transportation system.

Now I have to look at the socialists' position.

Mr. Kerrio: Get them on the buses, Albert.

Mr. Roy: We've got to review it.

Mr. Makarchuk: You are ahead so far.

Mr. Roy: I'm sort of a kind soul. I would not of my own initiative attack my friends to the left.

Ms. Gigantes: Smile when you say that.

Mr. Roy: That's not my style and the member for Carleton-East knows that; it's not my style. But I was provoked into it by an editorial which appeared in yesterday's—Monday, March 12—Ottawa Citizen. I think it's important; the Citizen is an important paper. The leader of the NDP reads the Citizen; that's an important paper for the leader of the NDP. It's taking him to task a little bit. In case you haven't read it, Mr. Speaker, I'll read it.

Mr. Martel: Well, he was here, but you never are on Monday.

An hon. member: He was at home writing his speech. Leave him alone.

Mr. Roy: That's true, Mr. Speaker. Some of us spend more time in the riding. I listened to the leader of the NDP and if he's going to spend his time doing foolishness like he's doing tonight, maybe he should spend more time in the riding.

Here's the editorial. It says "A Sweet Election Issue." That's the title of it.

It says: "Michael Cassidy and his New Democrats are stretching a point of philosophy to a point of absurdity." And that's his local paper. It goes on to say—

Mr. Cassidy: You fellows are going to move a motion of no confidence.

Ms. Gigantes: Read the whole editorial. I have it here too.

Mr. Roy: Okay, I'm quite prepared to read it together if you like.

Let's carry on. It says: "They are prepared, if we take their actions at face value—"and even the Citizen knows sometimes that you don't always do that with the NDP—"to force an election because of the Ontario government's refusal to increase subsidies to the Toronto Transit Commission." Then it goes on to say: "They want to head off the same fares for Toronto that Ottawa-Carleton residents are already paying." And who is one of the members from Ottawa-Carleton?

Ms. Gigantes: Read about Mr. Smith's hot air; read the paragraph about Mr. Smith's hot air.

Mr. Cassidy: The present rate in Ottawa for long-term riders is the old rate for Toronto.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, it goes on: "Wouldn't that be a sweet election issue for Premier Davis?"

Mr. Kerrio: Self destruction.

Mr. Ashe: Maybe we should vote for the no-confidence motion.

Mr. Roy: In every little town and village across Ontario, he would keep hammering away: "We are having this election because the opposition wants to give more money to Toronto." That's exactly what he would do. He'd win. We would have shades of 1971. He would win the election for sure. But then it goes on to talk about the sanity of the official opposition, and that's a plus.

Mr. Sterling: Read that part. It isn't too complimentary, is it, Albert?

Mr. Roy: If I may have your attention, please. I am sorry, my friends are impatient; let me proceed.

It says: "But of course we won't have the election on this issue and Cassidy knows it. That's why it was perfectly safe for his party to introduce its motion of no confidence in the government for failing to provide the \$6-million subsidy to TTC. The motion will pass only with the help of the Liberals"—but the Liberals know a lot better; I'm sorry, I'm getting ahead of myself—"and the Liberals won't support it because they realize that the pursuit of the issue would be suicidal outside of Metro Toronto." Right? We know that.

Interjections.

Mr. Ruston: Larry, why don't you vote with the NDP?

Mr. Roy: "Liberal leader Stuart Smith gave himself two options to show concern without actually risking an election." And that's smart leadership.

Mr. Eaton: Why don't you be honest and admit the rest of the members got to him?

Mr. Roy: I am bound to read this word for word, Mr. Speaker; the member for Carleton East, I am pledged to it. It says: "His first choice was an emergency debate which meant a lot of words and hot air in the Legislature without ever holding a dangerous vote. His second out was to say that he was opposed to an election on the issue unless he sensed a lot of public support.

Well, that makes sense too. We are not going to go into an election and lose it.

"He knows full well that there will be no public support outside of Metro and there are a lot of signs in support even within

Toronto. The NDP's no-confidence"—this is good, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Van Horne: It would bring a tear to your eye, wouldn't it, Albert?

Mr. Roy: Yes, turn up your hearing aids. It says: "The NDP's no-confidence motion is about as risky as playing Russian roulette without bullets."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Interesting simile he selected.

Mr. Roy: "But Cassidy," it goes on to say—you probably think I am making this up; straight word-for-word here.

"But Cassidy's own constituents in Ottawa Centre might well wonder why he was so comparatively mute when OC Transpo fares rose to 60 cents cash, the very fare that he's trying to block in Toronto."

[10:00]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Resign.

Ms. Gigantes: Keep talking, Albert.

Mr. Roy: It goes on: "He didn't play around with no-confidence motions then; why is he so concerned about Toronto?"

Mr. Warner: Where was your voice?

Mr. Havrot: The five-cent fiasco.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if I may complete this: I want to finish. There are just two short paragraphs here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Take all the time you want.

Mr. Roy: "His weak answer is that the line has to be drawn somewhere." It wouldn't have anything to do with by-elections here, would it? I don't think they'd do that, would they, for political purposes? If Toronto can get more subsidies for public transit, then so can other municipalities. Obviously, the line was not about to be drawn in defence of transit riders in his hometown.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the member for Ottawa Centre would deny the rumour that he plans to run in Toronto; that he still represents the riding of Ottawa Centre and he will for the next election.

Mr. Cassidy: And I represent it well. I am going to keep on representing it long after you leave this place.

Mr. Roy: If the member gets too exercised, we will send out Brian Cameron.

Let's face it: the political and media power in this province is in Toronto, although the choice of the TTC riders—the outspoken tabloid Toronto Sun—has sided with Davis against the subsidies: "Cassidy and Smith are

both anxious for support in Toronto, even at the risk of alienating the rest of Ontario, or maybe they thought we wouldn't notice."

So the point is this: I say to the member for Ottawa Centre and the people on that side: where were you when OC Transpo in Ottawa increased its fares?

Mr. Young: Where were you?

Mr. Peterson: Where were you when they increased the fares in London, Ontario?

Mr. Roy: My colleague to my right said: "Where were you when they increased the fares in London, Ontario?"

Mr. Cassidy: Where were you when I was talking about transit subsidies across the province in January?

Mr. Renwick: Where was anybody in this House?

Mr. Roy: Did they increase the fares in Windsor? I'm sure they did in Niagara Falls, St. Catharines, Kitchener. Where were you when they increased the fares in Kitchener?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They were out working for the federal Grits.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I think the best evidence of the logic of their position is that this same party is prepared to spend \$30 million—

Mr. Nixon: Start over again, Albert, start over. Let's have that editorial one more time.

Mr. Roy: I am not sure that the camera can focus sufficiently to pick this up but I say, Mr. Speaker, we know that the party to our left is posturing.

Mr. Cassidy: Speak for yourselves. We are voting with the motion.

Mr. Roy: As my colleague said some time ago, if we said to them now, "We'll support your motion," they'd have a heart attack.

Mr. Warner: Try it. Why don't you try it?

Mr. Peterson: It might be worth it. It would get rid of them once and for all.

Mr. Roy: As I said earlier, in due time this party—the official opposition—will make these people account for their policies. But I think it's important that the public of this province—

Mr. Cassidy: You are going to get your big brother in Ottawa to help you, eh?

Mr. Roy: As I said a year ago, we've got to give the people of the province some time to get to know the leader of the NDP—just a bit longer, the way we know him in Ottawa.

With the policies that we're putting forward and the reasonable positions that we're taking here I am sure that even the people

of Toronto, even the transit riders, as frustrated as they are about the policies of this government, would be the first to say there shouldn't be an election on this issue. The approach of this official opposition is one that is responsible and it's not a matter of posturing.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the debate on my leader's motion that this government no longer enjoys the confidence of this House because of its recent decision to withhold provincial funding to maintain current fares for riders of the TTC and because of its continued refusal to provide an adequate funding formula to public transportation systems throughout Ontario. While I listened to the member for Ottawa East accuse us of having weak hearts, I would suggest that perhaps one might tell the Liberals that people who have weak hearts shouldn't accuse other people of having heart attacks.

Throughout the weeks of discussion and lobbying and hard bargaining which have led up to this motion of no-confidence the Conservatives have attempted to convince us that the issues involved can be simply put and we hear them echoed again tonight by the Liberals. "It's Toronto versus the rest of the province," they tell us, "the pampered Toronto transit system versus struggling public transit systems in other Ontario municipalities." It is the old Conservative game, which the Liberals are trumpeting again tonight: Keep the locals fighting with each other and the provincial government can cast smiles of benign neglect over the resulting fray below.

It's strange to say, as the member for Ottawa East has quoted, there are still some in this province who get taken in by this old divide-and-rule gambit. The Ottawa Citizen, for example, which was widely quoted by the member for Ottawa East, ran the editorial to which he referred and chastised the member for Ottawa Centre for moving no confidence on Toronto transit fares and said he was comparatively mute when fares in the OC Transpo system rose to 60 cents. Of all the profound character analyses concerning the member for Ottawa Centre that pundits have indulged in, the accusation that he is comparatively mute is surely one which would stretch even the most credulous mind.

The editorial went on to suggest that my leader was running the risk of alienating the rest of Ontario by expressing our lack of confidence on this issue, and I should mention also, for the benefit of those who didn't hear through the buffoonery of the member for Ottawa East, that in fact the Ottawa

Citizen accused his leader of the same error. I think this kind of analysis is just what Conservative policies have been designed to produce and I feel these policies must be challenged.

I am one of those from the Ottawa Valley who gets occasional relief from time to time by saying things like, "Toronto is a nice place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live here," or, "Some of my best friends are Torontonians, but I wouldn't want my sister to marry one." That's the way we hinterland residents let off steam. It's a natural enough way of expressing our frustration, less with the city itself than with the 36-year-old government that has its power centre here in this city. But there is a limit to my willingness to indulge in this kind of anti-Toronto sport, especially when spitting in Toronto's eye means spitting in the eyes of other municipalities of this province who are struggling with similar urban transit problems, municipalities such as Ottawa-Carleton, Mr. Speaker.

I hope the member for Ottawa East will stick around to hear some information about the Ottawa-Carleton transit system. The Ottawa-Carleton regional municipality is one of the fastest-growing areas in Canada, let alone Ontario. The riding of Carleton East, which I have the great honour to represent in this Legislature, encompasses the eastern and southern urban and suburban communities of Ottawa-Carleton and includes about 20 communities separated by many miles from each other and from the employment centre, the city of Ottawa.

Carleton East is served by the buses of the Ottawa-Carleton transportation system, OC Transpo, as we affectionately call it, and we have a very strong appreciation in Carleton East of how important that service is. Most of us can remember how isolated and difficult life was in the days before OC Transpo took up the promise of provincial government support and began the difficult and deliberate job of extending service to our far-flung communities.

That was back in the early 1970s when the transportation man of the year had promised provincial income tax moneys for three quarters of capital costs and one half of operating deficits. The transportation planners—and we have some good ones in Ottawa-Carleton—and the local politicians—and we have some creative ones—set to work with those provincial promises and began the slow and careful extension of public transit in Ottawa-Carleton. Every suburban line they opened was filled to peak-hour capacity in no time flat, and the same is true for every new line today.

But because of the limits this government has placed on its promises, OC Transpo may soon be heading into difficulties. Our regular adult fares are now 60 cents. Because of the imaginative planning on routes, express surcharges and bargain-basement monthly pass packages, the average fare in Ottawa-Carleton is only 32.4 cents. The ridership continues to grow as the system is extended, but the signs of trouble for this system are clear. Last year the OC Transpo deficit was \$1 million higher than expected. The warning signs are in.

What is the reason? It is simple enough. Although the system is expanding, ridership is not expanding as fast as might reasonably have been expected. In turn, the most probable reason for that is that the off-peak adult rider has to pay 60 cents a trip. Sixty cents a trip is a deterrent for an awful lot of people who live in Ottawa-Carleton. It is another bitter and sad fact of life in this province.

The provincial subsidy to OC Transpo would be the promised 50 per cent of operating subsidy if, and only if, OC Transpo were raising 65 per cent of its revenue from the fare box. But OC Transpo discovered in 1978 that its ridership growth started to flag when public transit in Ottawa-Carleton was raising 60 per cent as opposed to 65 per cent of its revenue from the fare box. If we raise revenues from the fare box to 65 per cent in OC Transpo to meet the provincial government quota, our ridership will grow even slower. The increasing operating deficit will mean that in an area which is undernourished as far as public transit is concerned we may have to plan to cut routes instead of increasing them. So much for the Conservative policy of support to public transit.

Mr. Grande: The Premier finally came.

Mr. Cassidy: He came to see the government fall?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What did they do for urban transit in Saskatchewan?

Ms. Gigantes: While I am on my feet, I would like to remind the members of the Conservative government about a candidate they ran in a by-election in the riding of Carleton East in 1974. He was the mayor of the city of Ottawa and was well respected for his work in that role. The Conservatives thought they could elect him in Carleton East, but they didn't understand how people in Carleton East, who had practically no public transit, would feel about a mayor of Ottawa who didn't want expressways built over the communities in his cities.

He was right and so were the people of Carleton East. He wanted to protect communities in the city; they had to get to work. He would have had a much easier time as a Conservative candidate, if the people of Carleton East had been well served by public transit. It might be a good idea for members of this government to consult with him now on this question because I am sure he would confirm what I am saying.

I don't like divide-and-rule politics. I don't like to see the city pitted against the suburban area. I don't like to see Toronto pitted against the province. It is cheap, miserable and self-defeating. It is the kind of politics this government indulges in and promotes, and it is supported by the Liberals.

Mr. Turner: You're not supposed to be reading.

Ms. Gigantes: This government will ultimately be judged on its miserable record. In the meantime, I join with Mayor Marion Dewar of Ottawa, Mayor Morley Rosenberg of Kitchener and the other progressive mayors of Ontario—

Mr. Peterson: What about Jane Bigelow from London?

Ms. Gigantes: —and my leader and NDP colleagues in this Legislature to express my distaste for a government that promises public transport support but fails to deliver it. I am in support of this motion.

[10:15]

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Speaker, in rising to conclude what has been a debate on such a major issue that it could cause an election, such a major issue here in this town that the galleries are full tonight—

Mr. Kerrio: Sit down while you're ahead.

Mr. Eaton: A major issue the NDP say. Well, one hardly thinks so when they don't come. We've had major issues in this House when the galleries were full.

Mr. Cassidy: They're waiting for us to knock on their doors.

Mr. Makarchuk: They can't afford to ride the subway to get here. What was the major issue in 1977?

Mr. Turner: You should know.

Mr. Eaton: Working with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, I know the dedication of the people of this ministry to the support of public transit. The past decade has been one which has made us the most progressive area in North America as far as public transit is concerned. We are one of the forerunners of public transit, and we have visitors coming here at all times to see

the public transit system that we set up in this province.

We have considered all of the elements of public transit. We have included programs of surface capital; of rapid transit; of operating capital; of studies; of development and demonstrations. We have increased our operating subsidies in this province from \$6.7 million in 1971 to \$60 million in 1978; and the total subsidies have increased this year sevenfold to that time. That is a dedication by this government to public transit.

The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) made some references to other areas of transit. Yes, this ministry is involved in a number. We provide some of the best roads in North America. We have the soundest trucking industry in North America in Ontario. We have the safest public transit in North America. And on top of that we have the best connecting systems to that public transit.

I use the public transit coming in from London—the railway. The member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) does, too, at times—and a lot of his constituents do; but did I ever hear him speaking up for subsidy for them from the federal government on the railway coming in? Never.

The London transit increased its rates just about two weeks ago to 50 cents. Did we hear the members from London speaking up, or the NDP? No; not at all.

Mr. Cassidy: You certainly heard us.

Mr. Eaton: Because they are realistic. They know that a 50-cent fare is a realistic ride to work. The people in my riding would give anything to be able to get to work for 50 cents like all the people in Toronto can.

Mr. Villeneuve: Best bargain in the world.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Six tickets for three bucks.

Mr. Eaton: That 50 cents means \$5 a week. You can't park downtown for \$5 a week in Toronto. It's the best bargain there could be. The ridership has dropped a little, and very little, because some people are using their cars more. A very foolish move, really, when you see that even at 50 cents they can't park for that price. And you people

are trying to get us to put more subsidy into that. How ridiculous.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Could the honourable member wind up in 30 seconds?

Mr. Eaton: I can do that. The only member of the Liberal Party from Toronto talked about reality. Well a 50-cent ride to work is reality. It is a fair ride to work. The NDP have grandstanded, and they have grandstanded greatly on this issue. If they thought other members were going to vote for this resolution, or if they voted for it, they would need somebody behind them to clean up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order. The 30 seconds have expired. It is the duty of the Speaker to allow 10 minutes for the possibility of casting a vote on the motion before the House.

The House divided on Mr. Cassidy's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

AYES

Bounsall, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Davison, M. N., di Santo, Dukszta, Gigantes, Grande, Lawlor, Lupusella, MacDonald, Makarchuk, Martel, McClellan, Philip, Renwick, Warner, Wildman, Young, Ziemba.

NAYS

Ashe, Auld, Baetz, Belanger, Bernier, Birch, Blundy, Bolan, Breithaupt, Brunelle, Campbell, Conway, Cureatz, Davis, Drea, Eakins, Eaton, Epp, Gaunt, Gregory, Grossman, Haggerty, Hall, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Johnson,

Jones, Kennedy, Kerr, Kerrio, Lane, Leluk, MacBeth, Mancini, McCaffrey, McCague, McGuigan, McKessock, McNeil, Miller, G. I., Newman, B., Newman, W., Nixon, Norton, O'Neil, Peterson, Pope, Ramsay, Reid, T. P., Riddell,

Rotenberg, Rowe, Roy, Ruston, Sargent, Scrivener, Smith, G. E., Snow, Stephenson, Sterling, Stong, Taylor, G., Taylor, J. A., Turner, Van Horne, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Worton, Yakabuski.

Ayes 22; nays 75.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 13, 1979

Private members' public business re public transit policy; Motion No. 1: Mr. Cassidy,
Mr. Sterling, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Philip, Mr. Williams, Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Charlton,
Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Roy, Ms. Gigantes, Mr. Eaton 179

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 205

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
 Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
 (York Mills PC)
 Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
 Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
 Van Horne, R. (London North L)
 Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
 Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
 Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Williams, J. (Orion PC)
 Young, E. (Yorkview NDP)
 Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 7

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, March 15, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: I have a message from the Honourable the Administrator of the province signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, the Honourable W. G. C. Howland, the Administrator of the province of Ontario, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1980 and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, March 15, 1979.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Hon. Mr. McCague: I would like to take this opportunity to report to the House on the steps that are being taken to implement the intent of the 11 general recommendations of the standing procedural affairs committee on agencies, boards and commissions.

Members will recall that on December 7, 1978 the House adopted the report of the committee with one amendment. The report included 27 recommendations, of which 11 were of general nature. The other 16 recommendations referred to agencies specifically reviewed by the committee. The responsible ministers will in due course respond to the specific recommendations where necessary.

Before dealing with the 11 general recommendations, I would like to make two preliminary points. In my statement in the House on December 7, 1978 I referred in some detail to the important work that has been undertaken by this government to ensure that its agencies are administered in an effective and an efficient manner. The results of that work have already satisfied some of the concerns of the procedural affairs committee.

Secondly, I should make it clear that the current activities of the agency review committee, chaired by my colleague the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wiseman), are also aimed at resolving some of the issues raised by the procedural affairs committee. It is

anticipated that the agency review committee will issue its next report in the late spring of this year.

Recommendation one was that Management Board should review agencies in order to rationalize structures and that there should be an explicit policy in agencies. As most members are aware, this is a policy in the government's manual of administration in which all agencies are allocated to schedules which delineate the applicability of financial and administrative controls. This policy, therefore, meets the committee's underlying concerns. The agency review committee will, however, review the need for any refinement of the policy and will report on this matter in its next report.

Recommendation two dealt with two issues, the first of which was the number of members that should be appointed to agencies. The agency review committee will review the need for guidelines on the number of members in its next report. The second issue referred to was the remuneration of appointees. As the members are aware, remuneration is already closely controlled by Management Board according to a policy which was tabled in the House in May 1978 by my predecessor, the present Minister of Energy and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld). The policy is presently under review and the amended policy, when approved by Management Board, will also be tabled in this House.

Recommendation three referred to guidelines for the disclosure of interest of members. The committee is looking at that also.

Recommendation four, essentially, was that a written policy statement should be drawn up for each agency. Most agencies do, of course, have clear policy statements in their legislation or order in council, or in terms of reference prepared by the responsible minister. In addition, some agencies are required to prepare memorandum of understanding, each of which includes a detailed statement of the agency's role and objectives. The government certainly agrees with the intent of recommendation four, and accordingly Management Board will ensure that written terms of reference are prepared in each case where they do not now exist.

Recommendation five, that all memoranda of understanding should be tabled in the House, will be implemented as the memoranda are finalized and approved by cabinet.

Recommendation six suggested that all agencies would table annual reports in the Legislature. In the government's view it would be inappropriate for all agencies to table reports, given the fact that many bodies have no financial or administrative relationship with the province. In addition, some agencies are so small that preparing several reports would be administratively inefficient.

The government proposes, therefore, to meet the intent of the recommendation by including references in the appropriate ministry's annual report to all agencies, or groups of agencies, which have a financial or administrative relationship to the government and which do not now table reports. It is not proposed, therefore, to include those agencies, such as the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, which have no financial or administrative relationship with the province.

Recommendation seven discussed the content of annual reports. The agency review committee will review the need to stipulate minimum information and will report on the matter in its next report.

There are two parts to recommendation eight: firstly, that a standard accounting format should be established for agencies; and secondly, that all expenditures and services provided to an agency by a ministry should be charged back against the accounts of the agency.

As members will appreciate, one standard accounting format is not feasible, in view of the diverse nature of agencies. However, depending on the nature of each agency, its expenditures are required to be accounted for according to either government or commercial, generally accepted accounting principles.

To meet the intent of the second part, the following approach will be taken. All agencies will be listed in the appropriate ministry estimates briefing book provided to members during estimates debates commencing with the 1979-80 estimates. For information purposes only, estimated direct and indirect program-related costs from the consolidated revenue fund will be identified for each agency in the briefing books beginning immediately. In subsequent years, an assessment of actual expenditures for the previous year will also be included. This approach is the most efficient way of ensuring that members are provided with relevant cost information for those agencies receiving provincial

support, either in the form of money or services.

Nine referred to the need to improve co-ordination of federal and provincial interests. The government fully concurs with this sentiment and the recent creation of the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, as well as the current deregulation initiatives, are evidence of our concern.

Recommendation 10 was that the expenditures of all agencies should be subject to the review of the public accounts committee of the Legislature. It is accepted that the public accounts committee should review an agency's expenditures where there is an immediate or potential financial relationship with the province. The committee, of course, already has this mandate and can review all expenditures by agencies from the consolidated revenue fund and the accounts of those self-financed bodies included in volume two of the public accounts committee; therefore, no action is required.

The final recommendation, number 11, requested that all agencies be listed in the estimates book, and this will be done.

AUTO PACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, last night the Honourable Jack Horner spoke to the Windsor Chamber of Commerce outlining the federal government's policy regarding the Canadian automotive products industry. At the same time, the federal government announced its response to the Reisman commission recommendations and to the sector task force on the Canadian automotive industry.

Mr. S. Smith: May we have a copy of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm sorry, isn't it over there? It's coming now. Mr. Speaker, if the opposition wishes, I would be happy to stand down my statement for a few moments until they have it. I'm sorry for the delay.

I'm sure that honourable members would like to know this government's reaction to Mr. Horner's address. I also intend to expand upon my preliminary statement on the Reisman report that I made in this Legislature November 24, 1978. Our response to the sector task force on the Canadian automotive industry will be coming forward in the near future as part of our overall response to all industry sector task force studies.

While we agree with some of the recommendations from Ottawa, we differ on other of their approaches.

As we have said before, we agree with the federal government's decision that the Canada-US Automotive Products Trade Agreement, commonly known as the auto

pact, should not be open for renegotiation at this time.

To enhance the investment climate in this industry, we believe all Canadian governments should now support the auto pact. However, we firmly believe that studies should begin immediately to develop more favourable terms and conditions in the operation of the agreement in order to be prepared for discussions with the US government, when opportune.

We are pleased to learn that the federal government will review the automotive industry on an annual basis beginning with the 1979 model year. Ontario has been pressing the federal government to produce such an annual public report. We feel that the provinces and the automotive industry must have the opportunity to participate in the development of its form and content, particularly to establish an agreed upon data base. Assessment of the Canadian industry's performance in relation to the auto pact has been clouded by lack of accurate and comparative data. An annual report should end this controversy.

We support federal efforts in the area of duty remission programs but feel these efforts need to be intensified for the sake of our auto parts manufacturers. Moreover, every effort should be made to encourage not only increased parts sales but also new investments by foreign vehicle manufacturers. New capital investments in manufacturing facilities will provide more jobs and minimize our sensitivity to changing market conditions.

We feel that the federal government has not gone far enough in developing specific programs to improve the structure of the automotive products industry in this country; nor do we feel they go far enough in ensuring that Canada attains its share of the massive investment in design, development and production of the new generation of automobiles to meet energy conservation, safety and environmental requirements.

We feel that in order for the automotive industry to be able to effectively respond to the challenge, a firmer commitment than that given yesterday is required. We would remind this House that our government has proposed for some time now that an automotive investment incentive assistance program be developed on a one-for-two basis, with the government of Ontario being willing to contribute \$50 million.

The federal government's position in this regard remains vague. Ottawa only states that special federal assistance will be considered when such aid is beyond the financial

capability of the province concerned and when existing federal programs do not apply.

The industry, Mr. Speaker, is of course substantially located in Ontario and if the federal government is not prepared to say now whether Ontario qualifies or not, then Mr. Horner's statement is meaningless. We intend to fulfil our commitment to support the automotive parts industry in Ontario. We must know with certainty to what extent our tax dollars will be complemented with federal tax dollars.

[2:15]

To that end, we will approach Mr. Horner once again seeking more definitive arrangements. We will in any event, proceed to develop measures of assistance for the automotive industry in this province to the maximum of our abilities. We are encouraged by the fact the federal government has identified a need for special measures to increase the level of research and development in the Canadian automotive industry. Lacking more definitive information, we have some reservations as to the effectiveness, however, of some of these proposals.

We would like, for example, to know what steps are going to be taken to assist Canadian-owned firms to obtain foreign technology. We would like to know the extent of assistance to be available under the enterprise development program.

As I said in my statement to this House last fall, we do not disagree with federal funds being administered under the aegis of EDP; we do though, insist that a program be specially tailored for each segment of the industry, that it be developed through federal-provincial consultation and agreement and that the procedures be streamlined. We would like to know how the federal government will decide what type of research and development is most appropriate to Canada and we expect that the federal government will consult us on the types of R and D that will be promoted.

It remains up to the government and the individual firms involved, of course, to seek out and develop programs of maximum benefit, and to decide the specific assistance required for capital investment and R and D; nonetheless, some indication of the level of federal participation is necessary.

With significant restructuring of the auto parts industry due to new materials and new technology, there will undoubtedly be some dislocation of workers. We note that Mr. Horner said special arrangements for dislocated workers are being considered. We feel, however, that now is the time to clearly outline an adjustment assistance program. Consideration should also be given to the

provision of financial assistance to companies to promote rationalization and expansion where their financial resources are inadequate.

Mr. Horner said that while Canada now has a deficit under the auto pact, a recovery has been under way since 1976. The fact is Canada has had an automotive trade deficit since 1973. It is important, then, that we move now to reduce the deficit. Some of the measures proposed by Ottawa are encouraging; however, it is not likely that a deficit situation will be corrected until capital investment results in a strengthening and restructuring of the industry.

We will be making further submissions to the federal government on this, and we will, of course, report any new developments to the House.

DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly confirm to the members of this House that the flooded sections of both the township of Dover and the town of Paris have been declared disaster areas, entitling them to financial assistance from the province under our provincial disaster relief assistance program.

In Dover, the ice blockages in the Thames River caused flooding of about 8,000 acres on March 8 and 9. About 100 homes and 300 farm buildings were damaged and more than 100 cattle drowned. In Paris, about 60 residences and 20 small businesses sustained flood damage on March 5 when ice jams caused the Grand River to overflow.

Staff of my ministry have been in the two areas over the last several days and have been in constant touch with municipal officials to discuss the details of the disaster relief program. I am happy to tell the House that we have now also received from the councils of both Dover and Paris the request to designate the affected areas as disaster areas.

I might also say that even before those requests were made the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), the area in which the town of Paris is located, and the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson), the area in which the township of Dover is located, had already spoken to me about these matters and got us alerted to the problem well in advance of receiving requests from the municipal areas.

Mr. S. Smith: Which you would not have noticed from the front page of the newspaper.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We, of course, noticed it from the front pages of the newspapers, but

we like to hear everything first hand from the members of this House.

Mr. Nixon: You are not building an ark?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are discharging their duty in a very excellent manner.

Mr. Samis: Does that apply to Mickey?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Therefore, having officially received the request, the cabinet has designated these areas as disaster areas so that they now can receive the relief program.

A detailed assessment of the flood losses will be made by each of the local disaster relief committees, who will also have the responsibility of dispensing the aid money to the flood victims.

The province's disaster relief assistance program provides financial aid of one dollar for every dollar raised locally by a committee appointed by municipal council.

COMMUNITY SERVICES CONTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would also like to inform the members of the House that the province of Ontario represented by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett), and the federal government, represented by the Honourable Andre Ouellet, minister responsible for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, today signed a two-year agreement activating the Community Services Contribution Program. Other signatories for Ontario to this agreement included the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott), and myself.

The Community Services Contribution Program as we have designed it for Ontario, replaces the federal funding previously provided under CMHC programs for water and sewage treatment and neighbourhood improvement projects. As well, Ontario is designating a portion of the money it will receive for a new program which will offer incentives for municipal non-profit housing projects. One of the most important features of this arrangement is the significant degree of disentanglement that it achieves between the roles and responsibilities of the two orders of government in this area.

In recognition of the provincial responsibility for municipalities and community services, the agreement provides the province with almost complete flexibility to select the programs that will be included under the agreement and to determine eligible projects, allocation criteria and dollar allocations.

The federal role is thus largely a financial one. The only condition imposed upon the province is that federal funds be allocated

on an objective and equitable basis. The criteria that we have set out in the appendix to the agreement are the means by which we shall meet this condition.

With the policy and administrative responsibility now resting clearly with the province, we think duplication of efforts and related inefficiencies will be eliminated. Moreover, the program can be more readily adapted to changing priorities.

While the agreement signed today is for a two-year period only, negotiations will begin before the end of 1979 on a longer-term program.

Maximum funding from the federal government pursuant to the agreement that has just been signed will total \$137.55 million: \$51.6 million will be made available in 1980-81 in respect of spending on eligible projects initiated or in progress during 1979; and \$85.95 million will be made available in 1981-82 in respect of spending on eligible projects initiated or in progress during 1980.

In the first program year the Ontario government has committed to this program area an amount of approximately \$90 million. Much of the funding in the first program year will be channelled through the Ministry of the Environment. Thirty-one million dollars in federal contributions and \$83 million in provincial funding will be provided for water and sewage projects in an estimated 115 municipalities under the municipal infrastructure part of the program.

The Ministry of Housing will allocate \$13.7 million in federal contributions and an additional \$6.85 million in provincial grants to some 13 municipalities for neighbourhood improvement area projects. The balance of the first-year federal funds will be used for a new municipal non-profit housing incentive program. Details of the first-year allocation process are available from the two Ontario ministries mentioned, Environment and Housing.

Both the federal and Ontario governments emphasize the need for municipalities to submit their specific projects for approval by May 1, 1979. Submissions by this target date will ensure early construction starts, as well as full use of the funds being made available by the federal government under this new program.

Prior to the end of the current year, the province will decide how to distribute the second-year federal funds of almost \$86 million between different ministries, and the criteria for determining eligible projects and municipal allocations.

In order to simplify contracts with the government on the new programs, the Min-

istries of Housing and the Environment have decided jointly to sponsor a series of six municipal workshops. These will serve to explain the new programs to elected and appointed municipal officials, builders, engineers and architects.

The first of these workshops will be held March 22 in London at the Holiday Inn, City Centre. The others will be held in Toronto, March 27; in Sudbury, April 3; in Thunder Bay, April 10; in Ottawa, April 19; and in Kingston, April 24. Information on the programs and other information about the workshops will in the very near future be placed in the members' mail boxes.

Finally, I wish to advise members of the House that the Minister of the Environment and the Deputy Minister of Housing, along with myself, will be attending the provincial-municipal liaison committee meeting tomorrow, March 16, to discuss this new agreement and the details concerning it with municipal representatives.

Mr. Martel: On a point of order: The Chairman of Management Board made a statement to the Legislature a while back. We don't seem to have received copies of that statement on this side of the House. The Liberals have theirs, but we haven't received one.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You haven't read all your mail.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Chairman of Management Board can correct that omission.

FLOOD CLEANUP BY INMATES

Hon. Mr. Walker: Correctional Institution inmate work crews will help western Ontario flood disaster areas. In view of the designation by the cabinet of an area of southwestern Ontario as a disaster area due to flooding and as a result of representations made to me on behalf of the residents by the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson), I am pleased to announce that this ministry is prepared to provide a 60-man task force of inmate workers to help in cleanup operations after the flooding has receded.

Instructions have already gone out to mobilize a work force of inmates from five institutions to carry out whatever useful work the affected communities require. The inmates will be carefully selected and will include non-violent offenders who are not considered a security risk in the community. Inmate work parties will be drawn from the Elgin-Middlesex Detention Centre and the Chatham, Sarnia and Windsor jails. In addition, approximately 20 inmates will be transferred

from the Burtch Correctional Centre to these four institutions to swell the work force to a total of 60.

Arrangements are being made with the Guelph Correctional Centre and Burtch Correctional Centre for the provision of rubber footwear, safety boots and helmets, and other work for the inmates. Each of the four institutions involved in sending work crews will provide lunches for the inmates and correctional officers to supervise their activities in the community.

This action is in keeping with the ministry's philosophy that, wherever possible, inmates should undertake helping tasks that benefit the community.

Mr. S. Smith: If they were not a security risk, why were they in jail? Why would they not be in a community centre before?

Mr. Roy: We are only off for one week. Why all the statements?

THAMES RIVER FLOODING

Hon. Mr. Auld: Before bringing members up to date on the flooding situation in Dover township, I would like to begin by praising the actions and the many hours of hard work of not only the Ontario Provincial Police, but the staff of the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority. I'm sure every one of us is familiar with the excellent rescue work carried out by the OPP. It has been fully documented by the media, as well as in the comments of township people affected by the flooding.

Mr. Foulds: Your heart's not in this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would also like to commend the staff of the authority who have been monitoring the river conditions, issuing warnings and spending long hours patrolling the flood area.

Mr. Nixon: I thought your member called for an investigation into that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: All through the flooding, staff were working round the clock to stay on top of the situation. I believe that in a number of instances their judgement calls during the height of the flooding were extremely astute.

Mr. Nixon: What happened there will happen on the Grand too.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is still difficult to assess the full damage in Dover township. Much of the area is still inundated. On the basis of several meetings between local people, Ontario government agencies and the authority and ongoing surveys, the ministry estimates that a total of 8,100 acres of agricultural land have been flooded, 100 beef cattle lost and

100 homes affected. The acreage affected includes 1,000 acres of winter wheat which, presumably, is covered by crop insurance.

It is still hard to estimate the damage to private homes. Many people have not been able to return yet and make practical damage estimates. We know that some of these dwellings—not many—are seasonal homes and were not occupied at the time of the flooding. A rough estimate of the damage to all homes and personal contents is \$900,000. However, we must remember that these are rough estimates only.

[2:30]

The estimated damage to farm buildings and equipment in Dover township is about \$300,000 and, to stored crops, another \$300,000; damage to roads has been roughly estimated at \$750,000, bringing the subtotal to \$2.25 million. The cost of repairing the dikes, we estimate, may amount to \$1.25 million.

I am sure that these figures will change. The township of Dover will be meeting with the Ontario Provincial Police, my ministry and the authority to continue assessing the damage as I believe the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) has indicated. These organizations have also begun to meet to decide on the courses of action that need to be taken at the present time and will be considering the types of assistance available to the area. This will be the basis for an appeal for assistance to the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, the agency which administers disaster relief funds.

I have established a review committee to go over the events and actions that were taken before and during the Dover township flooding. This committee, as yet unnamed, will examine the events and file a report with recommendations to me on how flood action systems can be improved, if indeed there is need for improvement. I would like to wait for that report before making any final judgements; but, before that, I would like to comment on several points that were raised—some of them here in the Legislature—in the days immediately following the height of the flooding.

First, the question of dredging at the mouth of the Thames River where it flows into Lake St. Clair: It is the opinion of the authority, and of other technical staff, that dredging would have to be a continuous operation because of the continuous deposition of silt in that area. This could be classified as a delta, a dumping ground for any silt in the river as it is slowed down on entering the lake. As I said before, technical staff, both local to the area and from Toronto, are

of the opinion that the effects of dredging could be wiped out in a short time.

Second, there was the question of why an ice-breaking vessel was not called in to assist in clearing the mouth of the Thames. As you may know, the staff of the conservation authority continually monitored the river, beginning Monday, March 4. Both Chatham and Thamesville were notified on Monday and Wednesday that the river was flowing without interruption and that the flood would peak some time on Thursday. On Wednesday, conservation authority staff noted again that the river was still flowing strongly. Authority staff flew over the river on Thursday and identified an ice jam at the mouth of Jeannette's Creek, about three quarters of a mile up from the mouth of the Thames.

The decision to dynamite this jam was carefully considered but rejected, and we believe with good reason. Ice from the upstream jam could have moved to the mouth of the river causing another jam. That would have created even worse flooding in the Lighthouse Point area, a residential section that was flooded in 1968 when an ice jam formed at that same place. In addition, it would also have caused serious flooding throughout the townships of Tilbury East, Tilbury North and Raleigh.

The authority had already contacted the officials aboard the United States Coast Guard ice-cutter and had been told that, because of the ice conditions in the lake, there was no guarantee that they could reach the mouth. If they could, it would have taken a minimum of three days. Without the ice-breaker it was impossible for a local tugboat to get into the river mouth area to move the ice around.

I think you will agree that the conservation authority and the ministry made the right decision. A jam at the Thames mouth would have not only flooded the builtup residential area but also caused extensive flooding in the area on the south side of the Thames, as I have already mentioned.

Third, there was the question of the gauge at Prairie Siding, just one of the gauges the authority has installed along the Thames. Actually, I shouldn't say the gauge at Prairie Siding has been installed; physically, it is there, but it has never been operational. The gauge was put in place late last fall but, because of mechanical problems, it has never been used for water measurement readings. We must remember that these devices are hooked up to a telephone line and a hydro line. Because of difficulties in the telephone hookup, which were being worked on at the time, the gauge was not in use. Until these hookups can be made, of course, the gauge

cannot be calibrated. Without the proper calibration, any information from the device is useless.

I really don't think the Prairie Siding gauge was an important factor here. It was not malfunctioning, it was simply in the process of being installed and made operational.

I think I would be loath to agree with the statements that the conservation authority was ill-prepared for the flooding. As I said before, lower Thames staff monitored this situation from the very beginning and indeed throughout the entire crisis. They are still out along the river helping local residents, gathering information, helping repair damage to the dikes, and also monitoring for future flood crests if they should begin to materialize.

SALES TAX REBATES FOR VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members will recall that last November I announced a new vendor information program to help small businesses deal more easily with retail sales tax. This was part of a broader program established in my ministry to support the Premier's (Mr. Davis) commitment to improved customer services.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, boy.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I am surprised at the member for St. George saying, "Oh, boy." She was one of the people who thanked me for that information kit.

This initiative is a new pamphlet expressly designed to inform visitors to Ontario how they may obtain exemptions or refunds of retail sales tax on purchases made in Ontario.

This fully bilingual pamphlet, entitled Provincial Sales Tax Rebates for Visitors to Ontario, explains in simple language how visitors may obtain either immediate exemptions at the point of purchase when they choose to have the goods shipped home by retailers, or how they can subsequently apply for refunds when they return home. At the same time the pamphlet will clearly inform more Ontario businessmen of these benefits available to their tourist customers, so that they may more effectively promote their sales to tourists.

Each pamphlet contains a simple form for claiming retail sales tax rebates. To provide greater visibility to the program, a display stand containing supplies of the pamphlet will be distributed for placement in suitable prominent locations.

In anticipation of an increase in the volume of claims, we have taken steps in the Ministry of Revenue to streamline operations further to ensure that tourists receive their rebates promptly.

In announcing this improved service, I am particularly pleased to acknowledge the enthusiastic co-operation of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. The pamphlet has been designed, by using the "We treat you royally" slogan, to be directly included in the 1979 advertising campaign to be launched shortly by my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman).

Because of this co-operation, the pamphlet will be widely distributed through Ontario, Canada, the United States and abroad. I am informed that preliminary discussions have already resulted in many requests for supplies of the pamphlet. The first printing run will be 400,000 pamphlets, of which 100,000 will be made available immediately to retailers by my ministry. The remainder will be distributed by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. Plans have been made to supply airlines, the hospitality industry, chambers of commerce, Canadian and Ontario tourist information centres and the media.

In summary, copies will be widely available, with particular emphasis on servicing tourist entry points, airports, vacation areas and tourist attractions.

In conclusion, I believe this improved information service will reinforce the government's other successful programs for promoting our tourist industry. The pamphlet demonstrates our recognition and understanding of the immense contribution made by this industry to the economic strength of Ontario generally, and in generating employment in all parts of the province.

BYPRODUCT POWER PROJECT

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring members up to date on developments in regard to the byproduct power greenhouse project co-ordinated by the Ontario Energy Corporation.

Honourable members will recall that this project is designed to utilize the thermal energy of reject warm waters available at nuclear power stations. Last December I announced that in co-operation with my colleagues the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) and the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) we were working on the establishment of two greenhouse productivity tests, one in Bruce county, the other at Pickering. At that time I emphasized that in addition to ensuring that our project is designed to meet the needs of a family-size greenhouse operation, we were looking to the private sector for substantial financial and management resources.

I am delighted to confirm today that these expectations are being fulfilled.

First, I'm pleased to announce that a small test facility at Pickering, based on a conventional heating source, has been built and is now being operated by a farmer. We expect the first crop of tomatoes will be harvested in the near future. Following a successful demonstration of the productivity at Pickering, an eight-acre commercial project is proposed for that site, heated by the rejected warm water from the Pickering nuclear plant.

Second, I am equally pleased to report that a meeting organized by the Ontario Energy Corporation on February 7, 1979, for potential investors in our Bruce County AgriPark project has also proved to be most successful. At that meeting we invited a broad spectrum of business interests to participate in a joint venture research, design and development program to be undertaken in Bruce county.

As a result of that invitation we have received offers of participation exceeding \$600,000 in value—

Mr. Mancini: That's peanuts, and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —from a widely varying group of companies and individuals, including George Weston Limited, TransCanada PipeLines, Jarman Holdings Limited, Snobelen Farms Limited, and Huron Ridge Limited.

Mr. J. Reed: George Weston is a small family unit?

An hon. member: Absolutely. A family farm.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As this offered contribution satisfies the requirements of the productivity test component of the proposed program, the Ontario Energy Corporation will proceed now to enter into detailed negotiations with the potential participants.

I may say that I did not indicate all those people who are inquiring because some of them wish to continue negotiations and reach some conclusion before they have their names made public.

Mr. McClellan: Package this as a cure for insomnia.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It's my hope that these discussions will proceed quickly so that the construction of the test facility can be achieved by the next growing season. At the same time I expect the joint venture will also begin—

Mr. Cassidy: What about the condominium fish farms that are in that statement?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —to direct its efforts towards planning for the design work required for the full commercial development of a large-scale agripark—

Mr. Cassidy: Has Frank Drea got legislation to govern them?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —in co-operation with the municipal authorities of Bruce county.

Mr. Kerrio: On a point of order: Mr. Speaker, when it becomes difficult from time to time to get copies of ministerial statements across to the opposition, I wonder—if they're going to continue the practice of printing half of the statement or giving it to the media—why wouldn't they print the whole thing in the media and save us the time of listening to it?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: The speech was not given to the media.

Mr. Kerrio: Just half of it.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Not half, or a quarter, or any of it.

Mr. Cassidy: This whole thing is an abuse of the Legislature.

Mr. Foulds: This is the only important statement today.

HOCKEY VIOLENCE

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Recently concern has once again been expressed both in this House and outside about violence in amateur hockey. Obviously my ministry, which is responsible for amateur sport, including hockey, shares this concern. I am now in a position to inform the members of the Legislature about our most recent decisions to further look into and ultimately to eradicate violence in amateur hockey.

Mr. Nixon: Lots of luck.

Mr. Foulds: Why are you splitting your infinitives?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Before outlining our next steps, it may be useful to recall some developments during recent years.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Do you want me to continue?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would like to hear this statement.

Mr. Makarchuk: You're the only one.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: You're not interested in violence in hockey or you'd be listening to this.

Mr. Martel: Your statement is so full of baloney I can't help but be that way.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Yeah? Let me hear about it later on, okay?

Before outlining our next steps it may be useful to recall some developments during recent years. The William McMurtry report on violence in hockey in 1974 led directly

to the establishment of the Ontario Hockey Council, an advisory board in my ministry.

The members of that council under the chairmanship of Lloyd Davidson are drawn from leaders in organized minor hockey as well as several individual citizens interested in hockey but with no affiliation to the minor leagues. It is well to recall also some of the major functions assigned to the Ontario Hockey Council:

1. To define the purposes and objectives of amateur hockey;

2. To design a rule structure consistent with the purposes and structure;

3. To act as a final appeal tribunal from various hockey associations;

4. To ensure that coaches' and referees' clinics are operated in accord with the proper philosophy for amateur hockey;

5. To recommend the allocation of government funds in support of amateur hockey;

6. To assist in educating the public as to the role of amateur hockey.

[2:45]

Mr. T. P. Reid: They haven't done much of a job.

Mr. S. Smith: They should get a delay-of-game penalty.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Since its inception, the Ontario Hockey Council has been successful in a number of areas in collaborating with organized minor hockey authorities to minimize roughness and violence.

Clinics for referees and the eventual mandatory requirement for certification of referees have already improved control of games by referees. Body contact in the youngest age group leagues is increasingly being disallowed. Through educational programs for fans and parents carried out by publications such as "You and Your Child in Hockey"—

Mr. Warner: Name names.

Mr. Martel: Did you leave some out?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —and a film called "Hockey Is", the objectives of amateur hockey have been widely disseminated.

Mr. Cassidy: You skipped a page.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: There is tangible evidence to indicate that all of these measures are having a desirable effect. For example, injuries to the eyes sustained in hockey—some, no doubt, through acts of violence—have been reduced from 253 in 1974-75 to 27 in 1977-78.

Mr. Martel: Nonsense.

Mr. Kerrio: It's not because of less violence, it's because they wear helmets now.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: In spite of success to date in attempting to eliminate violence—

Mr. Martel: You haven't the statement we've got.

Mr. McClellan: Which statement are you reading?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —it is obvious that we must not only continue our efforts through the Ontario Hockey Council but substantially increase them.

Mr. Foulds: You split your infinitives again.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: As part of our expanded program, the Ontario Hockey Council has agreed to send a questionnaire to parents of almost 100,000 players in Ontario—

Mr. Kerrio: It says 200,000 in the paper.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —asking them to assess the quality of hockey experience available to their children.

Mr. Kerrio: You've got the numbers wrong.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: We believe that in ascertaining the viewpoint of the parents we are reaching that sector of our population which has the greatest direct interest in hockey and the well-being of the players. The 17 questions seek to find out what parents think about hockey as it is taught, played and organized in Ontario.

Mr. Bradley: Are we getting the results?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Respondents are asked not to name any specific team or individual, nor to identify themselves.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Will Alan Eagleson get one?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Responses to the questionnaires will be tabulated and analysed. The resultant information will then serve as a basis for further discussion at some 25 to 35 open forums to be held throughout Ontario.

We are planning to hold most of these during the month of May while memories of the current hockey season are still vivid. Forums will be open to all and we hope they will help shed further light on some of the concerns of the general public, referees, coaches and others about amateur hockey. By midsummer we should have not only a clear indication as to the major concerns but also be in a position to take whatever specific steps are required to deal with them.

In this exercise I should like to stress that my ministry, as heretofore, will be working through the Ontario Hockey Council and will be providing increased resources where necessary. This council, by its structure, is able to work in close collaboration with organized amateur hockey leaders, parents, players, coaches and referees.

We believe that this arm's-length approach, stressing self-regulation and self-government, will in the long run be far more effective in eliminating violence from amateur hockey than direct legislative intervention. We continue to believe that neither the provincial government, and certainly not the federal government, should become directly involved in regulating amateur hockey at the minor league level.

Mr. Bradley: How many games did you see?

Mr. Martel: On a point of order, the most significant part of the Minister of Culture and Recreation's prepared statement was left out of the statement that he read to the Legislature. In fact, he left that portion out which says: "For example, fighting now results in an automatic game misconduct penalty." That is just not the case, and he ignored putting that in the statement to the Legislature because it is erroneous.

SIGNATURE OF MINISTER

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege. It involves my privileges as a member in correspondence with the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the Honourable Jacques Neige.

Mr. Van Horne: That went over his head.

Mr. Roy: Some time ago, I had correspondence with the minister in one of the official languages, French, and the minister graciously answered in the same language, French. It was a very nice letter, very well written and all.

In the spirit of the letter the minister signed, instead of "James Snow", "Jacques Naige." I want to tell the minister that the humour was not missed but I want to bring to his attention that "neige" is not spelled n-a-i-g-e.

Mr. T. P. Reid: You can't spell in French, either.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I never could spell.

An hon. member: You're illiterate in both languages.

Mr. Roy: You see, I ran to my dictionary; I didn't know what it meant. It's spelled n-e-i-g-e.

PCB SPILL AT DOWLING

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege dealing with a press release put out by the Minister of the Environment.

In a release dated March 14, the minister indicated he would be making an important statement concerning a PCB spill at Dowling,

Ontario, at 7 p.m. on Monday, March 19, at Dowling.

My point of privilege is, in view of the fact this is one of the biggest polychlorinated biphenol spills that has ever occurred in Canada, and in view of the fact it has been raised in this chamber on a number of occasions, I believe our privileges have been abused by his failure to make his statement here in the chamber where there will be an opportunity to question him on the entire matter.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it is only appropriate that since the spill did occur in Dowling, it is about time the opposition recognized that we are more than prepared to deal with the problems in Ontario where they exist.

Mr. Martel: After three and a half years.

Mr. Warner: Five years later.

Mr. Laughren: When the House is not in session.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it is a good thing that we are prepared to go to the communities all over Ontario and present our case first-hand to the people who are most seriously affected. I don't think I have short-changed the members' privileges. I will be glad to answer those questions when we return to the House.

Mr. S. Smith: Presumably we will hear about the dump at Upper Ottawa Street after the House has risen as usual.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Health: Since all the anaesthetists at Toronto Western Hospital appear to have opted out of OHIP, as perhaps so have those at other hospitals as well, can the minister tell us what plans he has to ensure that people in Ontario and particularly people at that hospital will be able to have an operation at a public hospital in this province without having to pay a surcharge to an anaesthetist?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: These are the kinds of situations that we are looking for to work on with the medical association, to take them up on their offer to assist in seeing people do have that option.

While I am on my feet I didn't want to rise on a point of privilege—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Answer that question first.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Very simply, where those situations arise, and we are checking our records to see if there are others—

Mr. S. Smith: You didn't know about them?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, I wasn't aware of that particular one, no. We will go to the particular medical staff through the medical association which has offered to be of assistance in that regard to ensure that people do in fact have the option available to them.

Mr. Makarchuk: Does that mean they can have their operation without the anaesthetic?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I might point out the change in regulations recently to ensure that in all hospitals, in all clinical departments of all hospitals where there are billing groups, we will be able with their assistance to bring this about.

While I am on my feet, sir, I wanted to raise a concern. In this morning's Globe and Mail it seems the question of whom I consult for medical advice is more important even than the possibility of a settlement between Israel and Egypt.

Mr. Speaker: That wasn't part of the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On a point of privilege, then; I will make it a clear point of privilege.

Mr. Foulds: Don't deny it during question period.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I take some exception inasmuch as when I was asked about my medical services yesterday I pointed out that I have two doctors, one of whom has apparently opted out and the other of whom has opted in. I haven't seen the one who has opted out for about three years.

Mr. Conway: We thought you were a healthy young man.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Lakeshore Psychiatric?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We get our psychiatric assistance from over there.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He doesn't allow for a surcharge.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You get a caucus rate. I will tell the honourable members, his treatment is becoming obvious.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, is the minister prepared to encourage the immediate establishment of capitation medical groups or other kinds of health service organizations, especially in communities where patients are unable to obtain medical services at the OHIP rate? The minister has known this would happen for some time. Is he ready to move and introduce those kinds of operations in those communities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As the member knows, for a number of years, I think it is now six

or seven years, we have had a variety of forms of health service organizations in various parts of the province. In fact, we now have 29.

Mr. Cassidy: You've constantly dragged your feet in funding them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have recently, over the last year or more, been working on revising the budget system for the HSOs and revising the goals and objectives. When that updated policy has been approved by the cabinet I will be announcing it publicly, but in the meantime we have been approached recently by two groups in Peterborough; one a group of physicians, the other a group representing, I think, the largest union in the city. They are expressing an interest in establishing an HSO and we are quite prepared to meet with representatives of either or both groups to explore the possibility of establishing a financially-viable health service organization.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister not aware that the regulation that was adopted by cabinet in December and published in the Ontario Gazette in January, which permits opted-out physicians to continue to bill under OHIP for services they deliver in the hospital, is a means of encouraging doctors to opt out of OHIP? It allows them to have a certain amount of income from OHIP and to refer patients of whom they have doubts about their capacity to pay to outpatient clinics in the hospital. Will the minister take action now to rescind that regulation rather than encouraging doctors to get out of the plan?

Mr. Warner: You're helping the doctors opt out.

Mr. S. Smith: I said that at the time.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What I would do is encourage the honourable member to go back to the level—

Mr. Warner: You drew the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and the quality of research his party had when the former leader was there. It's clear that it's gone straight down hill. If he will check, he will find that that regulation has brought to the clinical departments of non-teaching hospitals what has applied in all departments of all teaching hospitals and in the emergency departments of all non-teaching hospitals for years.

Mr. Foulds: It is still a bad regulation.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is an assistance to the public.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: The minister has once again tried to accuse me of distortions in this Legislature. I would point out to him that that regu-

lation extended that privilege to doctors in 200 hospitals across the province. He should stop twisting facts in this Legislature.

Mr. Yakabuski: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister feel that the whole matter of medical people opting out here in Ontario and Canada could quite possibly change drastically if a national medicare plan comes into effect in the United States of America? Couldn't that trend be reversed, where the slogan will be "Go north young man"?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is worth noting that in the last couple of years we have had in Ontario visits from such personages as the Honourable Joseph Califano, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare of the United States, who was advised to come and look at the Ontario health plan as a model—

Mr. Warner: What's left of it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —one of the best in the world; the Honourable Edward Kennedy, senior senator from the state of Massachusetts; delegations from a variety of state legislatures, all of whom came here based on their research to find one of the best health plans anywhere in the world.

Mr. Warner: They wouldn't be impressed now.

Mr. Kerrio: I know what they were doing here. They really like the nurses; they were signing applications.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think at this point it is difficult to predict exactly what will happen in the United States. As honourable members know, some members of Congress have their own ideas about what they'd like to introduce; the White House and executive branch have some of their own ideas. They are determined, clearly, to have a universal medicare plan. The form of it is difficult to predict, and therefore the effect of it on this country is even more difficult to predict.

PLANT LOCATION INCENTIVES

Mr. S. Smith: I'll ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Has the minister received a request from the highly successful Tridon Limited of Burlington for a straight cash incentive in the order of about \$1.5 million to expand its operations in Burlington? Without it the company apparently has said it will do its expansion in Tennessee, where a recent calculation leads them to believe they could expand more cheaply.

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a number of firms that have written us in anticipation of the program—

Mr. Martel: Las Vegas in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are opposed to it, are you?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and Tridon is one of them; that's all I can report at this stage.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is better than roulette.

Mr. Martel: More and more like Las Vegas every day.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the minister aware now that he has, with the Hayes-Dana move, created a situation where no manager worth his salt will even dream of expanding any kind of plant in Ontario without at least pretending to look at the southern United States—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are doing it all over the place.

Mr. S. Smith: —and coming back to the minister and saying that he needs an extra million or million and a half to make up the difference?

Mr. Bolan: Just plain blackmail, that is all it is.

Mr. S. Smith: Doesn't the minister think the time has come to say no to these kinds of straight grant demands based on the southern United States and to set up proper criteria for an intelligent industrial strategy in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well firstly, I would point out, lest the Leader of the Opposition is unaware, we of course had a discussion in this assembly last fall about the possibility of this government giving another incentive grant to the Ford Motor Company to locate another plant, in this case the casting plant, in Windsor. At that time the same sort of cry was coming out of the opposition side that we might be subject to this blackmail in each and every case that came along. The members should know by now, and I am sure the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) has told them, Ford located a casting plant there, which was a further \$150 million worth of investment in the great city of Windsor without a nickel from this government. There was no money offered by this government; and I think it's important to note, in fairness to that—

Mr. Mancini: That is the way it should be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course it should be, but without the engine plant you never would have had it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —multinational, that they did not ask for any more money from this government.

So I think it's important to note that the multinationals are not automatically coming in here, nor is any firm automatically coming in here saying if you don't give us money, we are going to go somewhere else. I think there is one other important thing to note.

Mr. S. Smith: Where there are multinationals on the local scene, nobody is going to expand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, you are against growth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is one other thing to note, and that is that in that case and in the earlier case, we carefully analysed the situation in anticipation of a request and determined that particular plant was likely to locate in Windsor for other good, business-like reasons. We do make that very careful assessment.

An hon. member: Why don't you write Peter Lougheed for a handout?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would only add to the Leader of the Opposition that if he has been following some of the remarks made by both the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and myself over the last few weeks and months, then he will know that there are criteria being developed. They are very clear and straightforward and I know the Leader of the Opposition is aware of them because he is now adopting them in all of his speeches. After the budget you will see them formulated in strategies developed by my ministry for applications to that fund. In simple terms, in the next few weeks members will see an industrial strategy developed by this ministry and made quite clear to the opposition and everyone else.

An hon. member: In the next few weeks, I like that.

An hon. member: In the fullness of time, right.

Mr. McClellan: Going to sell lottery tickets.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you looking for a grant?

Mr. Peterson: Would the minister please relate his comments in the context of this quotation: "Mr. Prime Minister, while I support much of what has happened since February, an industrial strategy which relies heavily on widespread giveaways will only come back to haunt us." I am quoting the Premier; November 27, at the first ministers' meeting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't you ask me? I will expand on that.

An hon. member: Was that in Ottawa or Brampton?

An hon. member: Was that at a press conference?

An hon. member: Better watch that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As we have made quite clear in all of what we have been saying, there are many components to an industrial strategy quite apart from the financial assistance that this or any government can provide. Among them are some of the things members have heard us talking about—apprenticeship training, exporting, research and development, global product mandating, mergers where appropriate, and duty remission schemes where appropriate. All of those things, together with better purchasing practices, procurement policies by government and import replacements are components.

Mr. Peterson: We have seen nothing but words on that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well with respect, the member might have noticed, for example, the very successful Trade Horizons meeting we had last week in Toronto at the Harbour Castle. We were expecting 500 people to attend to find out how better to deal in the export market without government assistance. We had 1,400 people attend that very successful conference. The following day the federal government had a similar project at OISE. The Hon. Jack Horner attended. He did have 37 people turn up for a little analysis on how to do some exporting technology. That is a lot more than words.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The 1,400 people who attended our Trade Horizons conference have now backed up the numbers of applications to us to assist them, not financially but in making contacts in the United States. That's what industrial strategy is all about, taking people who aren't exporting and showing them how to export.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When the standing committee on procedural affairs is reconstituted and begins to meet, perhaps they can take under advisement bringing in some kind of provision in standing orders for a delay-of-game penalty.

A new question from the honourable member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, your reference is an excellent idea, because we're certainly not going to get—

Mr. Speaker: Off-sides and asides.

Mr. Cassidy:—any particularly useful advice the way the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) has handled the question of violence in hockey.

Mr. Hennessy: Here we go again.

Mr. Speaker: A new question, please.

Mr. Hennessy: Misconduct.

Mr. Peterson: Is this an attempt at parliamentary humour?

Mr. T. P. Reid: That is the funniest thing you've said in five years.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: The member would legislate it into the grave.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister should listen to what the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is suggesting. He made some excellent recommendations and I'm sorry they're being ignored by the ministry.

LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, arising out of his foreclosure of Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As long as there is no penalty.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the McKinsey report; and in view of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union brief this week, which has systematically documented the need for Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital to remain open; and in view of the strong community demand to keep the hospital open; can the minister explain why his ministry has rejected the OPSEU request for an inquiry which would allow the community, the workers and the patients to learn the rationale for the closing of the hospital and to participate in finding alternatives to the closure?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think I outlined the rationale fairly clearly in my statement on January 22. I met that day with the advisory board for the hospital. Recently, I met with a delegation representing the council of the borough of Etobicoke and the board of health of the borough of Etobicoke. I have a meeting coming up with representatives of various groups, including the advisory group. I have received copies of the lobbying brief distributed by the Ontario Public Service Employees Union to rate-payers groups and the like; I'll be responding to that.

Mr. Speaker: I will acknowledge that I am going to be a little bit longer in my answer, but it will take some time. I'm sure you'll want me to answer the question intelligently.

There are four or five main points in the lobbying brief that I would like to respond to. First of all, the allegation is made that 296 patients will be transferred to Queen

Street Mental Health Centre from Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, 14 to Hamilton and eight to Whitby.

The average in-patient population at Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital over the last six months has been about 280. Out of this total, members must subtract 46 beds which are presently in use for the alcohol unit and 26 beds which are being used for the mentally retarded unit. None of these will be moving to Queen Street Mental Health Centre, therefore the maximum number of patients who will be moved is 208. Transfers to Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital total six, transfers to the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital two; not 14 and eight respectively as reported by the union.

The second allegation is that the beds available at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre would be somewhere between 125 to 150. The facts are that the beds presently available at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre, with the relocation of some services to different areas of the hospital, comes to 292. This figure does not include the 68 beds which have been allocated to the med force unit.

The allegation is made that the closure of Lakeshore will further reduce the beds and force hospitals to resort to early discharge of uncured patients into the community and the establishment of more group homes and boarding homes. I think that if members follow the figures I've just given them we have shown that the Queen Street Mental Health Centre has sufficient beds to handle the in-patients, and therefore there is no need to resort to early discharge into the community.

Finally there is the allegation—

Mr. Makarchuk: That is very questionable, Dennis.

Mr. Turner: It is not.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —again revolving around the bed capacity at the Queen Street Mental Health Centre. I think I've already covered that, Mr. Speaker. So we will be answering OPSEU, and maybe they will give us their mailing list. I have a rough idea of the range and the distribution of their lobbying kit. We'll send out as many copies of the answers as we can.

Mr. Warner: The minister is just trying to fight a bad decision.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Basically, the factors which contributed to my decision not to retain Lakeshore, which I recommended to cabinet and which it supported, were the antiquated facilities there compared to the

modern up-to-date facilities and programs available at Queen Street. I haven't even mentioned today the beds available at Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital nor beds being built up in some of the community hospitals.

Mr. Makarchuk: What beds? In the corridors?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In addition, there is the lack of available capital to rebuild both Whitby and Lakeshore, as well as my concern for the safety of the patients and the staff, given the antiquated facilities. None of the factors which contributed to the decision has changed. Therefore, I think it would create undue expectations on the part of some of the staff, many of whom are already in the process of interviews for vacancies which have been identified elsewhere in the government and outside of government, and it would be misleading to the public at this point even to suggest that an inquiry was possible.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since the minister is saying in his statement that he is so set in this decision that no facts emerging from an inquiry would lead him to change his mind, can he then explain to this House why he said on January 22 that services, such as the excellent alcoholism program, would continue in the community they service when, in fact, the alcohol services unit is dependent on 28-day inpatient and partial hospitalization therapy and, since it will not be transferred to Queen Street, it is not going to be continuing to provide the kind of service that it has provided for many years at the Lakeshore location?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: My staff have asked the director of the alcohol services unit to outline what will be needed to maintain the alcohol services program in the community. To my knowledge, that has not yet been received. For all of the outpatient and community services programs, the work is under way to identify where in the community they will be located. But we do not intend to pull into Queen Street all of the community and outpatient services; rather, we will be taking to Queen Street the inpatient services.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: The director of the alcohol services division at Lakeshore has indicated to me as recently as this morning that the optimal condition is to maintain that unit at Lakeshore, since the Ministry of Community and Social Services presumably will be maintaining its responsibilities on that campus and since the vocational training building—and I may stand corrected and I would appreciate the minister's comments—which was built, I believe, in 1973 and which

is in excellent condition—a really fine facility—is still on the site—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Conway: —is the minister indicating that it is still his intention to close the door on the entire campus as far as his ministry is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We haven't even had the report yet from the group which has been set up to review what would be the most appropriate locations for the community service program.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister will have closed the hospital before he gets the report.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am not sure that any one building on the site could sustain itself in terms of the services as compared to everything else. My intention at this point would be to vacate the entire site, but I will await—

Mr. Martel: You are completely unresponsive to facts.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the reports which are being prepared with very extensive community involvement. Dr. Maharaj, who is the director of the unit, has specifically been asked to put down on paper his thoughts as to what is most appropriate there. Then the committee will report on what is in the best interests of the patients' programs.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't know if it is supplementary; it may be almost a point of personal privilege. The minister is not wearing the button with "Save Lakeshore Hospital" I sent across to him a few moments ago. No, that's not the question. The question has to do with two other units.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Speaking to the point of privilege, I would say that my motivation is that of the interests of the patients and the staff of that hospital and I think what we are doing is in their best interests.

Mr. Warner: Then save the hospital instead of closing it.

Mr. Martel: Save the hospital.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to ask the minister about two other units. One is the dialysis unit which has been switched to Whitby with all the patients in that unit located in Lakeshore. I think there are 18 of them. The second unit is with respect to special observation, which is people under Lieutenant Governor's warrants. I believe there are 16 of them, and they are somewhat dangerous individuals. The minister is closing the unit immediately. Can he explain that?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am sorry, I didn't quite get the last part. The dialysis unit is going to Whitby. Those are mainly people, I am told, who commute and the patients have

been advised. That's the advice I've had on that. What had the second part to do with? [3:15]

Mr. Lawlor: It has to do with Lieutenant Governor's warrants, to people referred from the courts, very often very dangerous individuals. There is a special unit at the hospital which is being closed immediately, so I hear. Has the minister an explanation for that?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will check, Mr. Speaker, rather than hazarding a guess. My recollection is that that unit is to go to Queen Street in its entirety, but I will confirm that.

Mr. Swart: You are closing the hospital and you don't know these things?

Mr. Warner: You are just closing it and you don't know why; you don't know what you're going to do.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the absence of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson). In view of the speech by the Premier to the Metropolitan Catholic principals in February, which stated that the government firmly believes in and will fight for the right of individuals and groups to retain and develop their cultural heritage and language, can the minister explain why the government intends to pay fewer actual dollars and in fact has cut its share of the cost of heritage language programs in the schools by just about half in 1979, and how does that represent an implementation of any genuine commitment to multiculturalism or help language groups to maintain their linguistic heritage?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Education, I will take that under advisement and make sure the honourable member receives the answer.

Mr. Lawlor: Not again.

Mr. Cassidy: You are supposed to be responsible for social policy.

Mr. McClellan: You should resign. Your policy secretariat is useless.

Mr. Speaker: Order. If I understand the limited response, the provincial secretary is taking the question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Education.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Not again.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No. It has been taken as notice and there will be an opportunity for supplementaries—

Mr. McClellan: I would like to know why this minister doesn't know what the Minister of Education is doing with respect to her own policies.

Mr. Cassidy: That's what the policy secretariat is for.

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Cassidy: Can I ask the minister to advise on further questions when she comes back with an answer after consulting the Minister of Education?

Mr. Speaker: No. She has taken it as notice and she can answer it either directly or refer it to the Minister of Education for a response.

Mr. Cassidy: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: No. It has been taken as notice.

Hon. W. Newman: You were trying to sneak in a double question and it didn't work, did it?

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr. Blundy: To the Minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker: Is it his intention to commemorate the International Year of the Child by reducing funding of the children's mental health program when at the same time his government can find an easy \$100 million for the delinquent pulp and paper industry?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the source of the information or the quality of the research of the honourable member happens to be.

Mr. Roy: He is always right on.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would suggest that one not jump to simple conclusions on the basis of what might be a misinterpretation of a particular letter. I know the letter that is being referred to. I will be meeting within the next week and a half with the representative agencies of all of the children's services in the province that we fund, at which time I will be outlining to them the full and complete picture of the funding provisions for this fiscal year for the children's services division. I don't wish to comment on any speculation at this point with respect to specific items within the budget until I have had an opportunity to carry out that process with those agencies.

Mrs. Campbell: You will have to tell the public before you tell the House.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, in this letter from the deputy minister in rather basic English—and I would ask the minister if this

does not convey the same to him as it does to me—a number of children's mental health centres, along with other parts of the ministry, will be asked to reduce certain services. That would appear to me, Mr. Speaker—does it not to the minister?—that there would be some further cuts there.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member to read that also in the context of a possible attempt to invite certain agencies, within their budgets, to shift priorities to, for example, non-institutional as opposed to institutional alternatives. There is that interpretation open. It does not suggest the interpretation he is placing upon it is the only one that is open.

Mr. McClellan: I have the memo too. When the memo from the deputy minister says that children's mental health centres will be asked to reduce certain services, I want to ask the minister if he will give us at least an assurance that there will be no reduction in the number of beds in children's mental health centres in this province. I would like that assurance now.

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I said earlier, I am not prepared to discuss specific details of the planning until I have had an opportunity to communicate with the agencies. Certainly, I will make this commitment to the honourable members opposite that there will be a very generous increase in funding to children's services as a total. I will not discuss at this point specific details within that.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Cooke: I have a question for the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister if he is aware of an incident that took place in Windsor on February 27 where a Mr. Turski went to Metropolitan Hospital complaining of weakness and difficulty in breathing. He was taken to the hospital by ambulance. He was there for three hours, underwent tests and was released. According to Dr. Yomjinda, the emergency doctor, he would have been kept at Metropolitan Hospital for observation if a bed had been available. Four hours after Mr. Turski was released he was dead from a massive heart attack.

I would like to ask the minister if he now agrees that the bed reductions are affecting the quality of care in Ontario hospitals and if he will please change his policy.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will be glad to look at that particular situation. It seems to me that the member has to accept one thing first and foremost, that is that no doctor, if

he thinks a patient is in danger, will release him from the hospital. No doctor will do that knowingly. Having gone through a situation myself when my own father passed away four days after being cleared of any illness, I think I have some personal experience in that regard. I can tell the member that the ethics of the profession are such that no doctor will do that.

I will look at that particular situation.

Mr. Warner: Patients will be in the hallways.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I do not agree that the policies are encouraging this. I wish the member would start to realize that his community is a good example of where, while active treatment beds are being reduced, chronic care beds are being increased significantly to take care of the chronic bed needs of the community—

Mr. Foulds: Where?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —as identified by the hospitals in that community and his own peers and his health council.

Mr. Cassidy: In Ottawa, we had to drag you kicking and screaming for four years before anything happened.

Mr. Cooke: Supplementary: I would like to ask the minister, since he knows that in Windsor there will be further cuts in the number of active treatment beds as of April 1 and more the following year, how he expects a community like Windsor to cope when we need the active treatment beds. I agree we need the chronic care beds but people are dying because of his policies. When is he going to change them?

Mr. Turner: Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think that member does not only the Ministry of Health but all of the health professions in this province a tremendous slur by making that kind of statement. It is absolutely unfounded.

Mr. Warner: You're destroying the system and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should be embarrassed.

Mr. McCaffrey: Resign.

Hon. Mr. Norton: What kind of talk is that from a social worker? That's totally irresponsible.

Mr. Cooke: On a point of privilege: The Premier says I should be embarrassed. I should point out to the Premier that the information presented in this Legislature today was—

Mr. Speaker: That's not a point of privilege.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary: In connection with the bed closures, would the minister disagree with the comment that was made by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) at the annual meeting of the Huron-Middlesex Conservative Association just a few days ago that if the quality of service was going to be affected in hospitals in places such as Goderich, Wingham, et cetera, this type of thing would be open to negotiation by his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am not sure what the honourable minister had to say. I am sure what he probably said was this—

Mr. S. Smith: You are sure of what he probably said!

Mr. Roy: You are playing with your odometer. Quit playing with your odometer.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that in every part of Ontario, as we move to de-emphasize institutional care, with greater emphasis on things like day surgery, day hospitals and care in the community, where the need for additional chronic or extended care facilities is identified we are prepared to approve more. Windsor is an example where we have approved more chronic beds. In Ottawa, we have approved the conversion of the Ottawa General for 200 chronic beds.

Mr. Foulds: But you are not opening them first.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Just yesterday we approved, in a couple more areas of the province where chronic bed needs have been identified, conversion of active treatment beds to chronic to meet the actual needs.

Mr. Warner: Tell us about Scarborough. Two hospitals are full in Scarborough.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: So we are prepared—working with the local planners, the local health councils or, where they don't exist, the local hospital planning councils—to ensure that needs in the chronic and extended care fields are in fact met.

BEAN CROP DISPUTE

Mr. Riddell: A question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food in connection with the ongoing dispute between the Ontario Bean Producers' Marketing Board and the dealers regarding the 1977 bean crop contract. Is the minister aware that the solicitor for the dealers has constantly and persistently postponed examination for discovery, and as the minister representing the interests of producers, does he not feel obliged to solicit the assistance of his colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), to bring some pressure on the dealers' solicitor to have the examina-

tion for discovery so that the matter in dispute can be brought to a head and so that the farmers can be paid for their 1977 bean crop?

Hon. W. Newman: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've often said to the member's former leader over there—and I have many things we could agree on about solicitors—

Mr. Kerrio: Let's blame it on the feds.

Hon. W. Newman: —but anyway—no, I realize that it's a very serious situation. I realize there are five lawsuits involved and certainly I will be glad to bring it to the attention of our very able Attorney General, or if he's here I would refer the question to him, because it would be more appropriate. But I do realize the seriousness of the delays that have been going on.

Mr. Foulds: I have a question for the Minister of Health.

Mr. Kerrio: Hey, Bill, that's a first.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member for Niagara Falls just cool it?

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Foulds: I would like the Minister of Health to let this House know what reply he is giving to the over 300 letters that he has received from residents in Thunder Bay asking him to stop his devastating cutbacks in active treatment beds in Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario. I would like to know especially what response he has made to the point that Thunder Bay is a regional service centre for most of northwestern Ontario and will he please accept the very sensible suggestion that has been made by a number of writers of these letters that the Ministry of Health allot temporary funding to provide the necessary additional long-stay patient care accommodation in existing vacant beds, so that the enormous strain on active treatment beds resulting in extensive waiting lists will be substantially reduced?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As the honourable member knows, within a matter of a couple of months—in fact it should have happened months before now—St. Joseph's Villa, I think I'm using the right name, will open. It's a 100-bed extended care facility which will provide a tremendous reprieve to the situation in the Thunder Bay area. That, as you know, Mr. Speaker, was supposed to have opened as long ago as October, or maybe earlier than that, but due to labour problems, it was delayed to December and then to May.

I will answer these form letters, probably with a form letter, pointing out the poli-

cies of the government; that as we have over the last number of years developed many alternatives—in fact, Thunder Bay is one of those communities in which the alternatives have been developed and experimented with first. We have had a chronic home-care program in Thunder Bay since October 1975. We have had an assessment and placement agency in Thunder Bay for, I think, it's now three or four years perhaps. We have the St. Joseph's Villa opening up.

Mr. Foulds: It's not open now.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have the new cancer clinic in Thunder Bay, which I was honoured to open last year. We have the new CAT scanner at the McKellar Hospital in Thunder Bay.

There are a number of new services that have been developed in that community and I will tell them about all of these developments and that we are prepared to add more in the extended care and long-term fields in the future as the needs are identified.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Why has the ministry failed to take the suggestion that was made, as long ago I believe as 1976, by the district health council that the temporary funding be provided to relieve the chronic-care strain on the active treatment beds? Why has that not taken place?

[3:30]

Second, would the minister not agree that there is an additional strain on Thunder Bay because of the regional nature of its work? Does he not think it is time that the magic formula bed ratio system for the small hospitals in the region, particularly in communities such as Nipigon, must be replaced by a custom-designed system when we get the situation where three of the five doctors in a small community like that are saying they may leave simply because they cannot professionally and adequately provide services? As the reeve said, "How do you cut back on an x-ray technician when you only have one, and how do you close a wing of a hospital when there is only one wing to the whole hospital?"

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, the regional nature of Thunder Bay is already taken account of inasmuch as the referral population for that hospital centre does take account of the people who actually use it. Whether they be from the city of Thunder Bay or from the northwestern region, the people who have actually used the hospital are taken into account in calculating the referral population and therefore calculating the beds.

It is interesting that the honourable member raised the question of Nipigon; and, Mr.

Speaker, I know, that is a hospital that is near and dear to your heart. I was looking at the figures for that hospital this morning. We did build in several factors in the budget formula for the very small hospitals, and in the case of the hospital at Nipigon the restraint, if you want to call it that, resulting from the application of the bed formula is one bed—one bed—this current year.

I would point out that in fact we have asked the Ontario Hospital Association and the Ontario Council of Administrators of Teaching Hospitals, which are representative of all the hospitals in the province, to sit down with us and develop a whole new budget formula. There are a number of things we have tried to do in the last couple of years—

Mr. Foulds: Why don't you do that first?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if he likes, I will take the honourable member through the steps that we have gone through over the last couple of years to take cognizance in the budget formula of things like the small hospitals: the fact that the very small hospitals have had higher increases in the last couple of years than the average for all the other hospitals; the fact that we built in a 10-bed cushion in the bed allocation formula for the very small hospitals, which resulted in that factor of one bed in the Nipigon hospital.

Also, instead of using the actual cost per bed, we used the average incremental cost per bed in the formula so as to cushion the impact. We have also indicated that the move is in transition in the active treatment bed area over three years, not in one year, which would have too great an impact on the system.

We want to develop a totally new formula, and one of the priorities on our table is the problem of the very small hospitals. In the meantime, we have put these cushions into the current formulae to cushion the impact on them until such time as we can develop a totally new budgeting system.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Thunder Bay hospitals, does the ministry's formula take into account the referral population from the Kenora and Rainy River areas which is going to be there, because the minister seems to be intent on destroying the secondary treatment facilities in places like LaVerendyre at Fort Frances, which will happen if he continues with this program the way it is.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in the formula for LaVerendyre hospital in Fort Frances there is an

allowance for 39 or 38 new chronic beds, and their overall funding compared to last year is up 16 per cent. That is the bottom line after taking all these things into account. In addition to the 16 per cent increase and the 39 chronic beds, I believe there has also been a recent special grant from the Ministry of Northern Affairs to that hospital for the space they are going to provide at annual cost to the health unit. So I think that hospital has been reasonably well done by. I met recently with the mayor of Fort Frances, and staff of my ministry will be visiting with Mr. White, the administrator, and representatives of the staff.

The referral population for the Thunder Bay hospital centre includes the calculations for the number of people or percentage of the population in those various communities who have used the hospital.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Not the future use?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. We can only go on what we know have been the patterns. If we try to project the future, I think the member could see that could militate against the interests of the small, far-flung hospitals if we overestimated on those projections. It's better to use retrospective information, which is absolute.

THUNDER BAY HEALTH STUDY

Mr. Hennessy: Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that the member for Port Arthur has presented a petition. I have a similar petition myself; his is only a duplicate of the petition I have. I think the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) had the same type.

The petition is with regard to the shortage of hospital beds, and I am concerned, as is the member for that riding. I'd like to know if there is a study going to be prepared by the Thunder Bay district health council for the ministry to take some action with regard to chronic care patients.

Mr. Foulds: The beds are going to close in 10 days.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm sorry, I missed the early part, but I take it the question was meant for me.

Mr. Philip: The earlier part was a ministerial statement.

Mr. Speaker: The question was, is the district health council going to undertake a study?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if they have launched a study on chronic care at this time. Most of the health councils have got studies under way on chronic and long-term care needs. We have

a few of those reports in now. Submissions are being prepared, in line with the commitment in the speech from the throne, to the Management Board and cabinet for approvals of some more chronic and extended care beds in various parts of the province. I'll have more to say as each of those reports has been prepared and analysis of local needs is considered by cabinet.

I will check for the member as to whether there is a study currently under way by that particular health council. Members can anticipate this is going to be an ongoing process. As the population continues to become much older, our needs in that area are going to become much greater. Even if a study were completed today they could expect it would be updated from time to time every few years.

RESOURCE EQUALIZATION GRANTS

Mr. Bradley: My question is to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. It relates to two questions asked in the House previously of other ministers.

In light of the fact municipalities across the province are striking their budgets and are looking for the precise amount the minister would be providing in terms of interim payments related to those municipalities adversely affected by the resources equalization grant, could the minister assure the House he will present those figures before the recess for the winter break so that municipalities would be aware of them? In presenting them, would he assure the House that the figures and information provided by the former provincial Treasurer to municipalities indicating those who would be eligible will be the figures that will be used to calculate this interim payment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The answer to that question is, I will be introducing a bill to give us the authority to make those payments; no, I will not be introducing the figures before we adjourn for the Easter break; and no, I am not using the list of cities and municipalities with figures that the former Treasurer tabled. We are using a new formula, and the eligible areas—those that perceive themselves to be adversely affected—will be notified probably sometime in the next week.

Mr. Bradley: Supplementary: Could the minister indicate why he is not using the figures and information provided by the former Treasurer, in light of the fact a lot of municipalities were anticipating those would be the figures used, and that they were accurate?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. I can indicate to the House very precisely. The figures used by the former Treasurer constituted a list of municipalities with amounts associated with the adoption of the total property tax reform market value assessment package. We are looking at something different. We're looking at those municipalities that would be very adversely affected because of the use of the present equalization factors for the computation of the resource equalization grant—something quite different from what the former Treasurer was using at the time he put his list in. So the list will be different from the one the former Treasurer had.

I might just say I already have a meeting lined up with the mayor and council of St. Catharines, I think for a week tomorrow, to chat with them about this and other matters.

LUMBER PRICES

Mr. Swart: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is he aware that the tremendous escalation that took place in the price of lumber last year has continued apace into this year? For instance, the wholesale price of a four-foot by eight-foot sheet of spruce plywood, five-sixteenths of an inch thick, has increased from \$7.25 to \$8.20 from January 1 to this time. As a result, is the minister prepared to abandon his provincial hands-off policy, which he explained to me in a letter, and at least monitor and publicize the unreasonableness of the price escalation in lumber?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Never having been a man to duplicate activity under way, I draw to the attention of the honourable member that for some weeks my federal counterpart, Honourable Warren Allmand, has had an active investigation into these prices under the auspices of the Combines Act.

I should add that his attention was drawn to the Ontario prices by me, not by the honourable member.

Mr. Swart: By way of supplementary, doesn't the minister realize his government has the constitutional responsibility for retail prices and that when it puts a restraint program on wages and all forms of government assistance it has to do something about holding prices? Doesn't he think his government, as part of its \$100-million gift to the forest industry, should require those companies to sell lumber here at the Canadian dollar level instead of at the United States dollar level?

Mr. Worton: He is putting the minister against the boards.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I would just say that while retail prices may or may not be a provincial responsibility—

Mr. Foulds: They are.

Hon. Mr. Drea: —the unusual activity in retail or wholesale prices is quite clearly a federal responsibility under the criminal code.

Mr. Swart: You've got enough clout to do something if you want to.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Furthermore, in terms of the development of resources, particularly in the lumber field, I thought the name of the game was to stimulate exports so that we could ease the balance of payments deficit.

Mr. Swart: Of course. We're not talking about combines; we're talking about Canadian prices.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I am very pleased to see the professional socialist from Welland-Thorold now wants to cut off exports so that indeed there will be even harder times in this country.

Mr. Swart: I never said any such thing.

Mr. Gregory: Pick on somebody your own size.

Mr. Mackenzie: Why don't you try to put 100 per cent of them out of business? It's your tactic.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Are they your friends?

Mr. Mackenzie: Some of them are. I didn't say all of them.

COURT REPORTERS DISPUTE

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Attorney General. Has the Attorney General no statement to make at this time with reference to the study of Mendel Green into the problems of the reporters in special examiners' offices, and will he table that report which I'm informed he now has?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I will be tabling the report in the very near future. At that time I will make what I consider to be an appropriate statement. I'm still reviewing the report. I'm waiting for reports from some members of the ministry who are interested in this area of special examiners. I expect to be reporting to the Legislature within the next two or three weeks.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Does the Attorney General not agree that these reporters have suffered for a considerable length of time, and for us to rise without any kind of a statement for them is at least thoughtless, if nothing else?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think the member for St. George has really raised another related issue, namely, a dispute between certain reporters and the special examiners. With all due respect to Mr. Green and his very interesting and useful report, I don't think either his report or my statement will resolve that dispute.

ALUMINUM WIRING

Mr. M. N. Davison: I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations about the inquiry on aluminum wiring in the hope that he'll give up his role as the Artful Dodger and answer questions without his characteristic vagueness and evasion.—

Interjections.

Mr. M. N. Davison: On March 2, this minister said at the hearing that the cost of repair or replacing faulty connections and equipment will "be borne in a very fair way." Does that mean the minister will agree with me and the members of the New Democratic Party that it would be extremely unfair to expect any home owner in Ontario to pay for necessary repairs when the fault lies with the contractor, Ontario Hydro or the minister's government?

Hon. Mr. Drea: On March 2, when I tabled the report of the commission of inquiry into aluminum wiring, the question was raised about who would be responsible if defects and so forth were found in individual homes because of the inspection service being offered. At that time—and the member who asked the question wasn't present, he didn't show up, he only saw it later or something—

Mr. McClellan: You should talk about showing up.

Mr. M. N. Davidson: You haven't been in the House for the last three days.

Mr. Philip: Where have you been this week, Frank?

Hon. Mr. Drea: —we pointed out that it was premature to try to attempt to give a firm answer to that question because it would depend upon what the inspections found. At that time I gave a commitment, not only on behalf of my ministry but on behalf of the government, that when all the diagnoses were in from all of the free inspections—and they are not in yet—the solution for the individual home owner would be fair. I still say that.

Mr. M. N. Davison: Does the minister contend that the rather shabby treatment meted

out to one Mr. John Wright, of 1 Juliette Square, Bramalea, who earlier this month—as a matter of fact within 24 hours of the minister's statement—had a fire in his aluminum-wired home, was fair?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Don't ask me, please don't ask that one.

Mr. M. N. Davison: I am asking that because the ministry has refused to pay compensation, even though research has clearly shown that a fire in a fuse box is much more likely to happen with aluminum wiring than with copper wiring.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The insurance will pay for whatever damage was in that fuse box.

Mr. M. N. Davison: You are inadequate.

Mr. Swart: Paper tiger.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary: I would like to ask the minister, if it is not very clear under the terms of the Power Corporation Act where the responsibility lies for the inspection and approval of all electrical installations in Ontario and that it does indeed lie with Ontario Hydro, and since in this case it is obvious that through certain incompatibilities of wiring and connectors and so on there have been problems, would it not be incumbent then upon Ontario Hydro, which is the approver and the inspector of these things, to make those corrections?

Hon. Mr. Drea: It is not quite that simple. In some cases people wired their own houses and received no approval. That is why we are waiting until all the—

Mr. J. Reed: They are not inspected?

Hon. Mr. Drea: If you don't take out a permit to wire your house, obviously it won't be inspected. What I am saying is, quite simply, when the diagnoses are in—those inspections are being made—we will take a look at who is responsible for the particular faults in the particular home, and at that particular time when we have all the specifics, the responsibilities will be assigned in a very fair manner. There is no general approach that can be taken at this time until all of those are in.

Mr. M. N. Davison: Was your treatment of Mr. Wright fair?

Mr. Warner: You didn't treat Mr. Wright fairly.

FAMILY BENEFITS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services, or perhaps his youthful assistant there; we might get a better answer from him.

I wrote the minister on January 29—he is usually very diligent in his responses—but I have never heard from him with respect to the case of Mr. Terry Pembleton from London, Ontario, asking to qualify for so-called mother's allowance as he has three dependent sons. Would the minister please tell me his response to my letter? Is he prepared to assist him to get mother's allowance under the Family Benefits Act?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I apologize to the honourable member. I thought I could recall having signed a response to him fairly recently. That may be erroneous. I am aware of the case to which he refers.

I would advise the honourable member that to the best of my recollection on that particular case the answer is no; the circumstances that Mr. Pembleton faces are not such as to justify, in my judgement, an order in council in order to provide special assistance.

Mr. Peterson: Surely, as a reasonably fair-minded chap at times, would the minister not consider changes to the Family Benefits Act so we don't have to go through this ridiculous procedure of order in council and come begging to the cabinet every time to bring justice and equity under that act and prevent sexual discrimination that's there? Is the minister prepared to bring something to change that law, or failing that, at least support my private member's bill on April 6 on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I wouldn't wish to prejudge my position on the honourable member's private bill, but I would point out to the honourable member, first of all, the procedure that is at present being used by way of order in council does, I admit, leave something to be desired. I would also point out that the majority—a rather substantial majority—of the male single parents who apply do apply under circumstances which render them eligible for assistance. There are cases where it's just obviously in the interests of the family or the children to provide that assistance.

Mr. Peterson: What about the three little children?

Hon. Mr. Norton: We could get into a lengthy debate on this. The circumstances, the needs of the family, have to be viewed if the appeal is on the basis of special assistance or special circumstances.

Mr. S. Smith: Treat men and women equally. It's not debatable.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I am not at this time prepared to bring in amendments to the Family Benefits Act in order to make the

present provisions as they apply to women, apply to men.

Mr. S. Smith: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Norton: For one thing that presupposes that the current circumstances as they apply to women are the optimum circumstances.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Just because of one part of your act, it does not justify sex discrimination.

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I have told the House, on numerous occasions, I am currently engaged—

Mr. Warner: You want to balance out the inequities.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —in discussions with the federal government seeking flexibility—

Mr. McClellan: It's been going on since 1973.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I wasn't around in 1973, but I'll tell you—

Mr. McClellan: You won't be around very much longer, either.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —we have made substantial headway in those negotiations in the last six months, and I'm hoping that if we are not interrupted by a federal election—

Mr. MacDonald: You've got your excuse all ready, Keith.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —the matter might be resolved satisfactorily, which would then allow me to proceed to make—

Mr. Warner: You move like a runaway glacier.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —significant changes in terms of employment incentives and so on to that program, which then might be appropriate for general application to both men and women. I do not wish to deal with this on a piecemeal basis; there are other glaring examples of discrimination in that act on the basis of gender.

Ms. Gigantes: It's because it's women.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Sometimes they're against women, sometimes against men.

Ms. Gigantes: Only against women.

Mr. Speaker: Time for oral questions expired two minutes ago.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I do wish to approach it when I am able in a comprehensive way and not in a piecemeal way.

MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BALLOT

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that notwithstanding the orders of the House, the order

of preference for private members' public business be changed so that Mr. MacBeth's ballot item be listed and called for debate April 12, and Mr. Johnson's ballot item be listed and called for debate April 19.

Motion agreed to.

WCB REPORT

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that in compliance with section 81 of the Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, 1973, the annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1977 be referred to the standing resources development committee for consideration starting the evening of Tuesday, March 27, and concluding Friday, March 30, the proceedings of which shall be transcribed by Hansard and appended to the Hansard proceedings of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Ministry of Transportation and Communications Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this bill will replace the present cumbersome and largely unworkable provisions for delegation of ministerial authority by order in council in my ministry's act with provisions that are identical to those in other ministry acts passed by this House in the last session.

STATUTE LABOUR AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this house-keeping bill simply removes the \$50 maximum limitation on the annual salary which may be paid to the secretary-treasurer out of the fund of an area under the Statute Labour Act.

LOCAL ROADS BOARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend the Local Roads Boards Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this bill is part of a response to a concern expressed by the ombudsman. A procedure is being estab-

lished which will ensure that residents who feel they should be removed from a local roads board area are entitled to have the question considered at the annual meeting, and that the minister has the final discretion in changing the boundaries of the local roads area, as I have always had when the boundaries are being initially defined.

The bill will also permit a board to vary the minimum tax from the statutory \$10 for property with the approval of the land-owners.

AIRPORTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend the Airports Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the government's objective of eliminating unnecessary red tape, this house-keeping bill will remove the requirement that an order in council be obtained for each grant to each municipality towards its airport construction or maintenance cost. The total of such grants are, of course, established annually in the ministry's estimates.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a plot to keep the House going until 6 o'clock.

Mr. Kerrio: Thank heaven for small mercies.

Mr. Cassidy: They are trying to eliminate the debate.

LINE FENCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 17, An Act to revise the Line Fences Act.

Motion agreed to.

[4.00]

Hon. Mr. Wells: This bill is very similar to the one which was introduced on December 8, 1978, but which died on the order paper. There are several minor changes in it—

Mr. Cassidy: Your government may fall on this one.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —which will be outlined at the beginning of second reading and I hope that we will be able to pass the bill in this session, Mr. Speaker.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend the Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, this bill allows for the payment in 1979 of special one-time grants to municipalities which have been adversely affected in the calculation of their resource equalization grants because of the equalization factors which, of course, have been unchanged since 1970.

The bill also clarifies the levying procedures of those area municipalities within regional municipalities which have been recently re-assessed under section 86 of the Assessment Act, such as the municipalities within the regions of Waterloo and Durham. This section merely ensures that a single set of mill rates is struck across the local municipality, rather than separate rates for each of its merged areas.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mrs. Birch, on behalf of Hon. Miss Stephenson, moved first reading of Bill 19, An Act to Amalgamate the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Education.

Motion agreed to.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT (SECOND SESSION)

Hon. Mr. Drea moved first reading of Bill 20, An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975, second session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, this extends the current Rent Review Act for 90 days so that proper notices can go out in the case of proposed increases by landlords, covering the period from June 30 through to September 30. By the end of June, Mr. Speaker, presumably the new Residential Tenancies Act will have been passed.

Mr. M. N. Davison: This is the third time.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I just heard that from over there. There was a commitment from the people in that party, and once again they weren't there, that this would be the last and it would also involve sufficient time for the bill to be passed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there was no commitment made by members of this party sitting on that committee.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 21, An Act to amend the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to prevent discrimination on the basis of a physical handicap where that handicap does not reasonably preclude the performance of the particular employment. Physical handicap means a physical disability, infirmity, malformation, or disfigurement which is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness. It includes epilepsy, diabetes and any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a seeing-eye dog, wheelchair, or other remedial appliance or device.

An hon. member: That covers all of us.

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AND COMMERCIAL RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Drea moved first reading of Bill 22, An Act to amend the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, this is really a housekeeping amendment. It will allow other ministries of the crown to use the appeal proceedings of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, the commercial relations appeal tribunals, in the spirit of the Wiseman report which urged consolidation of appeal boards.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Swart moved first reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Swart: The purpose of this bill is to declare that the designation "Member of the Legislative Assembly" and "MLA" are the official designations of persons who are elected to the Legislative Assembly. The bill provides that only members of the Legislative Assembly are entitled to use either of the official designations in association with themselves while sitting as elected members of the assembly and during the succeeding election periods. The designation "MLA" will conform with all other provinces in Canada except Quebec. It eliminates the confusion of the designations MPP and MP, and it will correctly designate the position of the members.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to standing order 13 may I take this opportunity

simply and briefly to indicate the order of business on our return from the school break?

The House resumes, following adjournment today, on Tuesday, March 27. As it will be a Tuesday, we will consider legislation in the House, doing the following bills in this order as time permits: Bills 74, 75, 2, 7, 8, 18, and 20.

On Tuesday when we return, the standing committee on general government will continue its review of Bill 163, and the standing committee on resources development will take into consideration the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board as indicated earlier by motion.

Mr. Nixon: Fifteen hours.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On Wednesday, the House will not be in the assembly, but committees will continue, as indicated.

Thursday, on our return, in the afternoon we will do private members' ballot items one and two. On Thursday evening, the House will be asked to take into consideration a motion for interim supply which will be put on the order paper on the Tuesday we come back. Following that, and as time permits, we will take into consideration some supplementary estimates which will be tabled on Tuesday when we return. That will continue on Friday morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Cassidy: You know, Mr. Speaker, if I can say this to the two ministers who are still present: One would almost think there was a conspiracy to impose silence on the New Democratic Party in this debate when you count the 10 statements of total inconsequence that we had between two o'clock and 3 o'clock today and the 10 bills of equal inconsequence which were put forward by the government between five minutes to four and 10 minutes past four today—

Hon. Mr. Norton: Listen, don't start off being provocative. Build up to it.

Mr. Cassidy: —and the fact that having heard their own voices at such length, the cabinet has now decamped. I presume its members are over on Bay Street supping and deciding on the future of the province.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Waste more time.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I was looking after constituency problems for your members.

Mr. M. N. Davison: They are watching Smith and Davis play tennis.

Mr. McClellan: It's a great show of courtesy by the government.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

I want to begin by paying my respects to you, Mr. Speaker. In the 21 months since the 1977 election, you have filled your role with distinction and I am confident that you will continue to act in that way.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Now, why don't you say that every day? You have to control that guy to your right.

Mr. Cassidy: But I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to be positive about the present government and about the throne speech with which they have launched the 1979 session.

The problems that Ontario faces continue to be serious. The fundamental weaknesses of our economy remain to be addressed by this government and now we have added to that an attack on social services of unprecedented proportions, particularly in the area of health. Working people will be the victims of that attack.

The response we have from the government is a desperate search for old remedies and a refusal to look at anything new, a failure of will which has cost this province dearly and which will cost us even more for each further month that the Progressive Conservatives are in power, and a set of priorities in government which we believe are totally upside down.

We are faced with a weak economy, with high unemployment, with a colonized industrial structure, and with a resource sector which is operating as though there was no tomorrow. The response of the Conservatives to every one of these problems is that the province needs more restraints. Their policies—this government's policies—are both as skillful and as useful as those medieval surgeons whose response to every medical illness was to let more blood.

There is only one exception: corporation profits have risen sharply in the past year—those of the pulp and paper industry by 94 per cent—at a time when the real wages of workers are falling steadily by as much as four or five per cent a year.

Hospitals are being closed, and services are being cut across the province. Daycare centres are closing, and special programs in our schools are being squeezed. Municipali-

ties are being pushed against the wall to provide services because of the cutbacks in provincial support. With all this going on, Ontario in its wisdom has decided that the corporate sector alone should get priority.

It is promises like the ones made in this year's throne speech that make people cynical about politicians. The government mouths concern about important problems, and then hopes that they go away. It has set up yet another advisory commission about women's rights, but won't change Ontario's laws to bring in equal pay for work of equal value.

The government is moving forward in providing special transportation services for the disabled, but what disabled people really want, and what the bill that the member for Downsview (Mr. di Santo) moved last year would have given them, is the right to work, and that we don't have from the government of Ontario.

The government's commitment to improve labour relations is pretty hollow when it comes from a government that sent the OPP to try to stop Fleck workers from getting a contract, that has placed a four per cent ceiling on Civil Service negotiations and that refuses to give workers the right to a first contract or to outlaw strikebreaking in the province of Ontario.

[4:15]

The commitment to multiculturalism also rings hollow, Mr. Speaker, when Ontario's heritage language program is being cut in half because of cutbacks in provincial funding. L'impegno preso in favore del Multiculturalismo non ha sostanza poichè il programma provinciale del "Heritage Language" sarà ridotto a metà a causa della diminuzione dei fondi provinciali.

A promise to give citizens easier access to government isn't worth much, Mr. Speaker, unless the government is also prepared to pass a freedom of information law. A celebration of the Year of the Child by opening provincial parks is hypocritical when basic services that are vital to Ontario's children are being cut to the bone.

The monitoring of food prices proposed by the government is of no use to consumers unless the government is prepared to create a food prices review board which will roll back unjustified price increases now being imposed on the people of the province.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, the government won't do anything at all.

Mr. Speaker, I intend today to concentrate on cutbacks in health services because this is the most serious example of how the govern-

ment is getting out of providing services to people. The NDP is also concerned about the cutbacks in education, concerned about the property tax increases that are being created because of the cutbacks to municipalities and concerned with what is happening with local social services. We are concerned with what's happening to services to children and as we have already shown, Mr. Speaker, in the no-confidence motion we had in this Legislature on Tuesday night, we're concerned about what's happening to our cities with the government's determination to cut back on transit. We've said clearly that we will draw the line and we'll fight the government, not just in the health cutbacks but in all of the areas where it's trying to cut back on services that are essential to the working people of the province of Ontario.

In the last two weeks in particular, since we've had a chance to join with the government or lock horns with the government over the health issue, it has become apparent that the Conservatives have decided to dismantle the universal health care system which has been created in this province.

Mr. Martel: They opposed it right from the beginning.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is immoral to make a statement like that.

Mr. Lane: Every day you get more ridiculous.

Mr. Cassidy: The New Democrats are proud of the part that we have played in bringing the security of universal health care to the people of this province. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is the single greatest achievement of the New Democratic Party and of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation to have brought health care to Canada and health care to the province of Ontario and we will fight to stop this government from taking away that security.

Mr. Martel: Do you remember the "Machiavellian scheme"?

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Mr. Martel: I remember it well.

Mr. Cassidy: The references to health in this year's throne speech conceal far more than they reveal. The government talks and the minister talks as well of reshaping health care delivery to ensure both excellence of service and effective management. The throne speech says and I quote: "The social value to Ontario is too great to allow any diminution in the quality or quantity of such significant social advances as our health care system."

This is a gross distortion of what is happening in the province today and it is time that the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell)

started to set the record straight on just what is happening in health care in Ontario and what is happening in his ministry.

Last April 14 we were told by the minister that the Ministry of Health was monitoring opted-out physicians on a very detailed basis. We got a commitment from the minister at that time: "The universal, accessible medical health care plan that we developed in this province over the last number of years will be maintained." In fact, Mr. Speaker, that promise is not being kept by the government of Ontario.

In just 10 months, the proportion of opted-out physicians has jumped from just under 10 per cent to almost 18 per cent, yet this week in the House the minister denied that the current rate of opting out is a threat to universality. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the financial consequences for Ontario residents are that people are now having to pay heavily out of their own pockets for medical care, in addition to paying the highest health premiums in Canada.

We have been told that the Ontario Medical Association schedule, which opted-out physicians now are charging, is 30 per cent higher than the Ontario Health Insurance Plan schedule. In fact, the difference amounts to a surcharge of about 43 per cent and in some cases is even higher.

For example, a 74-year-old pensioner in Toronto who was diabetic found late last month, when she went in for a regular examination, that her doctor had opted out. She had to pay \$20—in fact, they asked for it right away—and she will get only \$13.25 back from OHIP. The surcharge on that office visit for this pensioner was 53 per cent over the OHIP rate and the only way to avoid it was for her to beg for charity medicine to the doctor or to his secretary. The doctor's rationale for the surcharge is that OHIP fee adjustments have not been adequate. I do not know what the doctor is talking about, when the OHIP fee schedule has risen by 13 per cent since last May but that pensioner's income has risen by only nine per cent.

To put things into perspective, when last year's select committee established that doctors in Ontario averaged \$55,000 in net income per year, let us reflect on the fact that the net income of a pensioner receiving a guaranteed annual income supplement and old age security—like the pensioner I just mentioned—is \$4,116 per year, or less than one eleventh of the average income of a physician in the province.

I do not understand how the minister can stay so calm when his own staff acknowledges that almost 70 per cent of the doctors in the

cities of Peterborough and Orillia have opted out. I do not understand his complacency when we learn that every doctor in Amherstburg, in Essex county, has opted out, and the people who cannot afford the OMA surcharges either have to beg the doctor for a break or have to find a way to get medical care in Windsor, 17 miles away.

In Metropolitan Toronto, the figures that the minister filed this week show that 25 per cent of physicians have opted out; that is, one doctor in four. If you look just at full-time practising physicians, the proportion will be higher. If you look at specialists, it will be higher still. And we have yet to learn from the minister how many additional doctors have closed their lists or are not accepting patients who are trying to transfer from opted-out doctors.

When the ministry's own figures show that 30 per cent of the doctors in Halton, Perth and Wellington counties have opted out, that 41 per cent have opted out in York county, and that opting-out exceeds 24 per cent in Waterloo county, Simcoe and Metropolitan Toronto itself, it is obvious that there is a crisis. Even the Minister of National Health and Welfare has moved in, threatening to cut off federal funding if the exodus of doctors undermines universal access to medical care.

I want to say, as plainly as I can, that medicare in this province is in grave jeopardy. This government has not fulfilled its responsibility to make sure that every Ontario citizen continues to have access to universal medical care. This government, whose Treasurer said a year or two ago that it would not impose a deterrent fee on medical patients in Ontario, has moved aside and is allowing doctors to do the same thing through the back door.

I want to suggest a number of steps that the government should be taking now to preserve public health care.

The province must clearly indicate to our doctors that, while we value their services highly, Ontario will not allow its physicians to destroy OHIP or our medicare plan. Ontario must be prepared to use moral suasion, to use publicity, to use regulation and, if necessary, to use legislation to keep universal medicare in place.

Since the member for Don Mills has been the Minister of Health for two years, why has he not cleaned up the OHIP administration and the delays in payment which have caused such aggravation among doctors as well as patients and are one of the factors leading doctors to get out of OHIP? Why has he not examined the fee structure in response to doctors' grievances as well as exa-

mining alternatives to the fee-for-service payment system, which causes such problems for general practitioners who are penalized for spending time with patients? And why has the minister not already established and fully supported health service organizations for all citizens of Ontario, rather than keeping them on such a tight leash that they have not even been able to plan from one year to the next? The commitments he makes now about health service organizations are hollow, when you look at the treatment of health service organizations in the province over the past five years.

Mr. Martel: You beggars are responsible.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister told reporters outside the House this week that he thought "consumer control" offered the best protection of the system.

Ms. Gigantes: Shop around.

Mr. Cassidy: But the only effective consumer is an informed consumer. And we've had our problems getting information.

How about the people of the province of Ontario? What's the minister doing to inform the consumer of health care about where to get an OHIP physician; and about what is happening with health care costs in Ontario? What's he doing to ensure that patients will know where to find care under OHIP and what it costs to go to an opted-out physician?

While he is considering his responsibility on these questions, the minister has some other problems to come to grips with. One is the practice, adopted by more and more doctors, of charging for services which were formerly provided free. A telephone call to a physician costs from \$4 to \$12. Even a medical slip required by an employer will cost \$3, unless the patient is prepared to pay what amounts to a private premium of \$40 per family per year. That's the rate being charged by the Queensway Clinic in Toronto; but in some practices and in some clinics, the annual rate is even more.

This minister should make it clear that this is not acceptable. He should make it clear that Ontario will never accept doctors' demands for what they call "balanced billing," a system which looks to us like having your cake and eating it, too.

If I can go back to the pensioner I mentioned. The idea is that, rather than billing the lady \$20 and hoping that she can pay, the doctor can bill OHIP for the \$13 in their fee schedule and then charge the patient the additional \$7. Imagine paying such high premiums in this province and then having to turn around and pay a fee that is equal to half the fee in the OHIP

schedule, if you want to get medical services in the province of Ontario.

We also believe that the minister should tell doctors that the practice they call "patient streaming" is unacceptable. He should stop actively encouraging it. Last December 13 the cabinet approved a regulation to change the Health Insurance Act to allow doctors who have opted out to bill through OHIP for medical services that are provided in hospitals. In effect—and despite his denials today—the Minister of Health was telling doctors to go ahead and opt out, because if a patient looks a bit shaky financially the doctor can treat him at the hospital and be paid through OHIP. It's amazing to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health is adding fuel to the fire with this regulation at a time when opting out is already at crucial proportions.

His response in the House today is pure distortion. In one swoop he has expanded a regulation covering 20 teaching hospitals to apply to more than 200 hospitals across the province of Ontario. If that is not inciting doctors to get out of the OHIP scheme, then I don't know what is.

Mr. Martel: Some of you fellows in the cabinet should question that boy.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Where is the Minister of Health when he says he will protect the system? In fact, he is an active conspirator in tearing it down.

So far this afternoon, I have concentrated on OHIP. But I want this House to know as well that the Minister of Health's announcement about hospital funding on January 19 poses a threat to our health care system which is every bit as grave as doctors opting out.

In the past two months, I have talked to a lot of people who are deeply affected by the ministry's new budget guidelines. They are very concerned. As the phone calls mount and mail pours in, it's becoming apparent that this attack on the hospitals is even more devastating than the former minister's cutbacks of three years ago.

What is at issue is not just the budgets that were announced by the minister back in January. What is at stake is the provision of hospital services across Ontario. The 4.2 per cent budget increase announced in January means a cut in real terms of at least four per cent in hospital services across this province. And that comes on top of a system which has been systematically squeezed by the ministry for the past four years.

What is worse, however, is the sudden and arbitrary decision by the ministry that,

between now and 1981, Ontario will cut active treatment hospital beds in this province to the level of 3.5 beds per thousand population in the south, and four beds per thousand in the north.

Interjection.

Mr. Cassidy: The member has a comment? Let's hear it.

An hon. member: Tell us what the socialist countries—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The honourable member isn't in his seat.

[4:30]

Mr. Cassidy: Let's look at the rest of the country and at what the select committee had to find, a committee whose findings in the section I'm about to read were endorsed by the Conservative members unanimously.

As the select committee noted last year, in Ontario the number of beds per capita is already lower than in any other province but Newfoundland and has been declining at a faster rate than in the rest of Canada for the past eight years. In fact, we are now moving towards a standard of 3.5 hospital beds per thousand at a time when the average for the rest of Canada is closer to 5.5 beds per thousand.

Mr. Watson: What is it in England?

Mr. Cassidy: Let's talk about Alberta. It's just about six in the province of Alberta, where Peter Lougheed is the Premier.

Mr. Foulds: He's a Tory too.

Mr. Warner: Worst medical record in Canada.

Mr. Cassidy: He's a Tory, that's right. There is absolutely no medical rationale which has been offered by the minister to explain this sudden move, only budget constraints.

Mr. Foulds: The magic formula pulled out of a hat like a rabbit. It means nothing.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. The minister estimates that 1,200 beds will be cut this coming year, and that's bad enough. But to move from a ratio of four beds per thousand to 3.5 beds per thousand will mean cutting a further 4,000 hospital beds in Ontario over the next two years, and I don't see how our health care system is going to take it.

Mr. Warner: It's being destroyed.

Mr. Cassidy: It's not just beds that are being cut, but jobs too. As many as 4,500 hospital care workers could lose their jobs between now and 1981 at a time when we already face near-record unemployment in the province. The consequence, in other words, of this new round of cutbacks is deeply disturbing.

I have talked to a lot of people about this. The people at the Civic Hospital in my riding of Ottawa Centre tell me that all the fat has been removed over the past four years and these cuts are biting into muscle. When I met with the administrator of the Welland General Hospital last month, he complained that his hospital had no special consideration despite the fact its per diem bed rate is far below the level of most comparable hospitals in Ontario. He told me that even if the Welland General closes all the 16 beds ordered closed by the ministry it will still make no saving. It will have to close a full ward of 29 beds, and even then it will still be \$210,000 short of the savings imposed by the ministry.

In other words, the minister's figure of 1,200 beds to be cut is a sham. Hospitals are going to have to cut more and the patients, people who are sick, are going to be the victims.

Mr. Foulds: Scandalous.

Mr. Cassidy: In Brantford, the supposed autonomy and responsibility of hospitals in responding to the Ministry of Health has been revealed as a total shambles. Without even allowing community consultation, a select group from the local health council has delivered an edict with the approval of Queen's Park that St. Joseph's Hospital should become a chronic care facility. That entire community is up in arms because of the way this decision is being forced upon them, rammed down their throats.

These cuts threaten to close hospitals in many smaller communities and that is where the damage is going to be the greatest. Small hospitals have fewer special programs and equipment to be cut back, and because they need a minimum number of staff to carry out many duties these hospitals cannot be cut at the rate the minister decrees without going under.

I want to read a letter which came to my office this week from Dr. R. E. Laine, a physician in Geraldton in northern Ontario. I don't know this gentleman, but Dr. Laine outlined what will happen in the Geraldton hospital over the next three years as the number of beds will be cut from 45 to 20. The story is so vivid that I want to quote his entire letter.

"You may know," he writes, "that this hospital is central to a number of relatively isolated communities, including Beardmore, Jellicoe, Longlac with two Indian reserves, Caramat, Nakina, Aroland and Indian settlements further north like Ogoki Post. Approximately 10,000 people, augmented by a tran-

sient and tourist population, are served. An active woods industry utilizes the hospital for acute trauma and physiotherapy. These factors assume some importance if you appreciate that the nearest medical referral centre is Thunder Bay, a distance of some 300 kilometres by road."

That's not universal access if you have to go that far, Mr. Speaker.

"Geraldton District Hospital is the only medical facility in a very vast area and it provides very basic medical services, no frills. There aren't any duplicated services. One can't close down a nursing floor of the hospital because there is only one. One can't fire an x-ray technician because there is only one. Statistical manipulations and criteria used to justify reductions in Toronto are not necessarily valid here.

"Years of community effort have transformed Geraldton District Hospital into an institution with competent medical and ancillary services peculiar to the needs of this area. Now the Ontario government proposes 'pulling the plug' which will result in under-utilization of an established facility and which will force local residents to seek medical assistance 300 kilometres away from home, where beds are already in short supply." In fact in Thunder Bay my colleague from Port Arthur has shown me press clippings which show the waiting list for certain hospitals has as many as 1,000 patients.

Mr. Warner: Do you support the cuts up north, Leo? Do you support the cuts in Geraldton? Good idea, are they?

Mr. Cassidy: Dr. Laine is afraid that his hospital will be "reduced to the status of a first-aid post."

Mr. Warner: They'll run the ministers out of the north.

Mr. Cassidy: What is happening in Geraldton is happening across the north. The Minister of Health has tried to soften the blow for small hospitals this year by allowing them to keep up to 10 beds more than would otherwise be allowed under his rigid guidelines.

But that just postpones the reckoning. We believe that those hospital beds should not be cut back until the minister can tell us how the quality of the health care system in northern Ontario will not only be maintained, but improved.

We believe these hospital beds should not be cut back until alternative services are in place and the evidence that I had in travelling across northern Ontario, even in communities as well developed as Sudbury, is that

their standard of services consistently falls below what is available in the south.

There are nine hospitals throughout the north that will not get a nickel more in budget this year. Once this year's 10-bed cushion is taken away, the hospital in Fort Frances is going to face a 29 per cent cut in beds. The cut is to be 32 per cent in Red Lake, 54 per cent in Manitouwadge, 33 per cent in Nipigon, 25 per cent in Blind River, 53 per cent in the Hornepayne Community Hospital, 38 per cent in the Little Current hospital, 35 per cent in Englehart, 49 per cent in the Mattawa General Hospital, 63 per cent in St. Joseph's Hospital in Parry Sound, and as much as 85 per cent of the beds will be cut in the hospital in Chapleau. That's the government's commitment to health in northern Ontario.

Mr. Martel: When the minister flies in next week he might check some of that.

Mr. Warner: Leo supports the cut. You do support the cut? How could you? Shame.

Mr. Cassidy: The same kinds of cuts are now being imposed on southwestern Ontario. One third or more of the beds are at risk in the hospitals in Clinton, in Listowel, in Seaforth, in St. Mary's, in Newbury, in Durham—where the member for Muskoka (Mr. F. S. Miller) already tried to close the hospital—in Chesley, in Hanover, in Walkerton and in Shelburne. In Palmerston they could lose 23 out of their 37 beds, according to the standards now decreed by the ministry. I have not even mentioned the threat that the entire 65-bed hospital in Penetanguishene may be compelled to close because of the minister's cutbacks.

In God's name, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to those communities when their hospitals are cut back like that? What will happen to the nurses and the other skilled professionals who will no longer have jobs in those communities? Why does the Minister of Health think he can impose the same arbitrary standards on Goderich as on Toronto, on Geraldton as on Sault Ste. Marie?

I say, we say, the minister must be flexible enough to make allowances for the nature of the communities that these hospitals serve. The minister has an obligation to ensure that small communities in the north, small communities in the south, every city and town in all of this province and not just our major cities, can and will have a decent standard of hospital care.

Let me raise just one more specific case. The decision to close the entire Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital makes absolutely no sense at all, and that is why I am wearing

my button today. The consultants who were hired for \$116,000 by the Ministry of Health, McKinsey and Company, recommended that the Lakeshore hospital be fully renovated or rebuilt. They did so because—the minister doesn't understand that—the Queen Street Mental Health Centre cannot take care of Lakeshore's patients and because the expanding population of the area west of Toronto will make a new hospital essential in five to seven years if Lakeshore is closed. It doesn't make sense to "save," so-called, \$22 million today if we are going to have to spend \$100 million on a new hospital just five or seven years down the line.

The community is totally opposed to the closing of the hospital. The workers have been looking for alternatives. Why is the minister so inflexible that he must bring this hospital to the ground rather than looking at alternatives that have already been proposed?

On Tuesday, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union challenged the minister to a full inquiry into the rationale for the closing and the alternatives. We in the New Democratic Party demand that such an inquiry be held at once and we are confident that it will show that Lakeshore should not be closed.

If the minister is so confident of his ground he will agree. But his refusal to have such an inquiry shows that he is on shaky ground because he knows what the inquiry would show: it would show that Lakeshore hospital should be kept in operation providing vital services, not just to one community but to more than a million people in North York, in Halton, in Peel, in Etobicoke, and in the counties to the west of Toronto.

Finally, I wish to comment on the outrageous proposals by the ministry to charge a deterrent fee for chronic care. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) recently said Ontario is considering even wider use of deterrent fees such as the payments that will soon be required from chronic care patients. We're glad to hear the Minister of Health has withdrawn his proposal to charge deterrent fees for psychiatric patients. But it makes no more sense, in our view, to impose deterrent fees on people who are chronically ill than to impose them on people in psychiatric beds.

Chronic patients are being forced to remain in active treatment hospital beds in Ontario because of the failure of this government to provide enough beds in nursing homes, homes for the aged, and to provide alternatives such as chronic home care. There are still only seven chronic home care pro-

grams in the 49 counties and districts of Ontario. How can the minister say that those patients should go home and wait for chronic treatment at home when in 42 of the districts and counties of the province, there is no such service yet available?

All members of last year's select committee, including the Conservative members, warned that deterrent charges would inhibit legitimate use of the health care system. The committee noted that when deterrent fees were tried in Saskatchewan under a Liberal government, it was poor people who stopped going to doctors.

The Ontario Nurses' Association has not been so gentle. It says the proposal to make chronic care patients pay is despicable and irresponsible and proves the complete failure of this government to design and operate an efficient health care system in this province.

When I began talking about health I took the liberty of trying to take the words of the throne speech at face value.

Mr. Watson: Want us to run up the Union Jack?

Ms. Gigantes: They know what they're talking about.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to repeat those words from the throne speech: "The social value of Ontario's health care program is too great to allow any diminution in the quality or quantity of such significant social advances."

Everybody in the New Democratic Party agrees with that sentiment. We believe we should not diminish the quality or quantity of the health care system. The reason we are so outraged is that whether one looks at doctors leaving OHIP, whether one looks at the minister's failure to uphold the universality of our medicare system, whether one looks at what's happening to our hospitals in the south or to communities in the north whose health services are being devastated, whether one looks at the Lakeshore situation or whether one looks at what's being done to chronic care patients, the picture is the same. The Conservatives are hypocrites when they mouth those noble words—that they want to preserve the quality or quantity of the health care system.

I want to turn now to the economy and to suggest the cornerstone of social policy in the province should be a policy of full employment. A situation where unemployment is running at more than six per cent among men, at more than eight per cent among women, and at 13 per cent among workers under 25 is absolutely intolerable. The cost of unemployment to all of us is not just a human cost to people who feel that somehow

they have failed society when it is society that has failed them, but is also the sheer economic cost of billions of dollars of lost production and of enormous sums in tax revenues which would help keep this province on the rails and help ensure the viability of the social services of Ontario.

[4:45]

Last month the NDP caucus spent two days meeting with the people of Sudbury and looking at its economic prospects as well as its continuing needs in the area of social services. We found a community suffering from high unemployment, from cutbacks in social services, from the export of capital and not just from the prolonged labour dispute at Inco. We found a community suffering as well from yet another closure by a profitable multinational mining company, National Steel, in the town of Capreol. And we had the case put to us by Sudbury residents who see their community going the path of so many one-industry towns of northern Ontario. Either Ontario peddles our resources and we integrate ourselves further into the American economy, or we start now to shake ourselves free of our dependence on multinational corporations.

Sudbury is crying out for secondary industry that is based on its resources. Even a community as large as Sudbury will be threatened with extinction unless we make the right decisions to build its economy and to build its future. In its way, Sudbury is a microcosm of our province. To the people in New York, to the financiers in London and Dusseldorf, this whole province is like a one-industry town. When the industry dries up—that is, when our resources dry up—as far as they are concerned we will suffer the same fate that might now face Sudbury and is now facing the town of Atikokan in northwestern Ontario. Ontario is also threatened with industrial disaster unless we make the right decisions.

But those decisions require political will and we see no evidence that the Conservatives have the political will to plan for this province's future. Despite the promises of the throne speech, we are still waiting on the government for a commitment to create jobs now for the people who are unemployed in this province. Last year I proposed specific plans to create 45,000 jobs in the province through government action. We will be looking to the government's budget this year to see whether, having failed last year to create more than 142 jobs, they are prepared this year to come up to the challenge and create jobs now.

Not only that, but Ontario needs an industrial strategy. It needs to adopt long-term strategies to build our industry and to reverse the tide of deindustrialization. In its submission last year to the federal government on the effects of the GATT negotiations, the Ontario government itself admitted the erosion of the technological strength of our manufacturing sector. The government admitted the desperate immaturity of our research and development, particularly in industry. And it finally admitted what we have been saying for a long time: that government must play a positive role in the restructuring of our industry in Ontario.

But it's one thing to admit that problems exist and another thing to resolve them. So far as the economy goes, the people of Ontario deserve a great deal more.

There is still a great deal to learn about the employment development fund proposal in the throne speech, but so far it raises far more questions than it answers.

The state of our industry today provides ample evidence that the old system of corporate handouts wasn't working, so now the government is taking a new tack. The first step was that outrageous interest-free loan of \$300 million to Rio Algom and Denison mines last year, two companies that had just signed a uranium contract. It was like having \$2 billion in the bank. Once that precedent was set, Ontario then lavished \$28 million on the Ford Motor Company whose worldwide profits in 1978 were \$1.8 billion. This January it was the pulp and paper industry's turn. With their profits up 94 per cent last year, they got \$100 million from the Treasurer. The contrast between this generosity for corporations and the cutbacks in social services says everything about this government's priorities.

New Democrats say that public money should only be invested in the context of a long-term industrial strategy; in other words under the economic planning that we have been calling for year after year after year, in this Legislature, across Ontario and in the federal parliament.

Ms. Gigantes: Use your common sense.

Mr. Cassidy: There must be priority to job guarantees, to research commitments by industry and to the training of Canadian workers. Canadian industry should have priority in any incentive scheme, and so should small business. If there are times when government should act like a business, Mr. Speaker, that time is surely when the taxpayers of Ontario are being asked to use hard-earned tax dollars to pour into private corporations.

The only equitable way to handle these kinds of incentives is for the people of the province of Ontario to get shares or equity in return for their grants to industry.

Surely it's obvious that one ad hoc scheme of incentives, with \$200 million a year, does not amount to an industrial strategy. To achieve full employment and break the shackles of dependence that tie this economy to foreign multinationals requires an act, a will and a planning such as Ontario has never seen in peace time. It also requires a sense of responsibility and determination for our future and our resources which I despair of seeing from a Conservative government. Neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives have had the courage to plan this economy when it meant standing up to corporate power.

I want to outline the way the New Democrats believe that our industry can be planned and that we can build a strong industrial base for the province of Ontario.

First, the keystone of Ontario's economy from now to the end of the century has got to be the development of manufacturing. We have an enormous amount of ground to catch up in research and development, in training skilled manpower, in curbing the abuse of foreign control and in winning back those Canadian markets which have been neglected, or in some cases never even exploited, by Canadian companies.

There is so much we can do in a province which has the natural resources and the human talents of Ontario. It's a challenge which many people are prepared to rise to if the leadership were only shown to them by the government; but as its performance shows this week in response to the threatened loss of 700 jobs at Westinghouse in Hamilton, this government has no leadership to offer.

Alongside manufacturing, and this is my second point, we must make our resources into a tool for economic development and that will not occur as long as they are controlled by irresponsible multinational corporations. This government didn't care when International Nickel exported \$250 million of profit earned in Canada to buy manufacturing subsidiaries in the United States and Europe, or when Inco got Canadian funding to pour more than a billion dollars into new nickel mines in Guatemala and Indonesia that would compete with our Canadian workers.

We believe that the secondary manufacturing that flows from the resources of northern Ontario and that supplies the resource industry of the north should be carried out in this province rather than being carried out abroad. That's why we keep saying that the resources of this province belong to the

people of Ontario and must be developed in the public sector rather than being squandered under private ownership. They're our resources and we want them back.

Mr. Martel: We'll run them here instead of in New York. Remember our friends during the elections, "You don't want the bureaucrats in Toronto running it. We want them in New York running it."

Mr. Cassidy: I say now, Mr. Speaker, to the two ministers remaining in the House, my third point is this: Steel, the most successful single industry in this province, has maintained its position and has developed export markets because it made sure it secured the home market first. We must apply that lesson to every industry in this province.

I have said for two years that there was an enormous opportunity in replacing the \$20 billion of foreign-manufactured goods which were sold into Ontario every year, there was work for Canadians if we could win back those markets; but there was disaster ahead if you considered that between 1966 and 1976 the proportion of the Canadian market served by imported high-technology manufactured goods rose from a third to a half of our market. This trend is still against us.

How do you give the home market priority, Mr. Speaker? You give it priority by planning for those sectors that are now heavily invaded by imports but which any credible industrial country ought to command, such as machinery and electrical products. You give the home market priority by identifying industries where we ought to establish a presence and by finding companies to do the job, or even by entering into partnership with Canadian firms to get these needs met. You give the home market priority by accelerating the Buy Canadian program—which is still lumbering to a start; by insisting on the labelling of Canadian content; and by providing assistance for market development within Canada as well as abroad. You give the home market priority by planning for the future of our industry, rather than leaving that planning to the industrial sector to decide whatever it is they wish to give the province of Ontario.

Fourth, this province needs to make a commitment to small business, and to Canadian-owned business, such as we have never seen before. Over the past decade, small business has been creating jobs in manufacturing while big corporations have actually shown an overall job loss. The figures are dramatic. Small business in manufacturing has created more than 300,000 jobs in a decade, while big corporations have destroyed 125,000 jobs or more in that same period.

We should be looking for the winners in the small business sector. Our industrial strategy must recognize the crucial role of smaller firms. It must provide for adequate financing and for management advice; it must recognize that small firms are often the most innovative in research; it must ensure that they have access to those crucial orders for parts and components from large corporations and for business from government, which together are often the difference between their merely surviving and their turning into a success.

Fifth, the record of research and development in Canadian industry can only be described as depressing. Even the most recent efforts to bribe industry into doing more research are falling far short of their targets. The federal government has now set a target to have industry spend one and a half per cent of the gross national budget on research by 1983. Ontario has endorsed that objective. But when you look at how we are doing, we are falling so far short of that target it is to despair.

To take just one example: Our automobile manufacturers are sending an estimated \$230 million dollars a year to Detroit for research and development to be carried out in the United States, with all the spinoff that entails in jobs and technology in the US. Here in Canada, despite all the supposed benefits of the auto pact, they are spending only \$12 million dollars a year on research. No policy of incentives, on its own, will be enough to change that outrageous kind of behaviour.

It is time, we believe, to insist that a certain proportion of every sales dollar earned by corporations in this province be ploughed back into research and development. It is time to insist, if larger companies will not comply with that rule, that they be required to contribute to an industry-wide research fund to be directed in conjunction with government.

We have skills and know-how in abundance in Ontario, but we have failed to match our human resources to our industrial needs, because that has not been a priority, either for industry or for the government. If industry will not volunteer to do the research, then I suggest it is about time we made industry do the research which is crucial to the future of our economy in Ontario.

Sixth, the record in research is matched by our failure to train the skilled workers that Ontario needs. That failure is scandalously unfair to Canadians who have a right to expect that their sons and daughters can find their way into skilled opportunities. But it is also such a handicap for our economy that

even with eight per cent of the work force unemployed, we are today finding firms that have had to hold back or cut back on production because they cannot get enough skilled manpower.

Recent studies have indicated that 70 per cent or more of our skilled workers were trained outside Canada. They also indicated that our skilled work force is ageing so rapidly that the situation we face in the 1980s will be disastrous unless we start to train skilled workers now. I want to suggest that Ontario stop its cap-in-hand approach to industries which have proved they are not prepared on their own to take on the responsibility of training for skills.

We think apprenticeship and training should be a three-way partnership. The worker studies hard; he gives up time; and he or she forgoes income in order to learn a skill. The government provides facilities and training and, through the federal manpower authority, assistance with trainees' living costs. The corporations of this province should also be partners in the essential job of training Ontarians for the skills we need in the future. Those corporations not prepared to bear their share by accepting apprentices and trainees should be required to contribute to those companies and corporations that will make such a contribution.

[5:00]

Finally, we need a very strong and very deliberate campaign to make foreign-owned companies act in the best interests of Canadians and over the long run to reduce the degree of foreign ownership in our economy. To talk of an industrial strategy that ignores the fact that 60 per cent of our manufacturing is foreign-owned is like talking about animal life without once mentioning the fact that there is an elephant sitting in the middle of the drawing-room.

This winter I toured the very efficient CGE plant in Guelph, which makes heavy electrical equipment and transformers. It is a world-scale plant that exports around the world with but one exception. Management told me there were very clear orders from CGE not to seek business in the United States for the transformers and other equipment that are commonly used by utilities down there. That business, of course, is being left to the American parent company.

We need to come to grips with that kind of behaviour. What we need goes far beyond anyone's code of conduct. This is not a gentleman's game. New Democrats would require a share of corporate funds generated in Ontario to be reinvested in creating jobs in Canada. I'll repeat that. New Democrats

would require that corporations which generate profits in Ontario should reinvest a share of those profits in creating jobs in Canada.

We would insist that subsidiaries in Ontario break free of the export restraints that now exist and actively seek export markets in places like the United States. To ensure that Canada gets the maximum benefit from subsidiaries operating here, New Democrats would require every multinational to negotiate an economic development agreement that would spell out the timetable for putting our goals, the goals of Ontario, into effect.

The task before us in the area of industrial strategy is basically political. We must develop the political will to win back control of our economy. We have got to change the priorities of government so that we can build a self-reliant economy on the basis of our human and natural resources. That too is a challenge to which many Canadians can and will respond.

Before leaving the subject of the economy, I want to express my party's grave concern at the pitiful excuse for an energy policy that was put forward by the government in the throne speech. Through both the throne speech and a carefully executed series of addresses by senior ministers, the government has effectively told Ontario Hydro to go full steam ahead with its nuclear electric expansion program. It has dismissed as prophets of doom those sane voices that have questioned this irresponsible approach.

We're not talking about pennies a day, as the Treasurer has blithely suggested. On Hydro's own figures, we are talking about overcapacity which last year cost about \$12 for every man, woman and child in Ontario. Our own calculations suggest that if Hydro played the figures straight, it would be more like \$40 for every man, woman and child in Ontario that we are overspending because of Hydro. This cost to the citizens of Ontario will be many times higher in a few years if Hydro keeps building new generating stations.

We are talking about the wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars that have been borrowed on the credit of the province. We're talking about Ontario Hydro's grossly inadequate forecasting methods, methods which could lead to the needless expenditure of additional billions of dollars. Just to give one example, the planned Darlington nuclear generating station alone will cost more than \$5 billion and that is considerably more than the cost of Canada's latest fleet of new jet fighter planes. That's two and a half times what it would cost to acquire every share in Inco for the people of Ontario. We are seeing an enormous loss of opportunity to de-

velop our economy because the investment capital that might be raised by Ontario to implement an intelligent industrial strategy is going to Hydro instead.

Ontario Hydro suggests itself in a submission to the Porter Commission on Electric Power Planning that it might have to have access to general tax revenues if its continued overbuilding means a shortfall in capital. Surely we don't need any more proof of the destructive effects of overbuilding the Ontario Hydro generating system.

The government's argument that the \$3.5 billion worth of excess capacity that is now built into the system is just a nice little cushion, or that it can be justified on the grounds that electricity can substitute for natural gas or for expensive imported oil, is nonsense.

The technological and economic obstacles to such substitution are overwhelming. The Ministry of Energy's own projections show very clearly that, even with a determined effort to substitute electricity for oil and natural gas, and in the face of rapidly increasing fossil fuel prices, the growth in electricity demand over the rest of the century would not even come near the growth that is projected by Ontario Hydro.

On the other hand, a strong program of energy conservation could effectively, and immediately, reduce Ontario's dependence on oil and gas far faster than any conceivable substitution of electricity.

It is about time that we had an energy policy in which Ontario decided at what rate energy demand needs to grow and then took the policy steps that are required to see those goals achieved, rather than just planning on the basis of Hydro's inaccurate forecasts and regardless of cost. Such an energy policy would take full account of the potential for renewable energy sources that the Ministry of Energy has obstinately ignored. Such a policy would acknowledge the potential of energy conservation as an untapped source of inexpensive energy.

Surely there is something drastically wrong with a set of priorities which saw the government spend only \$5.4 million on conservation last year and only \$2.5 million on renewable energy sources at the same time that it guaranteed Hydro's borrowing—on the credit of all of us in Ontario—to the tune of \$1.8 billion in 1978 alone.

Surely we must take account of the mounting evidence that even the long-term primary energy growth rate of 2.3 per cent a year, which is projected by the Ministry of Energy, far exceeds the amount of energy that On-

tarians really need to maintain and improve their standard of living.

If we would just go back to the amount of oil, electricity and natural gas that we consumed on a per capita basis 10 years ago in this province, that would be a 25 or 30 per cent cut in energy demands almost overnight. I do not think anybody could maintain that we were somehow starving or freezing in the dark 10 years ago because of our level of energy consumption at that time.

Ontario now depends on sources outside the province for 80 per cent of its energy needs. Starting immediately, we believe Ontario must adopt a policy of becoming more and more self-sustaining in meeting our energy needs. But the direction that is taken cannot be one of building more and more ruinously expensive nuclear generating stations. It is already clear that solar energy and other renewable energy sources are cost-competitive with nuclear power for most uses when one looks at all the costs of nuclear electricity, and study after study is showing that, dollar for dollar, energy conservation is a many times better investment.

The government has known this for many years but it has ignored its own best advice. In 1972, the government's advisory committee on energy observed that "much of our attention has been centred on supply but there is an equally effective approach to the matter of energy, and that is to improve the efficiency with which energy is applied and to promote the conservation of its use." That came before 1973, before the sheikhs of Arabia and of Alberta had exacted their toll.

In 1976, the all-party select committee on Ontario Hydro recommended a wide range of programs for residential, industrial and commercial energy conservation. The government implemented almost none of those recommendations.

In 1977, the Ministry of Energy's document on Ontario's energy future concluded: "Investments and measures to increase efficiency and reduce energy demands are likely to be more productive over the long run than the supply investments that are displaced." To quote just one more of that document's conclusions: "The acceleration of planning and the related investments and incentives that will advance the transition to renewable energy sources must be considered to be very urgent." That is what the Minister of Energy says, but that is not what the Minister of Energy does.

We can only applaud the analysis, but at the same time we condemn the government in the strongest possible terms for its total

failure to design an energy policy on this urgent basis. Let me make some specific proposals.

Mr. Breithaupt: For the few Tories who are there.

Mr. Cassidy: First, as part of an overall review of Ontario's energy future the government must make a clear commitment to reducing Ontario Hydro's rate of system expansion sharply, based on realistic assessments of future energy needs. The assessment of energy requirements must take into account the need to reduce primary energy demand to a sustainable rate of growth. This is clearly feasible without any cost to Ontarians in terms of their comfort, their convenience, their standard of living, or of their jobs.

Second, the government must make a commitment that the capital that is made available for other purposes by this policy will be used to implement a serious industrial strategy for the province of Ontario. As part of that strategy it must guarantee the creation of at least as many jobs in construction and in industry as would have resulted from Hydro's continued expansion.

Third, as part of its energy expansion program the government must begin a major initiative to reinsulate every home in Ontario to the best practicable standard over the next 10 years. The results of a study by Dr. David Brooks for the Economic Council of Canada show that this measure alone, at a cost of \$1,300 per house, would quickly create 8,000 jobs in our province and that it is cost-effective now. The program would involve a combination of loans to consumers at the same interest rates that Hydro now enjoys, of incentive grants and the provision of information and technical assistance.

Ms. Gigantes: Recycling money.

Mr. Cassidy: It would lower consumers' heating bills, it would rapidly lower our dependence on imported oil and on natural gas, and it would be a far better investment in terms of energy per dollar investment than another nuclear generating station.

This should be part of a broad-ranging conservation initiative that will include programs like energy efficiency standards for all new homes and commercial buildings and financial incentives for energy conservation in the commercial sector. We need a capital pool which could be available to industry for energy-saving projects. We need rapidly expanding industrial co-generation as a source of electricity. The policy should include improved load management by Ontario Hydro to reduce the disparity between average and peak demand.

All these five programs were recommended by the 1976 report of the select committee on Ontario Hydro. Not one has been implemented, because the priorities of this government are upside down.

It's time, as well, to get serious about alternative sources of energy. Ontario was prepared to invest \$100 million in Syncrude. We should be prepared to make the same kind of commitment to projects like a pilot methanol plant to use wood waste that cannot be utilized by the forest industry. Ontario should make the rapid spread of solar heating for both new and existing structures the highest priority.

This is particularly true in view of recent studies for Energy, Mines and Resources Canada, which identified in the rapid implementation of solar energy use a tremendous job-creating potential in construction, in design and in manufacturing. The study concluded that if solar heating makes sense on the grounds of energy supply it makes even more sense as part of a full employment strategy for Canada and for its regions, including Ontario.

There's nothing in the least bit new or radical or surprising in all of this. What is surprising is simply that the government has systematically ignored the realities of energy supply and demand for the future. It has systematically ignored its own advisers and its own pronouncements. It's been a captive of the folk down at Ontario Hydro.

The throne speech is just the latest example of this total unwillingness to get serious about energy policy. Except for a single-minded determination to let Ontario Hydro go its own way, this government just doesn't have an energy policy, and Ontario needs one desperately.

What troubles me most of all about the present government is that sense of defeatism, that sense of failure, which is coming through from so many quarters. One after another we've had ministers making speeches which tell us that we must pay more and get less. What effrontery. Of course, the people who will get hurt will be the working people of Ontario, and we reject that kind of strategy from the government. This is still a rich province.

Mr. Grande: The Titanic hitting the iceberg.

[5:15]

Mr. Cassidy: Our gross provincial product per capita was worth about \$10,059 per annum back in 1977 and that is more than Sweden, it's more than West Germany and it's more than the United States. We can't

afford things in this province? That's bunkum. We have enormous natural resources and enormously talented human resources. Our population is as large as most nations in the world and we're located in the midst of the most affluent continent in the world.

The New Democratic Party believes that if Ontario only had the political will, we have the resources, we have the imagination, we have the creativity to control our future and to create a decent life for every citizen of this province. Our goal should be nothing less.

We must maintain and enhance our universal health care and all those other public services which play such an important role in creating the quality of life in Ontario, and we can do it. We must maintain and enhance the manufacturing industry which is the cornerstone of our economic strength and, therefore, of our ability to maintain a good life, and we can do that too.

We, in this Legislature, have a responsibility not just to meet today's needs but to provide for tomorrow's needs as well. We must ensure that there will be farm land enough to feed the people of this province in the 21st century and we can do that. We must ensure that our forests will be maintained as the base of the north's economy in the next century, and we can do that. We must ensure that our mining resources are used prudently to create the strongest possible industrial base, and we can do that. We must put in place an energy policy which allows this province to look after more and more of its own needs without bankrupting ourselves in the process. All this we can do if only we have the political will, which the Conservative government of this province so obviously lacks.

It's time we moved towards more self-reliance in the way we run this province and that we set priorities that are designed to benefit the working people of Ontario and

not just the corporations. We need to regain a sense of direction in Ontario, a sense of control over our lives, over our economy and over our province, and that will only happen when the rule of the Conservative Party in Ontario is brought to an end. For that reason, I wish to move an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Riddell: Get your running shoes on.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cassidy moves that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"That this House deplores the government's policy of damaging cutbacks in services to people and its failure to manage adequately Ontario's economy and, in particular, regrets the government's failure to maintain a universal and accessible health care system in Ontario as exemplified by the severe cutbacks in active treatment hospital beds and the failure to deal with the problems of doctors opting out of OHIP; its failure to use the power of government to make multinational corporations in this province act in the best interest of Canadians; its failure to create job opportunities and to build a healthy industrial base that will make Ontario's economy self-reliant; its failure to protect consumers against unjustified increases in food prices; its failure to put into place a balanced energy strategy reflecting Ontario's need for conservation and for energy sources additional to electricity and imported fuels; and that for all of these reasons this government no longer has the confidence of this House."

Mr. Laughren: Put the question.

Mr. Cassidy: Question.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Norton, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Norton, the House adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 15, 1979

Transmitting Estimates, the honourable the Administrator 211

Government agencies, boards and commissions, statement by Mr. McCague 211

Auto pact, statement by Mr. Grossman 212

Disaster relief assistance, statement by Mr. Wells 214

Community services contribution program, statement by Mr. Wells 214

Flood cleanup by inmates, statement by Mr. Walker 215

Thames River flooding, statement by Mr. Auld 216

Sales tax rebates for visitors, statement by Mr. Maeck 217

Byproduct power project, statement by Mr. Auld 218

Hockey violence, statement by Mr. Baetz 219

Point of privilege re signature of minister, Mr. Roy 220

Point of privilege re PCB spill at Dowling, Mr. Laughren 220

Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy,
Mr. Yakabuski 221

Plant location incentives, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Peterson 222

Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Conway,
Mr. Lawlor 224

Heritage language programs, question of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Cassidy 226

Children's services, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy, Mr. McClellan 227

Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cooke, Mr. Riddell 227

Bean crop dispute, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell 228

Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Foulds, Mr. T. P. Reid 229

Thunder Bay health study, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Hennessy 230

Resource equalization grants, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Bradley 231

Lumber prices, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. Swart 231

Court reporters dispute, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell 232

Aluminum wiring, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. M. N. Davison, Mr. J. Reed 232

Family benefits, question of Mr. Norton: Mr. Peterson 233

Motion re private members' ballot, Mr. Welch, agreed to 234

Motion re Workmen's Compensation Board Report, Mr. Welch, agreed to 234

Ministry of Transportation and Communications Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 234

Statute Labour Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading	234
Local Roads Boards Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading	234
Airports Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading	235
Line Fences Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	235
Ontario Unconditional Grants Amendment Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	235
Ministry of Education Act, B. Stephenson, first reading	235
Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act (second session), Mr. Drea, first reading	235
Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	235
Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Drea, first reading	236
Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, Mr. Swart, first reading	236
Business of the House, Mr. Welch	236
Throne speech debate, Mr. Cassidy	236
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Norton, agreed to	249
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Norton, agreed to	249

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
 Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)

Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maack, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCaffrey, B. (Armourdale PC)
McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)



No. 8

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Administrator of the Province of Ontario signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable William G. Howland, the Administrator of the Province of Ontario, transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1979, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, March 27, 1979.

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members will recall I tabled a set of supplementary estimates last December amounting to \$6.4 million. At that time I was pleased to note that the increases had been fully offset by decreases elsewhere, and that the government remained committed to a total expenditure ceiling of \$14.482 million as announced on April 25, 1978. The supplementary estimates which are being tabled today amount to \$96.165 million. Again I am pleased to report that these expenditure increases will be fully offset in other areas so that the total expenditure limit of \$14.482 million for 1978-79 will be maintained.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

PUBLIC OFFICERS ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the Public Officers Act requires that within the first 15 days of every session I advise this assembly of all securities furnished on behalf of public officers and of any changes made to such securities. Since my predecessor's statement on February 28, 1978, there have been no changes in either category.

CLEANUP OF SPILLS

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, in December I introduced a bill to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971, with respect to spills of pollutants including toxic substances to the natural environment. The purpose of

the bill is to impose clear responsibility to clean up and provide for more immediate and more effective action in these environmental emergencies and to provide a better mechanism for recovering costs and damages from the responsible parties. Early in January the bill was circulated to appropriate members of industry, to municipalities and to other concerned groups and I invited comments.

My request received considerable response and I am now introducing a revised bill that takes into account many constructive and practical suggestions I received. The compendium of background material on this bill is being updated and will be tabled shortly.

This revised bill is intended, among other objectives:

1. To impose a clear responsibility for control, cleanup and restoration on owners and those in charge of pollutants including those involved in their manufacture, handling, transportation and disposal;

2. To broaden the authority of the minister to order control and cleanup of spills and restoration of the natural environment by those responsible, and when necessary, by other persons;

3. To enable the ministry to take immediate remedial action in the event of a spill and to pursue the question of liability later;

4. To establish liability for compensation for damage resulting from a spill and for the cost of cleanup which clarifies and extends the right to compensation at common law;

5. To enable a person who has been ordered by the minister to clean up a spill, other than a person already responsible to do so, to recover his reasonable expense from the ministry. The minister subsequently will be able to recover the amount of such expenses from the owner and person in control. This amendment is meant to save the person ordered by the minister to carry out cleanup from having to collect from or sue the owner and person in control;

6. To authorize control and cleanup of spills and restoration of the natural environment by municipalities and designated persons and to provide them with the right to recover their reasonable expenses from the owner and the person in control.

In addition, among other things, the regulations to be developed will provide for the designation of certain types of discharges of pollutants as being abnormal, thereby clearly spelling out and avoiding delay and argument over what will be regarded as a spill and subject to the legislation.

Finally, the bill gives persons ordered to do cleanup and those authorized to do so, the right to enter on private land for the business of cleanup and immunity from prosecution.

As I informed the members previously, this legislation is unequalled in Canada. We hope it will lead to a decrease in the number of spills. We know it will speed cleanup, reduce potential damage and assist any injured party by placing initial responsibility on those who own and control pollutants.

Copies of the compendium required under the standing orders were of course made available during the last session when I first introduced this bill. However I must apologize to the honourable members that I do not at this time have a summary of the amendments that have been made since that date. The reason for this is that I wanted to give interested parties as much time as possible to suggest amendments and at the same time I wanted to reintroduce it at the earliest possible moment. We are currently working on a summary of the amendments made and I will be pleased to make those available as soon as they are ready.

In addition, there are three minor amendments of which I will advise the critics prior to second reading.

INTERFLOW SYSTEMS LIMITED

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I have a second statement on another matter, if I may present it at this time.

On March 13 in this Legislature, I gave a commitment to produce a detailed account of the situation with Interflow Systems Limited and the Upper Ottawa Street landfill site in Hamilton. This statement has been difficult to prepare, due to the risk of prejudicing upcoming court proceedings and the possibility of interfering with the ongoing investigations conducted by ministry staff, Hamilton-Wentworth police and the regional municipality, but the public concern and confusion which now exists makes it imperative that I speak in some detail about the situation.

We have said repeatedly that the day-to-day operation and responsibility for what goes into this landfill site belongs to the municipality. The responsibility for operating this site in accordance with ministry environ-

mental requirements and for deciding what waste goes into it rests with the municipal level of government. It shall continue to do so. It is their site. They are responsible for minding the gate, so to speak, as are other municipalities in Ontario.

I am not criticizing the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. They have taken prompt action when the report of our waybill audit was finished. They immediately notified police and implemented tight controls on waste being allowed into this landfill site.

My office has been informed by Hamilton-Wentworth officials that municipal staff have since been reorganized; indeed, one person was dismissed and seven were disciplined for their part in the matter. I also understand that a new bylaw is being drafted to regulate more closely activities at the landfill sites. In other words, the municipality has accepted its responsibility.

The ministry has also taken action on this matter and on the entire problem of liquid waste disposal. I need not review my seven-point plan, but I will point out that our new waybill system is proving itself effective in dealing with this situation.

Much has been made of the "samples" supplied to the ministry's regional office in Stoney Creek. I would like to make a few comments about this well-known scientific practice of pop-bottle testing.

In December 1976, two individuals dropped into our office with two pop bottles which they said contained samples from a load of waste delivered to Interflow and from another load hauled from Interflow to the landfill site. It was the understanding of the regional staff that these samples were given to them in strict confidence.

I would like to point out that the individuals were from a company operating in competition with Interflow; and it is not unusual for ministry staff to hear allegations from those in the waste disposal business against their competitors.

These samples had not been collected in an acceptable scientific manner. Since we had no way of determining whether they were representative of the loads they were taken from, no analysis was done in our laboratory.

Other than knowing what was in the bottles, an analysis would not have proved illegal activity. Disposal of liquid waste in this landfill site is not in itself illegal. The certificate of approval which we gave the municipality for the Upper Ottawa Street site allows licensed haulers to dispose of liquid waste there.

Mr. S. Smith: The fact that it came from outside Hamilton-Wentworth was illegal; that is against your certificate of approval.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: And who is running that site? Listen, please.

Mr. Nixon: No one is listening.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: It is the responsibility of the municipality; let that be very clear.

A Liberal researcher asked staff if they had had a meeting with three waste haulers. Staff said they did not recall such a meeting and asked for the date. A check of the files revealed that two persons had visited the office two years before. When reporters made inquiries, the visit was confirmed.

However, the ministry staff had suspected problems well before that visit. During 1976 and 1977, they conducted innumerable spot checks on Interflow, K-D Enterprises and the landfill site. Many visits were made incognito, as well as in the middle of the night, in an attempt to obtain evidence if illegal activities were going on. Both companies were also asked to supply additional information on the handling of their liquid waste. This they did. But no evidence of illegal activities was found.

The waybill system, with which we now keep tabs on what waste goes where, had only recently been introduced on an experimental and voluntary basis to give the ministry and industry time to become familiar with it. But it was not until April 1977 that this became a legal requirement.

During 1977, Interflow operations were closely monitored. On several occasions the ministry directed cleanups of minor spills on the company site. On November 29, 1977, Interflow was convicted on two charges for violation of the Environmental Protection Act and fined \$2,500 and \$500.

In December, staff supervised removal of contaminated soil and repairs to a leaking lagoon liner.

In the first eight months of 1978, staff conducted limited auditing of waybills, night-time investigations and indeed even tailed company trucks. But, again, no admissible evidence of illegal activities was found. Problems with linings of lagoons and improper piping were discovered. Requests for repairs were complied with.

It has been implied that trucks were illegally dumping waste at the site at night. We do not deny there is a lot of trucking activity there during the night. But most of it involves dumping of city street sweepings.

Mr. S. Smith: It was a foul-smelling liquid, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Is the Leader of the Opposition saying most or all? Or what is he saying?

[2:15]

Mr. S. Smith: I have between six and 12 cases of foul-smelling liquid—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Questions and answers come later.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: It isn't even a large portion. Most of it is city sweepings.

It is interesting to note that company officials complained of harassment by our regional staff—a rather interesting note, I might add, that the company complained of our harassment.

In September 1978, more work on the waybill system made it possible to do a detailed audit of records. I cannot go into the details of that audit, nor would it be appropriate to discuss further the charges that have now been laid, but I would like to point out that the ministry lawyers, as well as staff from the ministry's Stoney Creek office, have conducted countless interviews with truckers and officials from the municipality, Interflow and industries.

Statements have been made that people could die of cancer or suffer birth defects, as at Love Canal, because of this situation. Let me stress that public health is not in danger. Since the early 1960s we have regularly monitored Red Hill Creek which contains water that has seeped from the landfill site, called leachate. Monthly tests done at locations above and below the site have not found the presence of liquid industrial waste in the creek.

In the past two years we have stepped up the number of tests, and additional samples have been taken from leachate on the site itself. The results are the same. Most of the liquid waste that went into the landfill site consisted of water used to wash industrial tanks that held substances like oil, caustics and rust preventive material.

I am deeply concerned over the misleading and inaccurate information spread by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. S. Smith: Right on every time.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: He has asked for a judicial investigation. The ministry is investigating, the regional municipality is investigating—

Mr. S. Smith: Investigating itself. I am very impressed.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —and the police are investigating. His unfounded allegations have only served to deflect much of their efforts

and have delayed a comprehensive and reasonable assessment of the facts of the case.

The leader of the Liberal Party has made statements about ministry staff looking the other way because of dereliction of duty or because they were paid off. He has talked of illegal dumping and threats to health. I realize a by-election is on, but surely some responsibility should be exercised. If the leader has evidence, he should bring it forward in the interest of justice.

Mr. S. Smith: You waited until the Christmas break before bringing forward the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Let me repeat that: If the hon. member has evidence, let him bring it forward in the name of justice. And if he does not wish to present it to myself, then at least he can present it to the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) or the police.

Mr. Kerrio: Do you want them to do your job for you?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: On January 25 I asked the Leader of the Opposition in a letter, on a formal basis, to present that information. I again asked him on March 13. Instead, he has chosen to drop those insinuations in the media.

Mr. S. Smith: You ignored the information you were given.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: If you had listened to what I have said in the last 10 minutes you would know that I have not—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the minister confine his remarks to his original statement? This is ministerial statements.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker, if I don't have to deal with any interjections.

The Leader of the Opposition has claimed it was his pursuit of this issue that produced action. His first question in the House was on October 31, 1978. As I have pointed out, ministry staff were well aware of the situation in 1976 and have pursued it with all means at their disposal.

The Liberal leader has asked that ministry staff should be dismissed for their handling of this situation. I do not agree. He knows that on another occasion here in this very House I criticized staff for actions they took that I did not agree with. In this case I find no reason to criticize staff; in fact, I would commend their efforts.

I feel his accusations are unfair, because staff cannot defend themselves. I regret he chose to cast doubt on the integrity of those people, with remarks that in our opinion border on slander. I wish him to know that

the Hamilton-Wentworth police have told us that their investigation has cleared the ministry staff of any illegal activities or involvement in taking money; or "looking the other way," as he has so often accused them of doing.

Many of the individuals working in the Stoney Creek office reside in the Hamilton region. They and their families have had to live with the embarrassment caused by the leader's charges. I have spoken to them and I know the kind of insinuations that have been made to them. I feel a great deal of compassion for them.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the member for Hamilton West would have the courage to offer an immediate and public apology to my staff for the suffering he has subjected them to with his unfounded attacks on their professional reputations.

The ministry has certainly had its major concerns that all was not right. But the leader does not seem to realize that we must produce concrete evidence before actions can be taken. I hope he has now learned that the kind of allegations he made cannot be substituted for careful homework and investigation.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to ignore those interjections. In the last eight pages of this text I have put on the record what has been done. I had to be very careful in doing so because I do not wish to prejudice the trial.

In the future, I would like the leader to exercise greater care and I would welcome more co-operation from him in enforcing our laws. I intend to prosecute those who violate them, but I do not wish to try anyone in a kangaroo court conducted in the public media or in the Legislature by the Leader of the Opposition.

I have an obligation to do justice now and in the future. I wish that he shared it.

HOME RENEWAL PROGRAM

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to inform the honourable members that the very popular Ontario Home Renewal Program has been renewed for another year.

Recognizing OHRP's value to municipalities and home owners throughout Ontario, my cabinet colleagues agreed to allocate \$20 million for this year's program.

Since 1974, some 22,000 home owners in some 615 municipalities have received more than \$82.2 million in OHRP loans. In addition, another \$4.2 million was approved for

811 loans to the residents of unorganized territories.

OHRP provides grants to municipalities to administer directly as loans of up to \$7,500 to low and moderate-income home owner occupants for home improvements. A portion of the loan may be forgiven and interest rates vary from zero to eight per cent, depending upon the home owner's income.

GRIEVANCE ARBITRATION

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, later today I wish to introduce a bill to amend the Labour Relations Act. The purpose of this bill is to reform the grievance arbitration procedure.

Members will recall that in July 1978 an industrial inquiry commissioner, the Honourable Arthur Kelly, reported to my predecessor on certain perceived problems relating to grievance arbitration under the Labour Relations Act. He made a number of recommendations as to how the existing system might be improved.

Mr. Cassidy: It's taken so long, it's shameful.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have now had an opportunity to consider the commissioner's recommendations, as well as the comments of a number of employers, trade unions and arbitrators, to whom the report was sent for comment. In addition, I had the benefit of hearing the views of some members of this Legislature during consideration of my ministry's estimates before the standing committee on resources development.

The bill I am introducing has three main purposes: first, to expedite the hearing of unresolved grievances; second, to provide third-party assistance to aid in the settlement of grievances, and third, to reduce the cost of arbitrating those disputes that cannot be settled.

The amendments proposed are simple in form but significant in impact. They enable either party to apply to the minister for the appointment of a single arbitrator 30 days after the grievance is filed, or following the completion of the grievance procedure, whichever occurs first. On receipt of such request, the minister must appoint an arbitrator who is able to commence the hearing of the dispute within 21 days of the receipt of the request for arbitration. Grievances involving termination of employment will be dealt with even more expeditiously.

The amendments further provide that upon receipt of a request for the appointment of an arbitrator, the minister may assign a grievance settlement officer to confer with

the parties to assist him in arriving at a mediated settlement.

In addition, the amendments provide for the enactment of regulations fixing scales of remuneration for arbitrators and providing procedures for the review and resolution of disputed accounts.

Finally, the bill repeals the Labour-Management Arbitration Commission Act.

I believe the proposed amendments, while preserving the best features of the existing arbitration system, effectively and fairly address the problems of delay and of cost—the two major issues which led to the establishment of the Kelly commission. With the passage of this bill, and with the co-operation of employers, trade unions and arbitrators, upon which I am confident we can rely, Ontario should have one of the finest grievance arbitration systems of any jurisdiction in North America.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Minister of the Environment: In view of the statements by members of his ministry that they are seeking those dumps that may have accepted hazardous liquid wastes in the past, and that they have no record of where these dumps are, can he explain such a statement from his ministry, when there exists this document from 1974, which I draw to his attention, called Land Drainage Reference Study, Task 2B?

This document—which I may say was made up by a consultant from records in 1974, provided by the Ministry of the Environment itself—contains maps and descriptions of 13 sites in the province that are listed as having accepted hazardous wastes. I would ask the minister if the ministry has lost this information, which it seemed to have for the consultant who drew up this report in 1974? Had the officials in his ministry simply not seen this report when they announced that they didn't know where these hazardous locations might be found? Can he tell us how many of the sites referred to in this report are in fact still operating?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: On the very last portion, I would be prepared to get that information for the member. I think what we are saying with regard to the number of sites is that indeed there could be sites in Ontario that were in operation, were closed, that we would not be aware of; sites in the 1930s, the 1940s, the 1950s, the 1960s—long before we, as a ministry, were formed—that could have easily

been opened and closed and no specific records known of them.

This summer we are making a further and complete search of all of those sites. We'll have as complete an inventory as it is humanly possible to do of the sites throughout Ontario.

Had we or had any government had a ministry of the environment back in the 1920s and 1930s, it would be easy to have those records. But since neither we, nor any other jurisdiction, had those records, it's now up to us to try to find as many of them as we can. It will be a difficult task, but we're prepared to do it.

Mr. Breithaupt: I presume it all happened before 1943.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly; you are right.

[2:30]

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: In view of the fact that in 1974 there were records, maps and descriptions of at least 13 sites listed as having accepted hazardous wastes, can the minister tell us whether that information, subsequently incorporated into this report, has since been lost by the ministry? I think that is a reasonable question.

While he is thinking about the answer to that question, may I also ask another question by way of supplementary? In view of his response to the resources development committee last fall, in which the minister was asked for a list of sites licensed to accept liquid wastes—part of his information there noted eight sites which had accepted liquid wastes and now are closed, yet this report shows that as of 1974 as many as 15 sites were licensed to accept liquid wastes exclusively; interestingly, only three of the eight sites listed by the minister show up in the 15 here—what about the other 12? Why were they not on his list?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We will be more than pleased to identify those and to supply that information. The point I was trying to make, and I will try to make it again, was that we do not have full knowledge of all the sites that may have been opened and closed in the province prior to any particular date. Certainly we have not lost that information. If the member wants us to correlate it in, if you will, a more logical fashion for him, we are prepared to do so. I think that is easily done. If it will help, we will do it.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the ministry itself has estimated that there are more than 2,000 landfill sites that have been used across

Ontario, and not just the 13 that have been referred to, can the minister undertake, in the first place, that his ministry will be seeking to establish how many of those more than 2,000 landfill sites received hazardous liquid industrial wastes; and, secondly, will there be a complete record made available to the public at the earliest opportunity so that the public will know which of these sites will be used for hazardous wastes and what is being done about it?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: There is no doubt that we will do that, Mr. Speaker, and we are pleased to do so. I draw to the attention of the leader of the third party, however, that finding these sites will not necessarily be easy, and certainly determining what went into those sites 30 years ago is not going to be easy either. We are flying over certain areas which we suspect likely would have sites, and we are doing a great deal.

Mr. Cassidy: You should do it if we're not going to have any Love Canals in this province.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Let is not extrapolate too far.

Mr. Cassidy: Let's not extrapolate too little either.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I can tell the member that in our judgement today there is absolutely no fear of a Love Canal in Ontario. Let us be very clear on that point. But I am not going to stand in this House and give that kind of assurance when there can be the tiniest fraction of doubt. We are going to search out as many sites as—

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Those words may come back to haunt you.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: If the member would permit me the full answer, I said that, having made that statement, it is my unconditional belief, and the belief of my ministry, that that is true. But because I have a great concern, and indeed this government has a great concern, for the health of the people, it does not give us a licence to make that statement and then to rest on our laurels. We are not going to do that. We will continue to search out as many areas as we possibly can.

I say to the member, if he has a spot he thinks should be investigated in detail, he should let us know; we will do it. Not only that, but that information will be as public as he wishes it to be. We have nothing to fear. We have nothing to hide. We will be better served if all of us know as much as we can about that problem.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Since the fact is that in 1974 the ministry apparently knew of 13 hazardous waste sites which now it apparently doesn't know about, and since it knew of 12 liquid waste sites which the minister didn't bother to mention in his report to the resources development committee, and which again I therefore assume the ministry doesn't know about, I ask the minister if they have lost the information.

By way of answering that question, I will send the minister a list of the permit numbers of the 13 hazardous waste sites. Would the minister be kind enough to undertake in this House to send us copies of the certificates of approval for those sites, copies of any site inspection certificates and, while he is at it, copies of site inspection certificates for the Upper Ottawa Street site as well?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I just can't comprehend why the leader didn't hear me say that I would correlate that information. We haven't lost sight of what he has just said for the third time that we must have. I have rejected that statement three times. We will correlate it for him and will be glad to do it. That's no problem at all. But please don't ask me for the fourth time to say that I disagree that we have lost sight of it. We haven't, for the last time, I hope.

Mr. S. Smith: Why didn't you report it to the committee?

Ms. Bryden: Since I believe there are something like 900 fewer landfill sites now than there were in 1970, it seems to me the minister cannot say there are no potential Love canals in Ontario until he knows what is in those 900 closed sites. I would like to ask him is he just taking an inventory of sites or is he actually digging into them and taking a test of what is underneath.

Mr. Havrot: All 900. Yes, he is digging into them all.

Mr. Wildman: That would be something for the member for Timiskaming to do.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I said it was my unconditional belief that there was no danger and I am very sure of that.

As we try to address this problem, one should perhaps look at our history a little bit. I think there is a lot of comfort in that. We have been basically an agricultural community. We haven't been a highly industrialized society, a chemical society, nearly as much as have our neighbours to the south. They are now seeing some of the great side effects and unpleasant effects of a chemical industry. I think we are fortunate in that regard. It is a fact of our history.

Mr. Riddell: The farmers have saved your hide again.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I am glad they have and I am glad that I too, am a farmer and can share in that heritage.

Mr. Breithaupt: You are certainly spreading it around right now.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it gives us a far greater assurance that it isn't likely to happen in Ontario. I will assure the member that we are now looking into those sites that we are aware of. We are digging into them. We are quite prepared to investigate them as thoroughly as she or I think it should be done. I want that done. I want it on the record that it has been done because I think we have a great obligation to the people of Ontario to guarantee the statement I just made. We will continue to work at that. We want to be very, very sure about safeguarding the health of the people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Tell the honourable member for Timiskaming. He laughed at it.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think the member might recognize that our greater concern is not so much what is happening here in Ontario, but in those jurisdictions which have not been so careful as Ontario. Because there is no way one can stop air circulation in North America or water entering into our Great Lakes, we have some concerns coming from other jurisdictions. But I think it is easily proved that we have done the best job of any jurisdiction in North America in many of these areas.

Mr. Martel: That's taking it too far. The minister should have quit while he was ahead.

[Later (2:50):]

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Yes. I am not quite sure whether it is order or privilege and I am certainly not trying to be provocative on this point. But I thought, regarding the point the Leader of the Opposition made to the effect that our ministry had supplied that information on the 13 sites, I note that it was from Environment Canada. We may have supplied it, but the information was from Environment Canada.

Mr. S. Smith: But the data were from the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I thought it was inferred that we had given that report, and I think in fact—well I read here: "Task 2B Report: Waste Disposal Site. Prepared for Canada Department of the Environment by two independent researchers."

I am not trying to be provocative, I am simply saying I hope it is on the record that this was a Canadian report rather than—

Mr. Speaker: Talking on the point of clarification.

Mr. S. Smith: If I may respond on the clarification: Indeed, the report, of course, is from Environment Canada. It was provided to us by the provincial Ministry of Natural Resources. But the data used by the researchers, according to the researchers themselves, came from Ontario Ministry of the Environment records. That is where they got the data to draw up these maps and it is very questionable as to whether that data still exists within the ministry.

[Reverting (2:39:)]

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Health. Now that the minister is aware that anaesthetists at Toronto Western Hospital, and for that matter at North York General, Scarborough General and Branson Hospital, have all opted out, and that consequently any patient who goes for surgery at those hospitals is then subjected to a means test administered by the physicians themselves, one would assume, could he tell us how he feels about that particular erosion of the universal health care system and whether he is prepared to accept the means test philosophy, a philosophy which is apparently well known and well liked by the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) of this province? Is the Minister of Health willing to accept that doctors will apply that kind of means test?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let us perhaps deal with one example I asked my staff to look into and about which they reported. In the case of the Toronto Western Hospital, where the anaesthetists have apparently been opted out for a number of years, fully 70 per cent of the services provided are billed through the billing group on an opted-in basis.

Mr. S. Smith: A means test is what you call it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I look at it this way, and I think this is a principle that certainly has stood the test of time though I will acknowledge that perhaps we need to look at ways to reaffirm it. The principle is that wherever possible the agreement of the patient should be obtained first.

Mr. S. Smith: Wherever possible.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I say "wherever possible" because there are cases—

Mr. S. Smith: Just before surgery.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell:—where a person will be brought into hospital unconscious and wouldn't have the opportunity to agree or not. In those cases, it is my view and it is my understanding that it is general practice that they should not be charged in excess of the OHIP rate.

Mr. Swart: The doctors wait until they come to and then ask for it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As part of our—

Mr. Warner: You are an apologist for the OMA.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: They apply a means test; they don't ask anybody.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I come at it from the other side. The Leader of the Opposition is coming at it in a different way.

Mr. Swart: You sure do, but not from the public side.

Mr. Warner: Go run a Mr. Submarine somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I say that the person should have the opportunity to review it and must agree before the provision of the service.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister knows they don't.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm afraid that's not the experience and it's not the information I have; otherwise I think we'd have hard examples of people actually being deferred from necessary medical care.

As members know, we are reviewing with the medical association how we can revise the mechanism by which we negotiate their fee schedules. In fact, we are now talking about a specific document. We're at the point where we are looking at a specific proposal. It seems to me that that principle, that an individual should have to agree beforehand, is one that has served us well. It may well be that we have to look at, and we will look at, possible ways of—

Mrs. Campbell: Opening the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell:—reaffirming that principle.

Mr. Warner: Try ways of protecting the patient. That would be a good way to start.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, what is the minister saying? Is he not aware that certainly at the Toronto Western the chief anaesthetist is on record as saying that they don't charge certain patients the extra because they feel the patients are too poor and that they make that judgement based on

their own opinion about the patient's working status and one thing and another?

Is the minister now saying that as long as a patient agrees to pay the extra, it's quite all right for the doctor to charge it, even though these people are facing surgery, but if the patient doesn't agree, then the doctor has no business charging it? Do I take it that what the minister is saying is any patient who simply says, "No, I do not want to pay the extra," shall not be charged the extra by an opted-out doctor? Is that not what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. What we are saying is what is the strength of our system which has served the province well.

Mr. Swart: It's breaking down now. Does the minister realize that?

Mr. Warner: You put it in the past tense. The system is being destroyed and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In fact, every province has in one means or another a variation. In Saskatchewan they have what's called balanced billing where they can patient-stream anywhere at any time, in a physician's office or elsewhere, on any account. In other provinces, they have other variations. Every province is different in one way or another, although they all meet the principles of the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Mr. Swart: And this is the worst.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What I said was, to use a specific example of someone who perhaps comes into emergency unconscious, in that particular case it is my view—and I understand it is general practice—that that individual should not pay above the OHIP rate.

Mr. S. Smith: We're not talking about that.

Mr. Cassidy: You have to be unconscious to avoid their surcharge.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What I'm saying is, that has been the principle that has been agreed to and supported by the medical profession—

Mr. Martel: You just knock them all out first.

Mr. McClellan: Medicare for the unconscious. If you are conscious you can't have universal health care.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and by the health plan since the beginnings of the health plan. As part of our discussions with them, what I'm saying is we are looking at whether there is any need in some way to strengthen that and to reaffirm that principle.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: In view of the minister's statement that opted-out physicians should not impose a hardship on people receiving health care in the province of Ontario and in view of the fact that the OMA has indicated the same, could the minister explain to me why it is that striking miners in Sudbury receiving \$25 per week are receiving notices from opted-out physicians indicating that if they don't pay up their bill will be sent to a collection agency? How does that fit with the minister's indication that people in Ontario will have equal access to health care?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, I have to go back and point out that in that particular area of the province the level of opting out is extremely low compared to the other parts of the province.

Mr. Swart: You don't have to go back; you're as far back as you can go.

Mr. Warner: Look at the bills.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Secondly, the basic philosophy of our system is that it is based on options for the patient and options for the physician. In that particular area, there are a great many options available with opted-in physicians as there are in all parts of the province.

[2:45]

Mr. Warner: The only one who should opt out is you.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the minister of the belief that in 1979 the public of Ontario is ready to turn back the clock and, when entering public hospitals, is now prepared once again to let doctors decide who shall pay and who shall not pay? Is he of the belief that that kind of doctor-administered means test is once again to be part of the health-care system here in Ontario in public hospitals or does he not see the necessity to have within the public hospital system those people who are prepared in fact to work within the insurance plan?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think again the last part of the question suggests exactly what we are talking about, that there be options, and to take the example of the west—I don't support or condone the principle of means test as you call it. What I am stating as the basic principle we have always worked upon, and which I acknowledge we may need to reaffirm in some tangible way, is that patients should have to agree and if they don't agree they should not be billed.

Mr. S. Smith: With a knife over them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the member engages in hyperbole. It's not a question of a knife over them. I already gave the member my views on the instance where the individual might be brought into emergency and not be in a position to agree, to even consider it.

Mr. Breugh: Could I ask the minister whether I read correctly what he has just said. He has just said to the people of Ontario that if they don't want to pay extra services, fees or over the approved rate, they simply don't agree to it; the doctor must provide the service and the patient has the option then to agree or not to agree to pay that amount of money. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am saying and I have said all along, Mr. Speaker, that it is the availability of options that is important. In fact in hospitals it is the billing groups that ensure the options are available. What I am saying is that the patient should agree first, and if they don't then change the doctor—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, there are bound to be some cases where they are not in a position to consider it and in those cases they shouldn't have to pay.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the question of the opportunities and alternatives. Is it not a fact that at North York General not only the anaesthetists opted out but so have the obstetricians? What is the function of the ministry in the funding of these so-called public hospitals where a whole staff would opt out? Has the minister given thought to his position vis-à-vis the open or closed hospitals?

Mr. Breithaupt: What are the patient's options then?

Mr. S. Smith: You give the patient a choice.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I don't see the connection between the two but perhaps the member could make the point at a later date. Essentially, what we are saying is—and this is since the beginnings of the plan—the strength of the plan has been based on the options available. The evidence would indicate, from the inquiries we have had from the public over the last number of years and the investigations we have made to date, we found, for instance at the Western, even though the entire anaesthesia staff has opted out, fully 70 per cent of the claims have been on an opted-in basis.

Mr. S. Smith: On a means test.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is no option for the patient.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that point, I think. It would seem that in fact the public has been served well by the system that we have in this province.

Mrs. Campbell: In the past.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: And currently. There's absolutely no indication that the four principles of accessibility and universality of coverage and so forth of the plans, as embodied in the Health Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, are being compromised.

Mr. Speaker: A new question; the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue with the Minister of Health this question of the degree of opting out by surgeons and by other specialists in various hospitals around the province; and also ask about the kind of options that are in fact available to patients in situations where every practitioner in a particular specialty in a particular hospital has opted out of the plan.

If I can be specific, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there are no anaesthetists providing services at the insured rates at Toronto Women's College Hospital or at St. Joseph's Hospital in west Toronto; in view of the fact that all seven obstetrician-gynecologists accredited to Scarborough General have opted out; in view of the fact that all the pediatricians at Northwestern Hospital have opted out; in view of the fact that seven of the nine psychiatrists at Toronto Women's College Hospital have opted out; in view of the fact that many other hospitals we contacted in the past week would not, in fact, provide information on the number of opted-out specialists on their staff; will the minister now make available, for each specialty and for each community in the province, the number of doctors who opted out and the number who have remained in the plan?

Will he also say whether he really believes that the amount of opting out by specialists is not, in fact, a threat to the universality of health care in this province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to this fact: If members look at the history of the health plan as we know it in Ontario, I would point out that every one of the 10 provinces has a slightly different plan one way or another—

Mr. Swart: Not quite as bad as this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh Mel, you know better.

Mr. McClellan: What about Quebec?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —a number of them involving additional billing options; including Saskatchewan, that allows patient streaming of any patient—any patient on any service.

Mr. Martel: Three per cent.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Patient streaming and extra billing.

Mr. McClellan: Three per cent, and they are worried about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are trying to have it both ways.

Mr. Warner: You don't care about Québec.

Mr. McClellan: You couldn't care less.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Now I suspect, Mr. Speaker, if you look at any situation over the last number of years in any of the teaching hospitals, in those instances where we have groups of specialists opted out you will find an experience similar to the one we found when we inquired about Toronto Western. In that case a very high percentage of claims had, in fact, been billed on an opted-in basis. That is because for years they have had the right in the teaching hospitals to have billing groups. That right, as members know, was extended to all the clinical departments—

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you just give us the information?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —of the non-teaching hospitals earlier this year as a means of ensuring options for the patients.

I will take the member's other question under advisement and give him an answer in a few days.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Let me take a specific instance and then ask the minister if he can defend this.

At York-Finch Hospital all four dental surgeons on the staff have opted out of OHIP. Is the minister not aware of the particular case of a 76-year-old pensioner at that hospital, a man named Mr. Nick Laurella, of very modest means, who had a lung removed in June? He is now facing a bill for \$167.50, in addition to the \$433.50 paid by OHIP. His doctor has refused to listen to repeated protests by Mr. Laurella's family that they cannot pay and could they please be excused? Does this kind of charge not constitute a deterrent to vitally needed health care; and how on earth can the minister tolerate a pensioner or any other citizen in the province of Ontario being put into this kind of situation?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty in acknowledg-

ing that it is a deterrent when in fact the individual got the service. He got the service.

Interjections.

Mr. Warner: The system is crumbling around you and you're doing nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The second point is I would want to be sure that in fact it was discussed with the patient beforehand and that he agreed. What I am saying is I feel that it is a generally accepted principle—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I said I would want to know whether it was discussed with him beforehand, because it is a generally accepted principle, certainly by the government and by the profession, that it should be discussed with the patient beforehand except in those cases which we have discussed several times already today where you cannot discuss it with him, and that they should agree to it; that they then should have the option to find a doctor who will do it on an opted-in basis. That is the important point.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary: Trying to understand the ministry's reasoning, and accepting the fact that as part of the opting out if the patient has a choice then the process can work—if your general practitioner has opted out you can go down the street to somebody else, Mr. Speaker—but can the minister explain, getting back to my leader's question, what choice a patient has when he is sent to one of the hospitals mentioned and all the anaesthetists are opted out? When he is in bed in that hospital or wheeled over to the operating room, at what point is he given a choice? Can the minister explain to us here, does he feel that is a choice once the patient is in the hospital? And secondly, does he expect a patient in those circumstances to just get up, pack his bags, leave and go someplace else? Does the minister consider that to be accessibility and universality?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, in that particular case the evidence would seem to indicate that—to continue that review—70 per cent of the claims are on an opted-in basis; the system has been working as it is supposed to work, in general. Maybe we will find specific ones where it hasn't.

Mr. Roy: You have been given an example where it hasn't.

Mr. Cassidy: You are hiding behind your averages.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The way we expect it to work is that it would be discussed with the patient beforehand and if the patient

didn't agree that he could then seek out another physician—

Mr. Martel: Yes, get out of his bed and find another doctor.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, that is not what I am saying—on staff to do it on an opted-in basis.

An hon. member: What about emergencies?

Mr. Makarchuk: He is put in there by another doctor.

Mr. Rotenberg: Why don't you wait for the answer?

Mr. Warner: The system is crumbling and you know it. It is falling apart.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The evidence would seem to indicate that it is working that way.

Mr. Breaugh: I would like to ask the minister in this regard: In a telephone survey in recent days we called hospitals and the hospital would not tell us whether certain specialists had opted in or opted out. How is a patient supposed to know whether he can receive that service by an opted-in physician when the hospital doesn't tell the patient whether they are in or out, and in some cases says they don't know? How is the patient supposed to find out?

Mr. McClellan: Not from the Minister of Health, they won't.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think, first of all, it has been widely known—and I will acknowledge that perhaps more needs to be done to make sure that it is even more widely known—that the patient does have the option, that they can choose.

An hon. member: How can they choose when they don't know?

Mr. Makarchuk: It is another doctor who sends him to the hospital.

Mr. Rotenberg: Why don't you wait for the answer? Stop yelling over there. Just wait for the answer.

Mr. Makarchuk: He doesn't have any answers.

Mr. Cassidy: Because it is outrageous, that's why.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I can only point to the record of the health system these number of years. There is no evidence whatsoever—none whatsoever—that people have in fact been deterred from necessary medical care by our system.

Mr. Martel: Answer the question. They won't give you the list.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister says there is no evidence. I just want to bring to his attention the fact—

Mr. Speaker: This is your second question.

Mr. Cassidy: This is my second question, Mr. Speaker—that in the case I just brought to his attention, Mr. Laurella, this 76-year-old fellow was Italian-speaking, there was no advance notice given to him or his family. When the family, both verbally and then in writing, made the request to the physician to say, "Look, we can't afford it"—

Mr. Rotenberg: What's the question?

Mr. Cassidy: —the physician simply insisted on continuing with his demands for \$167.50, despite the inability of either the patient or the family to pay.

[3:00]

Mr. Speaker: No question yet.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the minister's repeated insistence today that doctors should inform patients in advance if they are going to charge more than the OHIP rate, I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware that section 26 of regulation 577/75 of the Health Disciplines Act provides for disciplinary action against physicians who fail to notify patients in advance if they intend to charge more than the Ontario Medical Association fee schedule, but the regulation is in fact silent in insisting that a doctor tell a patient he intends to charge a surcharge over the OHIP fee, even though that surcharge is now averaging around 42 per cent?

I would like to ask the minister if he will undertake now, here in this House, to change the regulations in order to ensure that patients of opted-out physicians are, in fact, informed in advance if their doctor has opted out and intends to charge more than the OHIP fee, and how much more?

Mr. Swart: Give that commitment.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can tell members that that is, in fact, what we have under consideration as part of the discussions with the OMA on the fee-negotiating process. That is the position we are taking.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Given the failure of the minister to give the commitment now—if he is really committed to defending medicare he should have made that commitment here in this House, this has been an issue long enough for him to have made his mind up by now.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: Since the minister says that the consumers of health should be informed, that an informed consumer is a good con-

sumer, is he prepared to ensure that the consumers of health can at least find a physician who is practising under OHIP? Will he do that by publishing, on a regular basis, for each community in the province, a list of those physicians who are in and those who are out of OHIP?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is my understanding that it would, in fact, be a violation of the Health Insurance Act—

Mr. Swart: Change it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —to publish physicians' names. What is more, I think that, again based on the experience with the plan, ensuring the public's knowledge of their rights, ensuring that this principle is upheld, will in fact serve the public interest best.

Mr. Warner: You are destroying this system we fought so hard for.

Mr. S. Smith: As the minister goes about permitting these little erosions of the principle of universality—

Mr. Swart: Little?

Mr. Warner: The system is being destroyed.

Mr. S. Smith: —to the point of complete dismantling, is he also, in fact, prepared to countenance the matter we saw discussed in a newspaper today? That is the question of insurance companies being permitted to insure for the amounts above the OHIP rates? Does he not realize that if he permits this to happen, he could succeed in completely dismantling the system and turning back the clock to where he seems to want to go; that is to when doctors said who must pay and who must not pay?

Mr. Warner: That is the next step.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I should say I am surprised at the honourable member, but maybe I'm not. He is now engaging in the same kind of hyperbole we have been hearing from that other corner of the House, for these many weeks. There is no evidence, there is no reason of any kind, to believe that our health plan is in any way being dismantled—

Mr. Swart: That is the biggest joke I have heard in the House.

Mr. Roy: How can you say that?

Mr. Warner: The system is being destroyed and you know it.

Mr. Cooke: You are living in a dream world, Dennis.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —or that it is in any way in violation of the principles of the Health Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act. In fact, there is all kinds of evidence to

suggest that it is very much in conformity. Any actions taken by this government have been to maintain the integrity of the health care system. And that includes, by the way, dealing openly and frankly with the medical profession; not trying to engage in doctor-bashing, not trying to use some kind of bludgeon; but rather to get at the real problem—

Mr. M. Davidson: Something you haven't been doing.

Mr. Swart: What is the problem?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —namely, the way we arrive at the fee schedules and the question of doctors' concern about the bureaucratic procedures of the health insurance plan. That's how you solve problems, by dealing openly with them.

Mr. S. Smith: Are you going to allow co-insurance?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, we are not considering allowing co-insurance.

DISCRIMINATION BY POLICE

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General although I would be delighted to have the comments of the Attorney General at the same time.

In view of the recent statements by police officers concerning apparent discrimination against Jews, blacks and homosexuals in our society, has the Solicitor General any comments to make? Has he made any investigation of these facts as they have appeared?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I assume, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. George is referring to a recent publication of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Association called News and Views. I have discussed the article with the senior members of the Metropolitan Toronto police force and very recently with the president of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Association, who has indicated to me that he regrets very much that the article was published. As a matter of fact, I understand that the president of the police association will be having a press conference tomorrow to indicate his regret for the publication of the articles to which the honourable member refers.

I have also written a letter to the editor of that publication indicating my concern about the publication and I should be pleased to supply the honourable member with a copy of that letter.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, do I take it then that the Solicitor General views such statements by those who are engaged in the administration of the justice system of the

province as being somewhat different from private statements of a similar nature made by private citizens?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker, and I pointed out to the editor of that publication that whether they necessarily always accept this fact or not, I think that the public regard the police as police officers 24 hours of the day. It is really impossible from a practical standpoint to separate their responsibilities as police officers and as private citizens, and although they may think that they are simply expressing their views as private citizens, invariably those views are going to be regarded as expressions of police officers and therefore I do regard them in a different position.

Mr. Bounsall: Will the minister, in his capacity as Solicitor General, suggest to the police forces across Ontario that in the annual education sessions which most of them undertake they include in that education session one of the very good courses run by the Human Rights Commission, whenever they are asked to do so, as a means of ensuring that these problems mentioned do not continue?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, at the present time that the police forces across the province are aware of this problem and through education and through any other means available are attempting to avoid this type of incident, any expressions of bigotry or intolerance, and that is a problem about which all police forces are aware at the present time.

BRANTFORD HOSPITALS

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Now the minister has had an opportunity to talk to the Brant County Health Council, has received a petition with 20,000 names on it—I'm sure he has even had a suggestion from the Premier—can the minister tell the House whether he is prepared to accept the idea that both hospitals in Brantford, the St. Joseph's Hospital and Brantford General Hospital, will continue to be active treatment facilities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all read to you a press release which came from the honourable member's office this morning, and it is part of the answer to this. It said approximately 400 people will be demonstrating—I think it was 120—in front of the Legislature to protest the attempt of the government to close St. Joseph's Hospital in Brantford.

Mr. Speaker, with respect, that is totally misleading because in point of fact there is no intent, no desire at all—

Mr. Warner: You changed your mind.

Mr. Swart: You are going to leave it open.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —to see St. Joseph's Hospital in Brantford—or any other hospital for that matter—close.

Mr. M. Davidson: What are you going to do in Penetanguishene, Dennis?

Mr. Cooke: You are just going to starve them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We had a very good meeting with representatives of the health council, and at a subsequent meeting we had a very good discussion with about 20 or 30 people, I would say, from Brantford and area, from the member's constituency and that of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon).

The health council, by the way, has not officially received or considered any report yet from the rationalization committee which was struck about a year ago. The committee was under the former chairman of the health council, with representatives of the board, administration, and medical staff of each of the hospitals. They have not finished their work yet—

Mr. Swart: But you'll close it anyway.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and therefore there's no report before the health council to make a recommendation.

Mr. Makarchuk: Of course there's a report.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. With respect, Mr. Speaker, my information is that the rationalization committee has not finalized their work—

Mr. Makarchuk: It was presented two weeks ago on Wednesday.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What the honourable member is referring to, I believe, is the present state of the consideration of the rationalization committee, which they discussed with the public, which they have discussed at various meetings—

Mr. Swart: You call that a report?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —but which they have not finalized, and which they have not recommended to the health council.

We do believe in decentralized planning, and we do believe the rationalization committee and the health council should have the time—

Mr. Swart: You believe in closing hospitals.

Mr. Cassidy: You have been using health councils as a smokescreen.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —to hear the representations, to consider the alternatives, and to make some conclusions. The conclusions will be based on how to maintain the quality of health care within the standards that apply.

I indicated to the health council I am prepared to see, as we have done elsewhere, at the conclusion of their work the savings that will be generated from the rationalization applied against deficits that will be built up in the interim. What is more, I indicated in a letter I gave them when they left that we are prepared, at the point where the hospitals and the health council finalize an agreement on the rationalization, to reinstate up to \$390,000 into the hospital budget for 1979-80, plus recovering—which is consistent with our financial incentive policies—any additional deficits from future savings generated by the rationalization.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The nurses say that in the past, sufficient material resources were available for sisters directing St. Joseph's Hospital as a fully-accredited, active-treatment hospital, and the present economic climate will not permit the continuation of this fine service much longer. In effect, what they're saying, contrary to what the minister has said, is that the hospital will stop being an active treatment facility.

The point of my supplementary is how much time does the Brant County Health Council have to come in with a new proposal? And is this proposal going to contain the decision to keep both hospitals open as active treatment facilities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, the health council has not made a recommendation. My information is they haven't even had a recommendation from the rationalization committee. They will eventually make a recommendation to me, which will be based on two things: first of all, what is the most appropriate way for that community to arrive at the four active treatment beds per thousand population; and what is the most appropriate way to meet the chronic and rehabilitation bed needs of that community.

I have made no foregone conclusions—

Mr. Makarchuk: How much time will you give them?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I've made no foregone conclusions of what the recommendation will be. It will be a recommendation which is in the best interest of that community.

Mr. Makarchuk: How much time are you giving them?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I haven't put a time on it. What I've indicated—to repeat for the member's benefit—is that at the point of an agreement up to \$390,000 will go back into the budget; and any additional deficit above that will be recovered, as would any capital costs associated with rationalization, from savings resulting from rationalization.

Mr. Nixon: Since the overall cut is estimated to be about \$1.5 million, and the minister has indicated that close to \$400,000 would be allocated—

Mr. McClellan: You are going down, Dennis, slowly but surely.

Mr. Nixon: —to give the community more time to consider its alternatives, might we and the people of Brantford assume they have approximately three months to further consider the situation before the cuts announced by the minister in January will come into effect at the present stance?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I didn't put a time limit on it, but I think everyone involved would want to do it in a timely fashion, so that the matter does not drag on indefinitely. I would hope it could be done in the next few months, so that we can get on with whatever is their ultimate recommendation, or set of recommendations, for the rationalization of services in that community, as we are doing throughout Ontario.

CHEST DISEASE CASES

Mr. Pope: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. It arises from a letter addressed to myself from Dr. Vingilis of the industrial chest disease service of the Ministry of Labour. Dr. Vingilis has said: "There is no excess of lung cancers in Ontario gold miners in comparison with the population at large."

Mr. Laughren: Really? He's a Tory.

Mr. Pope: My question is how can Dr. Vingilis make that kind of an absolute statement in the light of a report prepared in December 1978—that's approximately a month before this letter was sent to me—which is entitled *Cancer Mortality in Selected Northern Ontario Mining Communities*, including Timmins, Kirkland Lake, Elliot Lake and Kapuskasing, and which establishes exactly that there is an excess of lung cancers in Ontario gold miners in comparison with the population at large?

Will the minister immediately engage on an urgent priority basis through his industrial

diseases branch to determine whether this is a valid report and to determine whether or not there is additional information that can be made available? And will he act immediately to assure the miners of northern Ontario and their families that there is, in effect, no problem or take steps to remedy the problems?

Secondly, in the light of Dr. Vingilis' statement—

Mr. Bradley: Cross the floor.

Mr. Ruston: Come on over here.

Mr. Pope: —that diesel fumes in high concentrations are known to cause chronic bronchitis, will the minister review every decision the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board has made concerning railroad workers who are suffering from chronic bronchitis—

Mr. Germa: Speech.

Mr. Pope: —and try to ascertain whether or not they have been fairly dealt with in light of this recent conclusion?

Mr. Breithaupt: You will be a parliamentary assistant next time.

Mr. Mackenzie: He'd make that kind of minister.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the member to repeat the question, but I think I won't.

Mr. Bradley: No wonder you could upset that guy.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I would be glad to have the report the member has referred to reviewed by the industrial chest disease service, and I will assure the member I will look into the other matter as well and report to the House.

Mr. Renwick: He's the first Tory backbencher to express an interest in the topic.

Mr. Nixon: Some other people are going to look into it too.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: While the minister is looking at the bronchial problem, could he look into a report a number of years ago which indicated that 22.5 per cent of the smelter workers in Sudbury suffered a bronchial problem? In view of the fact that we have been trying for about four years to get this government to recognize that as a compensable condition, would he make a decision as to whether those workers in the smelter are also entitled to benefits? This is far in excess of the provincial average.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I'll be glad to look into that matter as well.

NIAGARA RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Is the minister aware of a statement made on water quality by the International Joint Commission that chemical dumps on both sides of the border must be found and clean-up must become a top priority by both countries? In view of that statement, I would also ask if he is aware of the fact the residents of Niagara-on-the-Lake, St. Catharines and Virgil have circulated a petition to be given to the New York state environment department protesting the dumping of additional chemical waste by a chemical dump company in the lower Niagara River? Is the minister leaving the responsibility up to the residents of the area, or is he, as the minister, going to assume a responsible position with the US authorities to make certain no more dumping of chemicals is going to go into the Niagara River until the residents on both sides of the border are guaranteed safe water?

Mr. Laughren: That's free enterprise. I'm surprised the member would intervene.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I guess it was yesterday morning the member for—I'd better check the location—Lincoln, was it?

Mr. Martel: Yesterday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Brock. Sorry about that.

Mr. Martel: I knew you'd have trouble with that.

Mr. Breithaupt: You made a real impression.

Mr. S. Smith: There was a time you were considered important in the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: The member for Brock gave me a call in the great riding of Oxford—I don't forget the name of that one—and we had quite a long discussion on the very issue. It's my understanding that the member—and I support him fully on it—is asking for a public hearing. I think he is doing so knowing that this is the approach that we in Ontario are now taking on these items. Having set the example for the United States in this regard, I think they would do well to follow our example and have public hearings on these items.

Yes, I am well aware of the statement by the International Joint Commission. Yes, I am well aware that at the moment by far the vast majority of those who are polluting our waters with chemical toxic wastes are from the other side of the border.

No, we will not sit idly by. We are very aggressively monitoring all of the water

supplies. Let me be very, very positive about that.

Mr. Martel: You used to walk across the water, George.

Mr. Warner: You are watching vigorously.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: There is absolutely no danger to the present water supply of those municipalities.

I share the concern the member for Brock (Mr. Welch) expressed to me very forcibly about the future.

An hon. member: Does that mean you are going for a swim?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We will remain concerned. But until it is proven otherwise—and I think the only way you could prove it otherwise is to seek tests that would indicate there is a problem and at the moment there is not one—there is no problem with the water supply in your riding, or indeed in Brock.

Mr. Warner: You will wait until we can have foot races across the river.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We feel very confident that the water supply is in a very safe condition right now. We will monitor it. We have stepped up our monitoring of it and we will do everything possible. I hope the member for Niagara Falls will join the member for Brock and myself in saying we are sure today the water is all right. If there is any change in the tests the member will be the first to know—the people will be the first to know.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Any time you want a public hearing.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: It is important that in the other jurisdiction over which we have no direct control we will not remain silent. I only hope they take the suggestion of the member for Brock and have a public hearing—have it out in the open so we will all know.

Mr. Kerrio: I just want to bring something to the minister's attention.

Mr. Speaker: By way of a question, hopefully.

Mr. Kerrio: Yes, thank you; I will bring the supplementary immediately.

I wonder if the minister is aware of the fact that both the Love Canal and the Bloody Run Creek are connected to that international waterway? Is he aware that one is in the upper Niagara River above the falls and the other is in the lower river? I hope he will not continue to make the statement that we will not have a Love Canal incident here, because it is connected with our waterways. I want to make that point very clear.

Also, I would ask if the minister is aware that if this dump site goes in in Lewiston, New York, they are contemplating moving some of the chemical waste over the Penn Central Railway in southern Ontario? I wonder if he would look into the matter to be certain that if any of these dangerous chemicals are going over the rails to that disposal site, he might be the first to know about it and therefore monitor it very diligently.

Mr. Martel: He is going to walk alongside the train.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think that the legislation I will be introducing in a matter of minutes has a great deal to say about the transportation of those dangerous chemicals. People from the industry have indicated to me it is pretty tough legislation because they will be held responsible. That kind of action on our part has alerted them.

Mr. S. Smith: The spiller must pay.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Well, indeed they have. It is so difficult not to react to the interjections, Mr. Speaker, but the material that will be moved by the transporter and/or the industry that owns it is their responsibility. I know now from the reaction of both the transporter and the industry that they are very concerned on the safe transportation of the material.

Mr. Nixon: Shades of George Kerr.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: While I may not know in advance it is being moved, indeed, they know in advance it is their liability, their responsibility and that is very clear in this legislation the member will see today. I think that is a very important piece of legislation, to answer the question.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. Renwick: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. It relates to the private insurance industry and the Ontario Health Insurance Plan and the consequences of the doctors opting out.

As the continuance of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan as the sole insurance carrier under the Health Insurance Act, 1972, is the guts of our health care system, will the minister tell the House whether private insurers can now re-enter this field to insure the public against excess doctors' fees over and above the fees permitted under the Ontario Health Insurance Plan, having regard to section 19(1) of that act, which reads in substance as follows: "Every contract of insurance for the payment of any part of the cost

of any insured services performed in Ontario for any insured person under this act is void and of no effect"—and these are the words that bother me—"insofar as it makes provision for insuring against the costs payable by the plan, and no person shall enter into or renew such a contract"?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Just a few moments ago, my colleague, the Minister of Health, replied "No." Since obviously for more than a decade there has been no co-insurance, I really fail to understand the concern of the member over those words.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary—and this is precisely why I asked the question—that subsection of the act states that there can be no insurance insofar as it makes provision for insuring against the costs payable by the plan. My supplementary question is: are those words not sufficient as at the present time to permit the private insurers to come in to insure the excess costs being incurred?

Mr. Breithaupt: Beyond that.

Mr. Renwick: If the answer to my question is that they are not an open gate for the private insurance industry to re-enter the field, will the minister consult with his colleague, the Minister of Health, and with the ubiquitous Attorney General of Ontario and let us have an opinion of the law officers of the crown as to whether or not that permits at this time private insurers to come in on the Ontario Health Insurance Plan and add to the destruction of that plan, which is taking place now?

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, I can answer the bulk of that supplementary question by saying, "No, not as long as I am the minister." Secondly, if the member wants an opinion from the chief law officer of the crown, why didn't he have the courtesy to ask the Attorney General? If the member wants me to get it for him I'll be delighted to get it for him.

Mr. Martel: He didn't have the courtesy to be here.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Hennessy: My question is to the Minister of Health. In view of the repeated requests from the city of Thunder Bay, the local hospital boards and myself for a meeting with the Minister of Health to discuss the hospital bed situation in the city of Thunder Bay, has the minister set a date for such a meeting?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As I recall, there is a meeting being arranged for April 3, I be-

lieve, with a group representing the city, the health council and the various hospitals.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that commencing Thursday, March 29, the House may resolve itself into a committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING GENERAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing general government committee be authorized to meet this afternoon and this evening concurrently with the House, and on Wednesday, March 28.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing administration of justice committee be authorized to meet on the morning of Wednesday, March 28.

Motion agreed to.

[3:30]

STANDING STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS AND MEMBERS SERVICES COMMITTEES

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the statutory instruments committee and the members' services committee be authorized to meet on the morning of Thursday, March 29.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing social development committee be authorized to meet concurrently with the House this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, might I use this opportunity to table the answers to questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 61, 62, 63, 64, 86, 89, 90 and 92, and the interim answers to questions 8 to 60 inclusive, 65 to 85 inclusive, 87, 88 and 91, standing on the Notice Paper. (See appendix, page 300.)

MEMBER'S BOOK OF POETRY

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) is not here in the House at this moment. It is very seldom that we have actual tangible evidence that one of the members of this chamber is literate; many people have had doubts on that particular question. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and all members of the House that the member for Lakeshore is very literate and that today, in fact, he has published the outpourings of seven or eight years of poetic endeavour—endeavour which I believe puts him in a class with such famous commentators, wits and reviewers of our time as Pope, Dryden and Ezra Pound.

The tome is known as *The Psychotic Personality of Our Time*. I wish to read one short introductory portion of it which I think sums up the thrust of the whole thing in reflecting this chamber. If I can quote Lawlor quoting Rilke's Second Elegy: "Jeder Engel ist Schrecklich"—"Every angel is terrible." And if I can quote Lawlor on this place, he begins his first canto in this tome: "The times are mad."

I have had an offer from the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), who was anxious to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest from having the member for Lakeshore peddling his own tome; therefore, the member for Riverdale will be happy to take orders for this particular work. At \$10 a copy, the member for Lakeshore will be happy to sign them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, having referred to the very distinguished member for Lakeshore as the poet laureate of this House on more than one occasion and having known him perhaps for more years than the present leader of the New Democratic Party, I would like to express my real congratulations to him. I guess it's a more creative effort than one that I have been told about emanating from a former caucus member of his. When I say more creative, it probably will add more to the literary style of this province than Morton Shulman's book will to the history of this province. I am not sure of that, but I am told that is the case.

I think it is only fair, as well, to point out to our very distinguished member that while I have no objection at all in paying \$10 for access to this book—and I am quite prepared to speak to the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) about having it on circulars 14, 15 and 16; I know that the school students of this province are avidly awaiting the introduction of this text in the

compulsory English courses that may or may not exist—I think it is only appropriate, in that he is of this very generous nature, that he look across the House—and even to his right, if he can—and come to the conclusion that he should sign copies for all members of the House at a nominal fee of zero. We would all be deeply appreciative of this gift. There would be no conflict. We would be delighted to have it. We would even promise to read it as bedtime reading, which would be much better than most of the things that the leader of the New Democratic Party reads in any event. But I would be quite prepared to accept a free copy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, if I also may be permitted a word of congratulation, I presume that a text with such a title as *The Psychotic Personality of Our Time* might be one of autobiography. Indeed, it might be one of dedication to his present or future leader. Of course, it could also be that it was written because of his caucus colleagues or in spite of them; I am not sure which.

In any event, we welcome this literary outpouring. I presume that for those members who cannot obtain a copy in the next few months, no doubt when Dr. Shulman's book receives greater prominence, perhaps in the future we could all get them as a pair at Coles for about \$3.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, as business agent, I just did not want any misunderstanding. The figure of \$10 is for the paperback. For the hardback book, which is in limited edition, the price is—well, it is almost going for auction now; of course, with the member's signature on the flyleaf of the book, I doubt if any member of this House could afford to buy such a copy, but I am willing to accept any offers at all for his work.

Mr. Sargent: He's trying to beat Maggie Trudeau.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, there is a lot of competition abroad in the publishing field these days. I do not know how anyone reads anything; there is so much to do.

However, I would warn the Premier that, by heavens, before he says very much about it, he had better read it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's why I am not paying for it first.

Mr. Lawlor: He will remember the famous colloquy of the critic who spoke to Robert Browning about these things. Robert said: "Oh, yes, there was a time when I and God understood what it was all about. Now only God knows." I take that position almost from the time of its birth.

Writing poetry—I suppose writing anything—is a form of self-exposure; it may be indecent exposure, although I suppose it is not arrestable quite yet.

As far as my friend over here is concerned, he is included, let me assure him.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Parrott moved first reading of Bill 24, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Elgie moved first reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to.

HURONIA DISTRICT HOSPITAL ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith moved first reading of Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the financing of the Huronia District Hospital.

Motion agreed to.

VILLAGE OF COOKSTOWN ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith, on behalf of Mr. G. Taylor, moved first reading of Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the Village of Cookstown.

Motion agreed to.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of Bill 26, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that every product offered for sale by a retailer that is marked with the universal product code must also be clearly marked with its individual purchase price.

PORTABLE FIRE EXTINGUISHERS SAFETY ACT

Mr. Stong moved first reading of Bill 27, An Act to regulate the Manufacture, Sale and Servicing of Portable Fire Extinguishers.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to protect the public from the

fire hazard created by inadequately manufactured and serviced fire extinguishers.

INNOCENT PERSONS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Stong moved first reading of Bill 28, An Act to protect the Reputation of Innocent Persons from Untimely Publicity.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to prohibit publication of the name of or otherwise reveal the personal identity of persons charged with offences until such time as a court begins to hear evidence in the case or the person enters a plea of guilty to the offence.

MOTION TO SUSPEND NORMAL BUSINESS

Mr. Foulds moved under section 34 of the standing orders, that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Minister of Health to provide adequate funding for hospitals throughout the province, as evidenced in northern Ontario by Thunder Bay, Kirkland Lake and other small communities; in Metropolitan Toronto by Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital; and elsewhere in southern Ontario by Brantford and Windsor; so that the reduction in hospital facilities and services is causing severe hardships to citizens of this province and is seriously threatening the level of health care the people of Ontario have a right to expect.

[3:45]

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member has up to five minutes to explain why he feels this is of urgent public importance.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the matter dealt with in the resolution is a matter of urgent public importance for the following reasons:

One, my attention was first focused on the issue by the effects of the active-treatment bed allocation method. It was devised by the Ministry of Health and sets the new and arbitrary bed ratios at 4.5 per 1,000 of population in northern Ontario and 4.0 in southern Ontario, to be reduced further to 4.0 in northern Ontario and 3.5 in southern Ontario by 1981. Although that came to my attention because of the devastating effects it was having in Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario, I believe the evidence is mounting throughout the province in places such as Etobicoke, Windsor, Brantford and

throughout northeastern Ontario that it is a province-wide phenomenon. It is just that we are now seeing the first evidence of it most strongly in the communities mentioned in the resolution.

Two: the first phase of the ministry's plan goes into effect just four days from now, April 1, so the matter is urgent if we are as a Legislature to express our opinions and try to persuade the ministry they are set on a wrong course of action.

Three: we have no other avenue for discussing this most serious problem at the present time. The matter deserves debate and discussion, not merely questions that can be fobbed off by ministers during question period. For example, the Ministry of Health estimates will not come up for debate until after April 1; in fact, they are, in my understanding, slated to come somewhat down the road of legislative consideration.

Also, it is my understanding there is no opportunity for debate in the throne speech debate this week, and the throne debate itself does not focus sufficiently on an issue of this importance and magnitude throughout the province.

Four: this is the first opportunity since the House has resumed after the March break to discuss a matter of substance. Surely, the health of the populace must be one of our top priority considerations in this Legislature.

As I understand it, on the previous occasion when a matter of health was brought up for emergency debate—the Chesley Hospital debate in November 1975—the Speaker ruled against such a motion that was confined to one situation. The House expressed its will otherwise so the debate proceeded because it was used as an example of the plan in 1975 which would decrease the effectiveness of the delivery of health care to the people of Ontario.

Five—and I just want to use this as an example—in my own area the matter has been brought to my attention very forcefully. I have received over 1,000 letters on the topic in the last 10 days to two weeks. There has literally been a news story every second day in the local media, which are being contacted by individuals. There has been concern expressed by city council and several representations to city council by McKellar General Hospital, St. Joseph's General Hospital, the senior citizen groups, the district health council and many individuals.

I note the efforts of my friend, the member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy), who has been trying to line up a meeting between responsible civic officials and the Minister

of Health and/or some of his colleagues to discuss this urgent matter.

I am sure when this debate proceeds, my colleagues from Brantford, Oshawa, Windsor, and Algoma will be able to present ample evidence of the urgency of this motion as it affects many areas of the province.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the hospital bed cutbacks, the implementation of the bed ratio rates, is only four days away. This Legislative Assembly has the final authority and has not had an opportunity to discuss this urgent matter until now. The regular avenues of debate are not open to us.

Three, the House expressed its will with regard to the Chesley debate on November 20, 1975.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter of health care is one that has been badly handled by the government. A government cannot cut back on active treatment beds the way it has until alternative services are in place and we shall make those arguments when the debate proceeds, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues join me in urging you to accept the resolution and recognize that the matter put before us in the resolution is one of urgent and public importance. It has already been put to you, sir, that the effective date of April 1 is just two or three days away as far as the application of the budget cuts are concerned.

One matter that sometimes is forgotten is that in those areas where the budget cuts are going to persist—I do not know whether there are any or not—the layoffs, if they have not already been undertaken, are going to have to be paid for from some source. I would suggest to you, sir, it will be the responsibility of this Legislature to find those funds.

There will be an opportunity, I trust, sir, having a lot of confidence in your good judgement, to discuss the specific matters later this afternoon, but I should tell you that when my colleagues examined the resolution, notice of which was given to us, we wanted to indicate that other communities not listed in the resolution certainly should have their problems aired and discussed and put before the Minister of Health here. I refer to the hospital cutbacks which are going to cause a serious depreciation in health care facilities in Fort Frances, in Goderich, in Wingham, in the Four Counties Hospital at Newbury, and of course I, sir, want to bring your attention to the problems faced by the citizens in Brantford.

Frankly, I was a bit offended that the minister in a rather cavalier way indicated with some disparaging tone that only a handful of people appeared in front of the Legislature today to argue against his cutbacks of the services in our own community. I should tell you, sir, that in fact it was a very important delegation indeed, well versed in the problems that we have. As a further indication the policy seems to be still fluid, the minister in his comments in question period today indicated there was going to be the flexibility of about \$400,000 in the situation in Brantford itself.

Unless we have a chance to put our arguments before the minister and to hear his responses in this connection, I would put to you, sir, that the citizens in our various communities, directly and deeply concerned with this matter, will otherwise not have an opportunity for the argument to be put by their elected representatives.

I end my comments, sir, by urging you once again to indicate that in your good judgement this matter would be properly before the House this afternoon for special debate.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would go along with the comments made earlier about the value of the discussion this afternoon of the various concerns with regard to hospitals. May I say, sir, in answer to the comments of my friend from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, I certainly meant no disparaging tone or intent at all with regard to the group with whom I met. In fact, this morning when I got into the office—I had been up to Penetang yesterday afternoon—I got the notice that the group was coming and I had been asked to meet with them. I readily agreed, although I couldn't meet at the time they suggested and they were good enough to come at a time when I was free.

As I said earlier, it was a very good meeting. I think it was a constructive meeting for me and I hope for that group as well. We shared information and views.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is one that consumes a great deal of my time every working day in dealing with the district health councils and hospitals, and has as long as I have been in this portfolio, since the evolution, the transitional phase of our health care system is one that has been going on for quite some time and will go on for quite some time into the future. As the health care needs of the province have changed, are changing, and will change, so too will the means of addressing those needs be changed so as to maintain the quality of the health care system.

I will, therefore, be glad to participate. The time limits of such a debate are such that all the points can't possibly be answered. Whenever my estimates do come on—I don't know when they're going to be, whether it's spring or fall, or whenever—or during question period, or for that matter privately with members, I'll be glad to discuss more than what can be covered in this limited time today.

I have arranged meetings with a number of members. My friend, the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), was in touch with me recently about the possibility of a meeting with some hospitals in his area to pursue the question of planning for additional chronic needs in that area to be met out of surplus active treatment facilities. I certainly readily agreed to that. In fact, I think we're meeting on April 6. I'm meeting on April 3 with a group from Thunder Bay, dealing with local people, to solve local problems. I'll look forward to the debate.

Mr. Speaker: It is the responsibility of the chair only to decide whether or not the motion was in order. Proper notice was given. The main criterion is that it be of sufficient and urgent public importance. Given the comments I have heard I would rule that it is, so it does meet the criteria of standing order 34. The only thing that remains is that the Speaker ask should the debate proceed?

Motion agreed to.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Foulds: In my remarks I'm going to focus on the problems as they have arisen in northwestern Ontario and Thunder Bay. Even in the 10 minutes allotted, I'm sure I cannot do that justice, as you will recognize. However, my colleagues will—and perhaps you could—describe the areas outside of Thunder Bay. I certainly feel inadequate to the task.

First of all, I want to say that my colleagues will be outlining situations in other areas of the province. I want to outline very briefly some of the facts, as I understand them, as they affect Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario.

I think the big problem that has arisen is that the reductions that were announced by the minister and the ministry in January have put a crimp in service because we have not had in place ahead of time adequate alternative care—adequate chronic care, adequate extended care. For all the will in the world, and for all the attempts, frankly—I know what the minister is going to interject. I'll let him use his time to do that—

adequate chronic care and extended care have not been provided first.

For example, in Thunder Bay we have lost 200 beds since 1974 and now must reduce by an additional 27 beds by April 1, 1979, and by 114 beds by April 1, 1981. In small areas of northwestern Ontario there are reductions that I'll go into later on. There are over 100 chronic care patients and 100 extended care patients in Thunder Bay awaiting adequate placement. Until alternative facilities are in place, no active treatment beds should be cut.

We get to the question of how the ratio is established. I think we have to recognize that the ratio is largely an arbitrary one, that it is set up arbitrarily and can be changed arbitrarily. It is not dependent on any rationale.

For the remaining 77-bed reduction after April 1 that must be implemented in Thunder Bay by April 1981, we haven't had details of that and there is no way of knowing at the present time if a four per thousand ratio is the final goal. We have not had a clear statement of that by the minister. As alternative services increase, hopefully, the minister may lower that ratio further, but because it is an arbitrary standard, it can be changed arbitrarily.

At the present time, my understanding is that McKellar General Hospital will be reduced by 16 beds, Port Arthur General Hospital by 12 beds, and St. Joseph's General Hospital by nine beds.

[4:00]

In the last factor, the only real standard is how much the public will accept. Clearly, the provincial government believes we will accept it. I want to assure the House that until those alternative services are in place, we in the north will not accept it. It's simply not acceptable. The conditions that exist are simply not acceptable.

I prefer not to use waiting lists as a criterion because they are not a full criterion for judging how crowded or overcrowded facilities are. But when you have occupancy rates of over 85 per cent, when you have patients staying overnight in emergency beds while they await admission to a regular bed, and when you have intensive care beds often full or nearly full and you have an increased number of patients being admitted as emergency cases rather than as routine admissions, then there is a widespread sense of chaos and pressure throughout the hospital. Those are the rules of thumb I would like to speak to.

The chronic care situation seems to me to be the crucial one to relieve the difficulty with active treatment beds. Although St. Joseph's Heritage is slated to open before long with 100 nursing home beds, there is almost as much need for 100 chronic care beds. At the end of February I believe the waiting list was 102 for nursing home beds and 129 for chronic care beds. Even the recommendation by the district health council has not been approved that 24 of those beds—just 24 of those beds that are in St. Joseph's Heritage which the minister likes to talk about—be designated chronic care. The minister cannot say the alternative services have been provided in Thunder Bay.

I just want to quote very quickly and briefly from one of the submissions made to the city council, I guess it was by St. Joseph's hospital. They indicated that occupancy rates are 100 per cent in their medical and surgical units. They indicated that—and I'm quoting—"patients requiring in-patient medical care are subjected to staying in emergency for one or more nights. Emergency is not equipped or staffed to provide in-patient type of care and vital space is taken up to the detriment of bona fide emergency cases. This (the imposition of the present bed ratios) has resulted in a decline in the number of elective surgical bookings which can be made. Some patients are inconvenienced by multiple intrahospital transfers before they are appropriately accommodated. Physicians are coerced by the demand for beds into making decisions on discharge under pressure.

"We believe that some of these patients are justified in believing they have not experienced the quality of care they should have expected from what was thought to be one of the better health systems in the world. The impending sense of chaos was heightened recently when one night every intensive care unit bed in the city was filled. Each of these beds held a patient who genuinely required intensive care unit treatment. This apparently has never happened before.

"The precarious situations described are real and render impossible the systematic and orderly management of patient bookings and admissions. With our 100 per cent occupancy rate, the patient booked in the 'urgent' medical category has almost no chance of being admitted. They get better or are eventually admitted as emergencies. About 68 per cent of all patients are admitted as emergencies."

As I understand the situation, that is serious. Those are not my words. They emphasize, too, the necessity for long-term care.

They also emphasize the necessity, quite rightly, of the pilot project that has been suggested by the district health council, but that won't provide for an immediate solution to the problem. What they suggest is a delay of the implementation of bed and financial cuts until the study is complete and long-term requirements are met.

The general hospital, 221 beds total: It has an 85 per cent to 95 per cent occupancy rate, and an elective waiting list of three months. Medical patients are being admitted on an urgent basis only. They have not yet determined where the cuts will come but it will probably be 12 beds.

St. Joseph's hospital I have dealt with, but I wanted to add they have an elective waiting list of 206, urgent waiting list 55, five rheumatic, eight rehabilitation, 15 psychiatric, nine medical, 18 surgery; all admitting being done on an emergency basis first.

The McKellar hospital has 98 per cent occupancy rate for medical-surgical, 100 per cent in all other fields, patients staying overnight in emergency because of bed shortages. They will have to close 21 beds, even though they are slated to close 18, because they have to close one unit to make it economical.

I want to touch very briefly on the region because in Geraldton they are being reduced from 45 beds to 25, in Nipigon 33 to 20, in Red Lake 44 to 27. My colleagues will deal with some of those, but when the ultimate cut comes to 27 in Red Lake, the administrator there is being quoted that the occupancy rate at peak periods would be in excess of 117 per cent. That is just not possible.

I think we have to decide, for the regions outside, what is a hospital? When you are 190 miles away from your referral centre, no matter how small the community or given it is a reasonable size, surely there is need for the essentials of a hospital. You can't cut physiotherapists or an x-ray technician when you have only one. So that those communities like Nipigon, Geraldton and Fort Frances are in danger of losing doctors.

La Verendrye Hospital and Geraldton Hospital, for example have had no increase at all.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Foulds: If I just might conclude with one or two sentences, Mr. Speaker, I think the present cutbacks in the northwest are just not reasonable. We are not asking for the moon. We are saying, "No. No more cutbacks until you provide the alternative chronic care and the extended care first."

There is no lack of space in the north for those places. There is no lack of possi-

bility of providing those under the present system.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Your time has expired.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say, then, we in Thunder Bay and in northern Ontario do not—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Nixon: I want to take this brief opportunity to convey to the minister how much the people of Brantford and Brant county resent the application of centralized power to the provision of their hospital services. They are all aware of our participation in the overall medical insurance program but the minister must surely understand how the area has been, I suppose, sensitized by the attempt by his predecessor, the present Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), to move into a small community in the area, Paris, and simply unilaterally close the Willett Hospital.

The courts found that the government didn't have the power to do that, Mr. Speaker, and the hospital still continues to give the excellent service for which it has established a well-earned and high reputation.

The minister, coming from his own more or less small community in the centre of Metropolitan Toronto, must surely realize the pride which people have in hospital facilities which they have, in fact, built themselves. With the initiative of the citizens of Brantford and more latterly the Sisters of St. Joseph, we have built there one of the finest hospital establishments probably anywhere in Canada, if not in the world. It has been done with our own initiative and, until about the last eight or 10 years, it has been done largely with our own money.

I see the minister is frowning and he may have a moment or two to tell us about it, but I simply recall to him, that at the time when the grants were coming from the Treasury of the province of Ontario and we were in an expansionary situation, there was no health council. The announcements of the grants were made by the Minister of Health's predecessors, going back to Matthew Dymond and before and, of course, that assistance was very much accepted. There was all sorts of gratitude expressed to the ministers of the day.

Now that we are in a situation with the budgetary problems associated with the mismanagement of the government, the minister has set up a health council which has to do the minister's dirty work in this connection. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I resent this

very much. The people in the community who serve on the health council are outstanding men and women. I feel that they have somehow been seduced by the minister into thinking that they are going to provide the views of the community regarding provision of the very best medical service.

Now, if they had been in operation a decade ago, when we were building these things, that would be fine. But, under these circumstances, these people have to make the tough decisions to apply the cutbacks which have been handed to them unilaterally by the minister. Perhaps they were handed to him unilaterally by the Treasurer or even the Premier. I'm not so sure that it happens quite as directly as it did when Darcy McKeough was holding the purse strings. But surely this is an area for real resentment as far as the people in our area are concerned. We have built these fine hospitals. We have two active treatment hospitals and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker—and the Minister of Health, I think, would agree—that we need them in the Brantford area.

Now the cutback of \$1.5 million which goes into effect on April 1, a few days from now, is in the opinion of the medical authorities in Brant county going to degrade seriously the quality of the medical service in the community. There appears to be an attitude on the part of the ministerial officials that our doctors put too many people in the hospital and leave them there too long.

Now, I believe there is no evidence to indicate that the "cookie cutter" approach of the Minister of Health to the provision of hospital services should be applied to a community such as Brantford. That it is unfair and, I believe, it is bad judgement to apply this kind of uniformity to the communities right across the province.

As you know, we are not favoured with a university or community college campus in Brantford. But the statistics do show, and these are available to the minister as well, that the average age in the community is perhaps higher than in many other areas. We don't have the hundreds and in fact thousands of young people going to university as they do, say, in Guelph, or in other communities, who, fortunately, don't have to leave hospital services. When they do, they normally return to their own home.

There are many factors which I'm sure the health council and the delegation from Brantford brought to the attention of the minister. I'll say I applaud the fact that the minister did see fit to discuss the matter

with both delegations. I'm glad he has at least relented to the extent that the final decision is postponed for some months—three or four months in the Brantford area.

To tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker, I was not entirely clear as to the meaning of the minister's comment when he said there would be a flexibility of approximately \$400,000 with regard to our own hospital situation. But the only meaning I can give it is that in fact the immediacy of the decision has been withdrawn.

You know, the minister—at least, spokesmen for the ministry have indicated that Brantford and Brant county had been warned that this cutback was coming. I suppose in some respect that was so. But we never believed either the minister or his officials. After all, they came and said that the Willett hospital was going to be closed, and the Willett is still functioning and it is functioning properly.

I would submit to the minister that, if this deleterious decision was going to be made in a hard and fast way, we should have had at least a year's notice of a hard and fast decision. Then the delegations and the health council could have discussed it further with the minister and the administrative officials of the Health ministry. Then they could have made the rationalization required if the ministry of the day could not be persuaded that our needs were greater than indicated by the budgetary cuts.

Instead of that, the announcement was made, I believe on January 19, to come into effect April 1. It has simply not been practical or even possible for anything but the toughest sort of rationalization, involving removing active treatment from the St. Joseph's hospital; centralizing it at the Brantford General Hospital; and removing the emergency service from St. Joseph's hospital, which is closest to our large and we hope growing industrial area. These are the sorts of decisions that can only be reflected by the needs of the community itself.

[4:15]

My leader has spoken and will speak again perhaps later this afternoon. But in the question period today and also in speaking to the group in front of the parliament buildings this morning he indicated that for the officials to work with a computer, having something to do with the number of hospital beds per 1,000, without looking at the special needs of individual communities is really in our type of government simply unacceptable and that's why I feel this debate is of such great importance.

I say again I am very glad indeed that the minister has softened his former inflexible approach. I have been somewhat critical of the health council of Brant county for not responding to the minister immediately with an indication that it feared the quality of our hospital services would be reduced to a point where it would endanger the good health of the community. I regret that their first response was to take the directive as if it had come from on high and simply determine how it was going to be implemented. This, if anything, is going to detract from the continuing value of a health council which must speak for the community first and not the Ministry of Health.

I feel that the members of the council individually feel that and I trust and hope that the Minister of Health feels the same way. I have a suspicion, however, that the health councils are, in the mind of the minister, designed simply to do his dirty work and leave him free to cut the ribbons. After all, he and his predecessors have not been too well favoured with the kind of brains that have seen the good allocation of public funds. You don't have to go very far down University Avenue to find a major world-class hospital that had been sitting empty for eight years until it was more or less reprocessed as a chronic care hospital opening just a year ago. You know the one I mean, Mr. Speaker.

You don't have to go very far away from here, just to McMaster University, I say with great respect to my colleague the leader, to find a \$100 million facility that has been built and operating now for many years, and I don't know what the percentage of utilization is but I believe that for all of these years it has been considerably less than half utilized. All of those millions of dollars, in fact, have been wasted in trying to persuade the community to use this facility. I believe that the planning of the Ministry of Health has been terrible and that this minister now is simply carrying the old ashcans that the former Treasurer had to set down when he found that his approach—that is, going out and unilaterally closing the small hospitals in some of the Liberal areas of the province—was unacceptable and that he could not proceed in that way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to have had the opportunity to at least put before the Minister of Health some of the very strong feelings felt by the citizens of Brantford and Brant county.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will try to deal with this situation in 10 minutes, but I ask your indulgence if I go over. Perhaps I could steal some time from my colleagues in this party.

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I won't try to respond to the specific situations that have been described so far and will be described later in the debate. Those are dealt with regularly in this House as we consider questions and regularly on a daily basis as I deal with individual members and health councils and delegations from various parts of the province, some of which I discussed earlier today.

First of all, let me respond though to one point, that being the question suggested by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk about giving a year's notice. In point of fact, what the ministry has done is to give three years' notice that we are moving in the health care system in the province towards the identification of and meeting of chronic care and extended care needs and the reduction of active treatment beds in recognition of that and in recognition of changing patterns in the provision of health care services. The standards that currently exist, of four beds per thousand in the south and four and a half in the north, are the standards which have applied in this province since 1972 and the goals of three and a half in the south and four in the north are for 1981, so, in effect, we are talking about moving over three years to achieve those levels.

I think our policies are well known in dealing with the hospital community. What concerns me—and I think it's worth putting on the record, though I don't do it in a pejorative sense but as they have not put it on the record, I will—is that certain of the policies of my friends in the third party are not referred to by them from time to time so that the people in a place like Brantford would know what the alternatives are.

I am concerned that if they ever sat on this side of the House it is their policy to abolish all hospital boards and establish social service and health boards. It is in their green paper and it is apparently stated as their policy. I think the people in Brantford, for instance, should know that at St. Joseph's, the Willett and the General they would abolish all their boards.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is better to have them elected than appointed by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: They should know that that party's green paper in effect is prescribing for Ontario a prescription on their part

very similar—in fact, it is almost identical—to that which is in place today in the United Kingdom. I think it is well known by any objective observer that the national health service of the United Kingdom is an unmitigated disaster. The policies of the third party, like those of the United Kingdom, would give effect to excessive bureaucracy and bureaucratic centralized control.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's not true. What is the mortality rate?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In my time in the ministry I have spoken repeatedly—literally hundreds of times—in every corner of the province about the need to move our health care system through what is admittedly a difficult period of transition, a period of restraint in government spending, a period when the health needs of the province have clearly changed, are changing and will continue to change.

We have set standards for the province which compare well with any jurisdiction which one chooses to bring forward in Canada or North America or, for that matter, anywhere in the world.

Mr. Cassidy: That's not true. It is the second lowest in the country, and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if you go back to the deliberations of the select committee in the summer and fall of 1978, they found that in terms of health spending for the provision of beds and on doctors or whatever Ontario tends to be pretty well on the national average. Some are higher. For instance, British Columbia spends more proportionately on doctors than we do, and proportionately less on hospitals than do we in this province.

It is interesting that this morning at the conference at the Constellation Hotel, which I believe my good friend from Renfrew North (Mr. Conway) was attending, apparently a gentleman, who is one of the principals in the firm of McKinsey and Company of the United Kingdom, made the observation that in the National Health Service, the Valhalla of the third party, they spend one-third as much on health care per capita as do we in Ontario. That is only one comparison. There are many and, in fact, people continue to come to this province to look at our health system as a model for other areas of the world.

Mr. M. Davidson: A lot of them are leaving because of it too.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are encouraging rationalization. In my time as minister I have been pleased to see the initiatives taken

by health councils and by hospitals. Let me just refer to two or three. In Windsor, when I came to the ministry, there was an ongoing holy war—that's the only way I can describe it—between the ministry and the hospital community in Windsor. It revolved around one particular hospital.

There I said to the hospitals and to the health council that if they can find a way to rationalize services, to increase the numbers of chronic-care beds and to reduce duplication and overemphasis on active treatment, then the money would be ploughed back in for additional chronic beds—

Mr. Cooke: Tell us the whole story.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —for chronic home care, for a CAT scanner and so forth. They grabbed the initiative. This wasn't an imposition; this was working with the hospitals. The representatives of the boards, administrations and the medical staff—

Mr. Cooke: You tried to impose a lot of things, but we wouldn't accept them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —arrived at an agreement which embraced all but one of the hospitals in that county and which will see, beginning April 1, albeit a reduction in the number of active treatment beds, an increase in the number of chronic and additional new programs throughout the county.

Mr. Cooke: Tell us the whole story.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The whole story is the ministry learned from its earlier experiences on how to work with a community like Windsor, how to work with a community like Brantford, how to work with Sarnia, how to work with Sault Ste. Marie and how to work with Cornwall.

This is the other point I wanted to respond to. My friend from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk says the people resent the application of centralized power. I would tend to go along with that. I live now and have for some years in a place called Don Mills, which we consider to be a small town within the bounds of a large metropolitan area, but I come from an even smaller area, so I think I understand that mentality as well as anyone here.

We cannot escape the fact this ministry does have a responsibility to set some standards, whether active-treatment-bed standards or of whatever kind, and we ultimately have to answer for the considerable amount of money we spend, which is running at about \$11 million a day. As far as the planning is concerned, how to apply those standards and how to ensure the maintenance of the quality of health care, we do more and more rely on

the health council. There are going to be good times and bad.

Mr. Nixon: There aren't good, just bad. When are they going to get good?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: There are going to be easy decisions and there are going to be tough decisions. I have to tell you, I am impressed beyond description with the way in which our health councils by and large have been working with their communities and advising them. I have to tell you too our batting record is about 95 per cent as far as the acceptance of the recommendations with which they come forward. So they are not just there to be a buffer, they are not just there to take the flak, they are there to work.

Mr. McClellan: Like Riverview?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Yes, like Riverview, exactly. That was a recommendation of the health council.

Mr. Nixon: So definitive and autocratic they never think of questioning them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I want to talk about North Bay. In North Bay there isn't a health council, so we are talking about other types of communities. There, the hospitals grab the initiative very early on. I have to tell you the day I got back from Windsor and a meeting with the health council to announce the agreement of all the hospitals but one, there was a phone message for me from Sister Margaret Smith, the administrator of the hospital in North Bay, St. Joseph's. The message was very simple. We are going to make Windsor look like child's play.

I was up there a few weeks ago to approve formally the proposal put forward by those two hospitals to move to the second phase of rationalization. The fact is that rationalization has been going on for the last four or five years in any number of areas and it has not meant a reduction in health care. It has meant a maintenance of the quality of health care. I would argue, where you are combining departments such as obstetrics where they have been run down in size, and putting them together and concentrating skills, that is actually an improvement.

I want to say one pejorative thing—I will forewarn the House. I think if there is a problem in health care today it is the kind of things I see coming out regularly from that caucus at the end there, the kind of press releases that come out, the kind of statements that are made. If there is a threat to health care in this province it is the hyperbole and it is the distortion and it is the inaccuracies which regularly flow from that caucus in their public utterances.

Mr. Makarchuk: Twenty thousand people must be wrong.

Mr. Cassidy: I regret those last comments by the minister, I have to say, because I have been putting forward a great deal of accurate information about just what is happening in the health care field and in the hospital field. I have not yet seen a word from the minister to refute any of the facts which I used in the throne speech debate a week and a half ago. If the minister wants to refute any of that let him put it on the record.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On a point of privilege: I fail to understand how the member can claim that, when he has been going around claiming the ministry is trying to close 17 or 18 hospitals which is blatantly untrue.

Mr. Cooke: They are starving.

Mr. Cassidy: I did not say that at any time. I said the number of beds which are being closed by the Ministry of Health is in fact equal to 17 or 18 major hospitals across the province. That is the scope of the cuts and I am putting it in those terms in order to illustrate just how savage the cutbacks being imposed by this ministry are in terms of health and hospital care across the province. I will put some figures on the record, Mr. Speaker. A cutback in two and a half years—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the honourable member—

Mr. Cooke: This is not a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —denies the statement attributed to him in the Canadian Press story of the eighth, wherein he claimed that the ministry's policies are in fact going to result in a closure of more than 17 hospitals and a loss of 4,500 jobs, neither of which is true. Does he deny that?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would just say quite simply that I did not say they would result in the closure of 17 or 18 hospitals, and if that is what CP reported—

Mr. Turner: You were quoted.

Mr. Cassidy: —then it is a misquote. I did say there would be a loss of around 4,500 jobs and I believe in fact that may well be an underestimate rather than an overestimate. We can calculate that with eight million and some people in the province, and something over a half a bed per thousand being cut, it is very easy to show how 4,500 beds are to be cut from the hospital system of this province according to the plans of the Minister of Health. The minister and his ministry have yet to come clean with communities across the province to say precisely how many beds

are going to be cut in Hamilton, how many here in Toronto, how many up in Ottawa.

[4:30]

We have managed to learn of certain cases where there are going to be very substantial cuts. In my reply in the throne speech debate a few days ago I spoke about what was happening in Geraldton, where 20 of the 45 beds in their hospital are going to be cut. I read into the record a letter from the physician who practises in the area. He said, and I quote: "A viable hospital is an important factor in determining the scope of service a physician can provide. Competent doctors will be very difficult to attract or to keep here, should the hospital be reduced to the status of a first-aid post." That is a small, isolated community 300 kilometres from Thunder Bay—the problems of which my friend from Port Arthur was speaking about just before me.

Mr. Hennessy: How about your friend in Fort William?

Mr. Cassidy: We know, in other words, that about 25 beds are due to be cut in Geraldton. But I understand that several hundred beds have to be cut in Hamilton and very substantial numbers of beds have to be cut in Toronto and other parts of the province. All we have had is "one shoe dropped." People don't know when the other shoe is going to be dropped, in terms of how many more beds are going to be cut and what impact that is going to have on the quality of health service across the province.

I do want to suggest, though, that if this cut—which is arbitrary and not being made on any medical basis that we can see—if the minister is set in this pattern then we will get down to 3.5 beds per 1,000 in southern Ontario by 1981. We will be down to three beds by 1984; to 2.5 beds by 1987; to two beds by 1990; and by the turn of the century, there won't be a hospital left open in the whole province.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's nonsense—unmitigated nonsense.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister says "nonsense." I presume that somewhere there is going to be a stopping point. But let it go on the record that from the statistics we have been able to gather from Statistics Canada, Ontario at the present time has the second lowest proportion of active-treatment hospital beds per thousand population of any province in Canada. Now, that's already very low, and for the minister to say there are medical grounds for suddenly, sharply and arbitrarily going down even further suggests to me

he is looking at his budget—but not at the quality of health care in Ontario.

As far as the workers are concerned, I met yesterday with some health-care workers in Windsor. I haven't the notes with me and I can't reproduce specifics, but they were telling me of 30 and 40 per cent cutbacks in the work force in specific hospitals because of the effective budget squeezing by the ministry up until now—before the further squeezing which is going to take place. I think the minister will accept there is at least one health-worker job for each hospital bed in Ontario; I believe the ratio tends to be a shade higher than that.

Not only that. When I met with the administrator and the medical director of the Welland General Hospital in Welland a few weeks ago they told me the minister had decreed that for this year their hospital, which is a very efficient one, is to have a cutback of 16 beds. The efficiency of the hospital and the fact that its per diem is far below some hospitals which may have conceivably a bit of fat to cut is not considered. They are finding that they have to cut a whole ward, or 29 beds. Even then, they will be \$210,000 short of the overall cutbacks that the ministry wants to achieve.

If that holds true across the province—and I have heard other hospitals tell the same story—then what we will be seeing over the course of the next couple of years is not 4,500 beds being cut, not 12 per cent of the hospital beds in the province being cut, but a much higher proportion. How, I ask, can the quality of hospital care be maintained in that case: when we have never had a plan for health and hospital care in Ontario; when we have never had any rational ordering of priorities to ensure that services are available in the community before these savage cutbacks take place.

The health-care workers I met in Windsor told me a very troubling story. They said: "Our hospital used to be a happy place." Everybody understands that if you have a happy hospital it is a healing hospital as well, because if people are happy, that will be transmitted to the patients.

Mr. Wildman: Is that your solution?

Mr. Hennessy: It's yours.

Mr. Cassidy: Half the art of medicine is psychological, not just medical. But now they say the tension and the pressure have transmitted themselves right down to the people who make the salads and do the work in the dietary facilities in their particular hospitals.

They told me stories about how workers are under such pressure now because of the cutbacks already in place, even before the latest round, that they are having to take sick days in order to get their act together, they are feeling such pressure. They tell me that when a worker is sick, that worker isn't replaced, so the pressure on the colleagues who remain at work is increased. When workers go off for pregnancy or take a holiday they are not replaced, so other people have to cover up for that particular job.

They are telling me that among health-care workers in Windsor the number of compensation cases for people whose backs are injured from lifting without the aid of the second person who used to be there, is on the increase. They are telling me of head nurses in wards who are bursting into tears because of the difficulties they are having in order to try to provide adequate care.

They were telling me yesterday of older employees in the hospital who may have 10 or 12 more useful years ahead of them in providing care, dedicated conscientious people who have been working there for many years, who are now considering or, in fact, taking early retirement because they can't hack it any more because of the kinds of pressures that they are coming under. They are telling me of tensions which are transmitted from support workers to nurses, from nurses to doctors. You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that if people are under that kind of pressure it is going to be translated into pressure on the patients, and if the patients are feeling the pressure, there is no way those hospitals can be healthy healing places where people get better.

They were telling me that in the chronic-care facilities there seems to be an increase in the incidence of bedsores because there is not enough staff to ensure that the people in those facilities are getting turned frequently enough and are being looked after adequately.

Let me give the House another example. My colleague Mac Makarchuk will talk about Brantford. My colleague Jim Foulds has talked about Thunder Bay. In the throne speech debate I talked about the enormous number of hospitals, in the southwest and in northwestern and northeastern Ontario, which are registering not just zero increases this year but have to endure very sharp bed cutbacks in areas where there is absolutely no alternative available, where the options the minister says should be available to the people who are consumers of health care are clearly not going to be available.

My colleague the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) will talk about the problems there where the minister didn't consult any kind of a hospital planning council before he closed the Lakeshore Hospital, he just acted arbitrarily. A letter from the Goderich Medical Centre to the Minister of Health reads: "I would beg you to read this letter on my enclosed chief of staff's report which has been appropriately underlined. The bed situation at Alexandra Marine and General Hospital is serious and if the bed cuts go through as proposed by the Ministry of Health we will be confronting a dangerous and potentially lethal situation." Dangerous and potentially lethal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: I will just be 30 seconds more. The minister bridled the other day when my colleague from Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) raised the case of a 78-year-old patient who was sent away from hospital because there wasn't room in the emergency facility and who subsequently died. The physician who did the autopsy put the blame on the cutbacks. He put the blame directly on the cutback policy of this minister. It is not just my colleague raising this, it's doctors themselves.

Mr. Deputy Speaker. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: People are consistently being backed up in the emergency ward—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order, order.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at how quickly history repeats itself within this government and more particularly within the Ministry of Health. It seems to me that three years ago I, along with many of my colleagues, pleaded with the Minister of Health—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond, if I may, on a point of privilege. I had hoped I would have been asked earlier in the day—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: What is the privilege? What is the point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The privilege, sir, is the allegation that somebody knowingly let somebody go away and die because of some policy of a hospital or the ministry. The fact of the matter is my staff did investigate the matter for me and informed me it was a case where the attending physician felt the individual was well enough to go home and not requiring—

Mr. McClellan: We'll see what the inquest says.

Mr. Cassidy: We'll see what the inquest says.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We will, sir. But let's let the inquest do that; let's not have members prejudge it; shall we?

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege?

Mr. Warner: He's abusing the rules of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I don't believe you raised that question.

Mr. Cooke: I raised the question the other day. I originally raised it in this Legislature.

I would like to point out that this caucus is not prejudging that particular incident. Dr. Broadwell, the coroner in the city of Windsor, stated the following in the Windsor Star; referring to my comments that the policies of this ministry are causing people to die in this province, he said the following: "Dr. Broadwell, in a telephone interview, said: 'Good for him, I think he's right,' when told of Cooke's comment." Those were Dr. Boardwell's comments, not ours.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I was referring to the comments of the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, since I raised this just now and the minister was responding to it: I met yesterday with a patient whom I believe was at Hotel Dieu or Metropolitan General Hospital in Windsor on January 19. That night when she had to be taken into the emergency ward there were six people stacked up overnight in the out-patients and eight people stacked up in the emergency ward itself; and that, surely, prejudices a doctor's decision about whether or not—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This is becoming a debate.

Mr. Roy: That's right.

Mr. Cassidy: That's what we are here for.

Mr. Riddell: Before I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister of Health, I was alluding to how quickly history repeats itself in this government and within the ministry.

It seems to me that three years ago I, along with many of my colleagues, pleaded with the Minister of Health to find other ways of cutting the ministry's expenditures without having to employ the heavy-handed tactics of closing hospitals. With the aid of the courts we were successful in keeping the hospitals open, with the exception of two psychiatric hospitals which were owned by the province. I would hope the minister and his officials have had an opportunity to assess the tre-

mendous error they made in closing these facilities.

Whether it was due to sheer spite, knowing that the ministry had no authority to close the hospitals, or due to a determined effort to cut the budget at any cost, the minister now appears to be accomplishing the same mission by reducing the number of hospital beds to a point where the hospitals will find it very difficult to continue the provision of a much-needed high quality service, or even to operate.

I don't think I need to tell you Mr. Speaker, the tremendous impact that the policy statement of the ministry has had in the riding I represent. I'm sure the minister has been deluged, as I have, with letters from Goderich and surrounding areas. They aren't just ordinary letters from constituents. They are letters filled with fear and frustration. Many of these letters are from senior citizens who are terrified of becoming sick and immobile, with no place to go and no one to take care of them.

In their letters, some of them suggest that society, due to the actions of this government, is moving closer and closer to legislation that would permit euthanasia. Men and women growing old in Huron county after a life of struggle and care, are actually living in fear that they will be reduced to little more than bothersome burdens, without dignity or respect. Surely the most fitting word to describe this is sad.

Not only have there been large public meetings in both the Wingham and Goderich areas over the ministry's proposals, but the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) and I, along with our health critic, visited both the Wingham and Goderich hospitals over a week ago to talk to the grass roots of Ontario about the delivery of health-care services.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we got an earful. If the senior citizens in Goderich and area are frightened by the trends in health care across the province, the doctors in the community are even more afraid. They made it amply clear that the Ontario Ministry of Health, and the Minister of Health, along with his civil servants, are playing a numbers game that is purely political. The government is attempting to eat into the large deficit which it has accumulated over the years. The Minister of Health has decided to reduce hospital beds for no other reason than to meet a budget which was struck by his ministry officials.

The minister came up with a formula of 3.5 beds per 1,000 referral population. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is making a serious mistake when endeavour-

ing to base health care on a formula. You simply cannot formulate health care.

It is obvious that the government doesn't care about who will suffer from the bed cuts; and I think that is a sad commentary indeed.

A number of my constituents have met with ministry officials, and the first question that was asked of them was, "What in the world is going on in Goderich? The only letters we seem to be getting are from the Goderich area." It's obvious from this debate today that this is simply not true. But if apathy does exist in certain areas of the province, it may be that so much has been happening on the health-care scene lately that people don't really recognize the implication of the bed-cutting edict.

[4:45]

In Goderich's Alexandra Marine and General Hospital, a community hospital providing nearly 90 per cent of all the required medical services for the people who live in the area, and a hospital that has just come through one of the most rigid and strenuous cost-cutting exercises anywhere in Ontario, the bed cuts are a hardship and a terrible hardship. What's more, it is dangerous. Doctors at Alexandra Marine and General Hospital have become unbelievably scared, because they have been trying to mix patients inappropriately, breaking the rules of good medical practices and squeezing the situation so tightly as to invite disaster. The doctors using the facilities of the Alexandra Marine and General Hospital have looked at other ways of running the hospital, but they don't really have any idea of what the costs will be.

For instance, day-care surgery has gone away up at AM and G recently, and probably will continue to climb. There is a whole list of surgical procedures which are approved for a day-care surgery unit. It means the patients are brought into the hospital in the morning, the operations are done, the operating and recovery room staff take care of them for the day, and in the evening the unit is cleared of staff and patients. Everyone goes home.

Doctors are looking more and more to home care for patients in Huron county, but the home-care program is limited to a very restrictive set of criteria. Not every patient qualifies for the program that gets people out of hospital and into their homes where the medical treatment continues under OHIP funds. The services of the Victorian Order of Nurses and the staff of the Huron county health unit are also possible alternatives to in-hospital care for some patients, but prov-

incial funding for these services hasn't increased sufficiently to expect them to accept any increased load.

There may indeed be other ways of coping with the reduced hospital bed situation, but many of the programs aren't in place in Huron county, as they are in some other counties, and really don't provide a viable alternative. The reason such programs are not in place is that the government has refused to fund such things as additional nursing homes in places like Goderich.

In all due respect, the ministry itself understands some of this conundrum and has provided small hospitals with a 10-bed float during the switch-over period, but this isn't of much use to AM and G. This hospital has been on a tight money-saving regime for months, trying to make up a deficit, and will pay a fine of \$60,000 for having more beds open than the ministry guidelines decree. AM and G can't afford to run a 10-bed float. We in Goderich are really quite bitter about the penalties imposed by the ministry for being over-bedded.

We believe the penalties are not legal, and it would not surprise me if there was a move afoot to take the ministry to court on this matter. It might well be that the ministry has no right to penalize hospitals and withhold funds. It is very difficult for people to understand that on the one hand AM and G got an overwhelming vote of confidence when it received a three-year accreditation recently, and on the other hand the hospital gets hit for a \$60,000 penalty. Somehow we have to maintain good care in spite of it all.

But there is even more to fear. No one knows what further penalties will be imposed by the ministry. Alexandra Marine and General Hospital simply cannot afford any more budget surprises this year, next year or any time. The ministry has decreed that for 1979 four beds per 1,000 referral population will be approved. That computes to 43 active treatment beds for AM and G. In 1980 that number will drop to 3.5 beds per 1,000 referral population, or 37 beds for AM and G. It is understood that the bed allocation will be approved annually by the ministry and that the only way to increase the hospital's bed allocation will be to document an increase in the referral population. This we think we can do, and I am pleased that the minister has agreed to meet a delegation from the Goderich and Wingham area to discuss this very matter.

It is the referral population that is concerning all of us in the Goderich area, including the community doctors and the

hospital boards. Board members have been in the ministry office time and time again to ask questions and to express concern. Until recently, board members and doctors felt they were not getting the number of beds to which they were actually entitled under the ministry's own guidelines.

Just a short time ago it was explained to the board that the ministry accepted 10,032 as the referral population for AM and G, while the hospital board had assumed from its calculation that the referral population was 14,581. The administrator of AM and G Hospital said it was an honest mistake on the board's part. He said the board was adding in 4,549 referral population for obstetrics based on cases discharged from the hospital, but for ministry purposes the obstetrics population was included in the 15-to-44 age group referral population, and the board isn't quite satisfied that this is fair. The population allowed by the ministry for the 15-to-44 age group is 4,603; that is both men and women.

By the ministry's own calculations, the referral population includes 4,549 for obstetrical services only, which shows that some women are using AM and G when they have their babies and other hospitals for all other medical procedures. The delegation which has spoken to ministry officials on a number of occasions finds it is futile to dispute the ministry statistics, but it still has some doubts about the referral population figures and doesn't seem to be able to get satisfactory answers to that.

The doctors have even more doubts. The doctors say the referral population is based on 1977-78 referral patterns and there seems to be little argument these referral patterns have changed drastically within the last year or so.

Practically the entire medical staff in Goderich has changed since these referral patterns were established and the board agrees. Whereas doctors who formerly practised in Goderich often sent their patients out of town for medical care, doctors in Goderich now prefer to treat their patients themselves in the local hospitals. This creates a greater need for hospital beds at the Alexandra Marine and General Hospital.

In a question I posed in the Legislature, I expressed the concern that the ministry has not taken into account the fact that Goderich is a tourist town, and as such has an increased population in the summer months. I have seen figures which would substantiate a claim that the summer population in the area swells by 9,311 persons in

the area including Goderich and surrounding townships and villages.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Riddell: I could go on for some time, and I intend to do so when I reply to the throne speech, but suffice to say at this time that the government, in my way of thinking, stands to be condemned for its policies reflecting its philosophy: the survival of the fittest.

Mr. Wildman: Then support our no-confidence motion.

Mr. Laughren: I am worried about the Liberals' restraint package.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: I would like to—

Mr. Acting Speaker: I am sorry, the member for Peterborough. I was looking on that side and didn't see anybody standing. The member for Peterborough has priority.

Mr. Turner: I apologize for my diminutive size, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McClellan: Tell us about Peterborough; tell us about health care in Peterborough.

Mr. Laughren: Tell us about how many doctors have opted out in Peterborough, John.

Mr. Turner: I can tell the member the figures are not what he is quoting.

An hon. member: They are only half as bad.

Mr. Turner: They are not even close. He knows that and he is deliberately distorting.

Mr. Cooke: We have seen your articles in the Peterborough paper.

Mr. McClellan: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. Mr. Speaker, you will ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Eaton: He didn't name anybody.

Mr. Turner: I didn't name anybody.

Mr. Acting Speaker: You don't tell the Speaker what he is going to do until he has a chance to consider it. What is the remark that you want withdrawn?

Mr. McClellan: He said we were deliberately distorting.

Mr. Eaton: He didn't name anyone.

Mr. Wildman: Oh, so he can generally state it, is that it?

Mr. Acting Speaker: As I recall, he said the figures you were using were wrong, and I think that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. McClellan: And that we were deliberately distorting them, is what he said.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I don't recall him saying deliberately distorting them.

Mr. Makarchuk: You had better withdraw, John.

Mr. Turner: Why? I am all the time. That is one of my problems, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Laughren: Either withdraw or take off those glasses.

Mr. Turner: I can't comply with the member's request, Mr. Speaker, because I have lost my reading glasses and I must rely on these.

Mr. M. Davidson: We know you are the member for Peterborough now.

Mr. Turner: That is firmly established. It is interesting that the Ministry of Health is probably mentioned now in more headlines than I suppose any other ministry in government. The subject of health care has obviously become a matter of debate throughout the whole of our society, and I would suggest it is an interesting paradox.

On the one hand the people of Ontario are satisfied with the health care they are receiving. According to a survey, fully 84 per cent of people have indicated the level of health care they are receiving is acceptable or satisfactory to them. I would have to say, as a politician, there is some comfort in numbers of that kind.

We also have endorsements from other jurisdictions, particularly from our friends to the south of us who wish they had a health care system such as ours.

Mr. M. Davidson: You haven't got anything; you are going to endorse something.

Mr. Turner: On the other side of the equation there are some interesting factors involved. Hospital administrators are upset that we are limiting their increases to a four-and-a-half per cent figure. The Ontario Medical Association is concerned about the level of income for their physicians, and the consumers have indicated very clearly that they are concerned about the rising cost of living, as we all are. It is the concern for money, I suppose, that has been focusing attention on health care on the front pages of our newspapers, and I would suggest that it is the cost, rather than the quality or the amount of service, that people are concerned about.

Basically, it is fair to say, the people within the health-care system want more money than has been budgeted for them. The ministry and the taxpayers want restraints. So obviously there is a difference of opinion. But

some misconceptions are developing, and I think they should be clarified. I think there has been perhaps some exaggeration. We hear people talking about cutbacks and restraints—and undoubtedly we are in a period of restraint—however, it is interesting to note that the Ministry of Health figures this year will increase by 8.1 per cent.

Mr. Laughren: Did the member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy) write this speech?

Mr. Turner: No. I would suggest that increase is considerably more than the increase that has been allowed for social services, education, government administration or support to local governments. Quite obviously, health has not ceased to be a priority of this government, and it will not.

What really lies behind the headlines and the debates about the cutbacks and the spending restraints is a fundamental shift in our approach to health. In its simplest terms—and I do not want to be accused of oversimplifying it—the strategy is to take money out of some of the traditional high-cost areas and to shift these resources to new priorities such as community health, home-care and chronic home-care programs.

Mr. Wildman: Where are the chronic-care beds then?

Mr. Laughren: A long silence.

Mr. Turner: Not really. That is one of the things that is happening: Beds are being redesignated and will be used for chronic care.

I would suggest that an analysis of health spending yields three important conclusions.

First, the general level of health in our province is not rising as quickly as our expenditures for it. We are experiencing diminishing returns on our health-care dollars, and this would indicate that perhaps we are spending our money in the wrong places.

Second, quite obviously society is changing; we are getting older. The health-care system is not oriented towards the treatment of degenerative and chronic illnesses which now are on the increase. Thus, quite clearly, we find patients in intensive-care facilities designed to treat acute illnesses who really need physiotherapy, counselling or housekeeping assistance.

Finally, we have to recognize that we have not made enough progress in prevention. Medical research increasingly points to the fact that many of our diseases are preventable or controllable if we can simply learn to lead more intelligent life styles. It makes no sense to continue spending more and more money to fix up the problem when we can prevent it in the first place and, I would suggest, with-

out the pain and suffering created by unnecessary illness.

Thus, we are not exercising restraint simply because we want to cut spending; this is an important consideration, but it is not the whole story. And I would like to emphasize that it is not because we lack resources; there is enough money to go around. It is just that we believe now that spending more on hospitals is not the best way to improve the system.

There is no question that building acute-care hospitals has had some real benefits. There's no question that providing these health-care resources has been of great benefit to the various communities. But, as I mentioned before, the population is changing. We cannot continue to make progress if we continue our apparent love affair with high-technology hospitals and acute, in-patient hospital care.

[5:00]

I would emphasize that our target is not a healthy system but in fact a healthy population and that's why we have developed a strategy to restructure the health system in Ontario. Quite obviously, we are de-emphasizing hospital care. I mentioned that earlier. We continue to budget more money for these institutions but we are also redirecting funds to develop less-intensive facilities and forms of care such as chronic-care facilities, as I mentioned before.

Mr. Laughren: Where are they? Where are they?

Mr. Turner: Floyd, you know as well as I do, they have been mentioned many times: day surgery clinics—somebody mentioned that on that other side—day hospitals and out-patient services.

Mr. Laughren: Ask the member from Timmins. Ask the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Pope). Boy oh boy, send them from Timmins to Peterborough; what a joke.

Mr. Turner: These developments, I would suggest, reflect the fact you don't have to be a passive patient occupying an acute-care hospital bed having your every need attended to to receive effective treatment.

Mr. Wildman: You need a chronic-care bed if you are going to move.

Mr. Turner: The alternatives I mentioned are needed to treat degenerative disease, which is relatively unresponsive to high-care intensive hospital care.

Mr. Laughren: Quit while you are losing.

Mr. Turner: Secondly, disease prevention and community health programs are being expanded. We are moving towards creating

a uniform province-wide standard for community health because we recognize this is the best and most cost effective way to improve the general level of health. Thirdly, we are promoting the concept of individual responsibility for health. We believe so-called self care holds enormous untapped potential for improving the health of the people in this province. The other day I read an interesting report by Dr. Robert Levy who is director of the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute in the United States. He says if the rate of death in 1976 had been the same as it was in 1968, 164,000 more Americans would have died. His conclusion is based on the number of people who would have died from heart attacks and strokes had they not made significant changes in the lifestyles they had been leading in the past decade.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Turner: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The member for Peterborough said the people of Ontario are satisfied with health care. Today, the people of Ontario from one community delivered to the minister a petition with 20,000 names which were collected in less than two weeks, saying they are not satisfied with the health care. I have a feeling the people who signed that petition are more accurate and know more about what it's all about than the member for Peterborough.

I would like to get into this debate to point out to the Minister of Health and to the members here exactly how they go about implementing some of their decisions. In Brantford, the local health council called a meeting on a Wednesday night. The meeting went on for two and a half hours of steady droning by officials from the ministry. After the droning was over the message came across that they were going to close St. Joseph's Hospital and make it into a chronic care facility. There were a lot of people who were upset. They wanted to ask questions. They wanted to find out. They were denied absolutely any opportunity to question the report, or question the officials.

That's the way they operate. They ram it down the throats. We had a member before known as the great McKeough. Remember him? Every time he got up, the guys used to shudder. I think the feeling is developing. I notice when the Minister of Health was

sitting over there, there seemed to be the cordon sanitaire around him that used to exist around McKeough when he brought in that OHIP budget.

Remember those days when the Attorney General said: "It's not my budget, it's his"? The Premier (Mr. Davis) had to get a solidarity group together there for a while. I think the same thing is going to happen with the Minister of Health. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) is saying right now that obviously Timbrell doesn't know what he's doing. I have a feeling the Premier is going to call the boys into the back shed and have another chat about sticking together on the situation.

The Minister of Health gets up in this House day in and day out and says all the beds are available, despite the fact doctors, people and everybody else cannot find beds for the people in hospitals at this time. He says there are beds. I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of how good the bed service isn't in Ontario.

There was a mental patient in Brantford who had enough sense to realize he was suffering an acute attack and he needed to go into hospital. He contacted the hospitals or his doctor; they could not place him in the hospital because there were no beds. He contacted the hospital in Hamilton; there were no beds. He contacted the police; there were no beds. Finally, in desperation, this man got into his car, drove down to the local OPP station and demolished their fleet. After he had demolished their fleet, they found him a bed.

That is the health-care service of Ontario; there is an example of what the people opposite are doing.

Regarding the Brantford situation, something the minister and his group failed to realize is the fact that we have two hospitals, but one of them, St. Joseph's, which the ministry plans to close, is situated next to an industrial area in which some 5,000 or 6,000 people are employed. It is convenient; it is adjacent to the industrial area. Having an emergency department close to an industrial area is very necessary. Everybody would agree to that, maybe even the minister.

Other factors are involved. The minister uses the population in the Brant county area of about 98,000 population. But he does not recognize the fact that the hospitals in Brantford receive patients from Norfolk, from Haldimand, from Oxford and from Wentworth. These people also come and feed into the Brantford system. But this is not taken into account in a decision when he goes about with his "cookie cutter," as someone

described it earlier, and chops off the beds and chops everything else.

It should also be recognized that there is a good deal of opinion and medical research available now pointing out that if you have a hospital with other services than chronic care—it doesn't necessarily have to have all the services, but it does have other services; it has an emergency; it has an operating theatre—this kind of hospital operates better, provides better service for chronic-care people, provides better service generally all around. This is a factor that should receive great consideration from the minister and his officials when they try, as they have been attempting in Brantford, to close down the hospitals.

The assumption is that there are hundreds and hundreds of people in hospitals lolling about in the beds; just lying there. I challenge any member here in the House to name one. I challenge any member to name one patient he knows who is lying around in the hospital just because he or she likes to lie around.

Something the minister forgets to recognize is the fact that they have admission committees, they have discharge committees. In some cases, they may fall down on their jobs. In some cases, there may be some influence on the part of the doctor to ensure he has nine, 10 or 15 patients in the hospital so that when he comes through on his royal tour in the morning he can bill for nine, 10 or 15 patients for saying "Hello." That is a well-paying business. But if you have a proper administration and if you have the committee set up, this should not be a problem.

No amount of computer input, or whoever uses a crystal ball in the back room, or something like that, can decide exactly or specifically how many beds should be there. The only way one could really decide on that is by knowing whether the beds are being used, used to capacity and the people in there need to be in there. Then, obviously, you have to keep that hospital open because you can't play around with human lives. It was mentioned by my colleague the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh): How high must the body count be before the minister changes his mind?

We have mentioned the one incident in Windsor. There was another incident in Brantford that involves a coroner's inquest right now, a very similar situation. How many more do we have to go through before the minister starts looking at this thing from a human, sensible, point of view?

I want to conclude by pointing out to the minister that the doctors in Brant county disagree with him. In fact, one of the doctors on the health committee, who decided to express his views publicly, was chastized by the health committee: "You should not say these things." The man was concerned that they are demolishing the health system here. He put a letter in the paper and the local health council immediately sent a letter to Timbrell dissociating itself and then sent a letter to the doctor criticizing him for speaking out for his community.

That brings into mind just what kind of people are on the health council. Mind you, a lot of them are old Tory hacks. I can understand they do have their political biases and they do have the intentions to protect the minister. But somewhere those of us who are not Tory hacks have some concern about the community, and sometimes we wish that some of the Tory hacks we have on some of these committees would show some concern for the communities.

I suggest in conclusion that doctors say the minister is wrong, the people have said the minister is wrong, and it is damned near time the minister started to listen.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments in this debate because Huron county, and particularly the Wingham hospital which I represent and which is in my constituency, are greatly concerned about this matter.

It has been mentioned this afternoon that the hospital bed-cutting program isn't a program that is generating universal concern across the province and that is quite true. It is not doing so for a very good reason I suspect—perhaps a number of reasons. One of the reasons was alluded to by my colleague the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell). The other reason I suspect is that a number of hospitals in Ontario are currently operating at the 3.5 beds per thousand level or below, and approximately 50 hospital centres are already at the 4.0 bed per thousand level which is the guideline applicable for 1979-80. So those hospitals that are already at the 3.5 or even at the 4.0 level certainly won't be greatly concerned and raising any sort of a fuss at this time because they are really not being affected.

But I repeat that in my community there is a lot of concern, particularly as it relates to the Wingham hospital. There are concerns on the part of the workers who are afraid of losing their jobs—a legitimate concern. There are concerns on the part of the medical staff. The medical staff feel that their ability to treat patients and their ability to deliver a

first-class health-care system in the community are going to be somewhat limited and interfered with if they don't have the active-treatment beds to which they can refer patients in need.

There are concerns expressed by senior citizens who fear that when they get sick there won't be a bed in the hospital available for them. There are concerns expressed by the community generally—legitimate concerns—that once the ministry enacts its program of this particular bed cut three or four years down the road there will be another cut and eventually the small, rural hospitals will be reduced to a level that really won't be economical in terms of operation.

I was at a hospital meeting last night in Goderich—my colleague was there as well and he alluded to it—where one of the medical staff said that in his view a hospital that doesn't have at least 30 active-treatment beds cannot be operated efficiently. There is a great fear that the ministry will just gradually cut back and ultimately say to some of these smaller rural hospitals, "I'm sorry, you only have 20 or 25 active-treatment beds, you are no longer operating efficiently, you are too small." And so the hospitals will go by the board in favour of a larger, centralized operation.

Mr. Riddell: That is what you call coming in the back door to close hospitals.

Mr. Gaunt: That's right. I think my colleague is right. The government wasn't able to do it via the hospital closure route and now it is attempting another measure in effect to accomplish the same thing. That is the fear that is being expressed.

Mr. Cooke: Closure by instalment.

[5:15]

Mr. Gaunt: Closure by instalment. I think there are some fears, particularly on the part of medical staff who have come from England and who have seen their system operate over there and fear that the same thing is happening here. The same sort of program evolved and eventually they got themselves into a real dilemma in terms of health care delivery, where even for a gall bladder operation a person has to wait for a year in some cases.

Let me cite some figures applicable to the Wingham hospital for the period April 1, 1978 to December 31, 1978 in respect to the use of active treatment beds. My colleague has dealt with the Goderich situation. Both of us are concerned about that as well, even though it isn't in my riding, because there are people in my riding who are referred to the Goderich hospital. We really have major

concerns with respect to both hospitals, but my colleague having dealt with the Goderich situation I will concentrate on Wingham for a moment, if I may.

First of all, those 65 years of age and over constituted 30.6 per cent of all the patients admitted during that period to which I made reference. There were 677 admitted for a total of 8,089 hospital days, which was 49.2 per cent of the total hospital days. The average length of stay was 11.9 days.

For those under 65, there were 1,536 patients admitted. They constituted 69.4 per cent of all patients and represented 8,343 hospital days out of a total of 16,432 active-treatment hospital days. In other words, of the total admissions for active treatment, 30 per cent were in the age bracket of 65 or over but constituted 50 per cent of the total hospital days.

At present, there are 33 long-term or chronic patients over 65 in the hospital, even though there are only 18 designated chronic beds in the Wingham hospital. In addition, there are six chronic patients under 65, for a total of 39 chronic patients but only 18 designated chronic beds.

The point I am making is that the hospital needs more chronic care beds than we presently have because the population makeup in Huron is well above the provincial average insofar as people 65 years of age and over are concerned. As a matter of fact, Huron is 50 per cent higher than the overall provincial average in that respect; 12.9 per cent of the people in Huron are 65 and over compared to the overall provincial average of 8.6 per cent.

There are only five counties in the entire province that have a higher percentage of aged population. In Bruce county, 13.3 per cent of the population are 65 years of age and over. There are only three counties in the province of Ontario that have a higher percentage of aged people. These figures, incidentally, are taken from the March 25, 1977 figures supplied by TEIGA.

Further, I should point out what is happening at Huronview, the county home for the aged. At the moment, there are 292 beds being occupied out of a total of 310. There are 148 patients who require extended bed care, which means that those who occupy those beds require at least one and a half hours of nursing care per day. 78 out of the 292 require some nursing care and only 66 are able to totally look after themselves. There are 27 on the waiting list. Of those, 14 will require bed or extended care while 11 can partially take care of themselves.

The point in all of this is that the home for the aged for practical purposes has now been turned into a chronic hospital. There should be more chronic hospital beds designated in the county and more nursing home beds approved to return the county home to its original purpose. The Ministry of Health has continually refused to grant any more nursing home beds in the county. We have made a plea on numerous occasions, year after year, but consistently the ministry turns the applications down. The need is there and can be shown, and I hope the ministry responds accordingly.

Surely in an area as important as health care the ministry has to be sensitive and alert to the needs of every community across the province. Obviously there is difficulty in applying a policy uniformly and universally across the province because there are differences in communities, there are differences in population makeup, there are differences in the degrees of hospital efficiency across this province, and those matters should be taken into account.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that those matters, up until now, have not been taken into account. The Wingham hospital, for instance, has come in under budget on three successive occasions, the latest of which is this year.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I just conclude by saying that the minister has indicated to me in a letter dated March 16 this year that reclassification of surplus active beds to chronic care will be considered in those areas where there is a demonstrated need. In my view we can demonstrate that need and I hope the ministry responds accordingly. Not only do we need to maintain our active treatment beds, but we need more designation of chronic beds as well.

Mr. Hennessy: I rise concerning the district of Thunder Bay. I am greatly concerned about the cutting of hospital beds. I have not before had as many calls, as many people who were concerned about an issue as they are about this one. If you live in a remote area far from major places of medical attention, if you happen to live up in northwestern Ontario and realize the long distance between various towns and municipalities, you then come to appreciate what it is to be a northwestern Ontario resident. It is very, very difficult to reach one area from another, especially if medical attention is seriously needed. You have difficulty maybe with air transportation—because of the

weather it might not be feasible. At various times the weather changes within 50 miles' radius with a large snowstorm between different towns.

I can't buy the idea of cutting back beds. In all sincerity I cannot buy it. Even being a member of the government, I just cannot buy it as a human being.

Mr. Riddell: Come on over, Mickey.

Mr. Hennessy: No, this side is still better. With all due respect, we all have our own thinking. I feel that I would not be fair to myself if I was just to agree it's right financially; in a humanitarian way it's not right. When you have somebody in a hospital, Mr. Speaker, whether it be a mother, father, sister, brother, a relative, whoever it might be, there is nothing that leaves a more lasting impression than the medical care and attention they receive. You also consider in your mind whether you got in there soon enough, or were you too late, or did you do the right thing. I think the members know what I am talking about when I talk in this vein.

When you have to go to a hospital and be put in a hallway to wait overnight to receive a bed, it does make the person wonder—it does make the people, the parents, whoever it may be, wonder—about the welfare of the people who are there. I guess it is very nerve-racking, because when you are sick you do a lot of thinking, you have a lot of time to think.

I am concerned about the possible loss of jobs. The economic condition is not that good. There are many people who are working in hospitals who could possibly lose their jobs after 15 or 20 years of employment, people who maybe do not have much of a bankroll stashed away, if you want to put it that way; or who don't have many benefits in regard to a pension fund and therefore would be more or less destitute and perhaps spend their remaining years in poverty, to some extent.

I am greatly concerned and, as I mentioned to you before, there is the problem of the long distances involved. I think that the lack of chronic-care hospitals or beds in Thunder Bay is like putting the cart before the horse.

We mentioned the other day at a hospital meeting I was at with my colleague the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) and the members of the hospital board, and I'm very pleased to say this, that a meeting has been arranged for this coming Tuesday with the mayor and council, the hospital boards and the Thunder Bay District Health Council, along with the local representatives. The

Minister of Health and his colleagues no doubt will be there. I hope that something satisfactory can be arranged through sensible dialogue between all parties concerned. I don't think any ranting, or any yelling and shouting, is going to solve the problem. I think if we sit down with people who know something about the medical situation in Thunder Bay perhaps we can come to a suitable arrangement. I sincerely hope so.

Knowing the long waiting period, one can understand the anxiety that is experienced by people in Thunder Bay who have somebody who is sick and are worried about whether they can get to a hospital to receive medical attention—particularly when you realize that Winnipeg is 450 miles from Thunder Bay and in between, from Kenora on, you have to go either to Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba, or to Thunder Bay, for major surgery. Even when you look to Manitowadge and White River, you're still talking about 200 miles or 300 miles which you have to travel. It's very difficult.

Before I became an esteemed politician—if you want to call it that—I was a liquor salesman.

Mr. Ruston: Oh you are very esteemed, Mickey; sure you are.

Mr. Hennessy: I'm talking about you fellows too.

I was a liquor salesman and I had to travel those routes in the wintertime. Even at the best of times, coming from Red Lake was no prize. I almost got killed a few times. I still think to this day that it was the Liberals who were trying to kill me, with all due respect to Bob Nixon.

To get back to the subject—

Mr. Kerrio: That's why you were a Liberal, eh Mickey?

Mr. Hennessy: That's right, a black one.

Mr. Wildman: Black and blue.

Mr. Hennessy: I would hope that this situation can be rectified to some extent.

I hope that money for maybe a sewer or a road is not as important as the life of a person who depends on the medical attention they may receive—whether it's a woman or a man or a child, a boy or girl. That's the last stage in life, when you're going to a hospital and everything depends on whether you will have the right attention and whether the facilities will be available for you.

I think that medical facilities should be made available. After all, you're dead a long time. There's lots of sorrow left behind when a person departs from this world, perhaps through no proper facilities being available

or the right precautions taken. As far as I'm concerned, I would very much like this meeting on Tuesday to produce more chronic-bed care so perhaps we can make more beds available in the hospitals in the city of Thunder Bay.

Mr. Wildman: I rise to participate in this debate because of a concern for the problems we have in northern Ontario in terms of hospital beds. I appreciate the comments of the previous speaker because we know the feeling he has and I understand the difficult position he finds himself in.

We have today a very serious situation in northern Ontario, and even the government is aware of it. When you consider studies that have been done by this government—for instance the health policy evaluation study, in part of the review for the "Design for Development in Northwestern Ontario" two or three years ago, where the government was told the death rates, particularly violent deaths and infant mortality, are much higher in northwestern Ontario than they are throughout the rest of the province. When you consider that, one has to wonder why we are cutting services. It seems to me we should be increasing services, not cutting them.

Members might argue that hospital services won't deal with these major problems, but until we have more community-based services in place it doesn't make sense to cut the active-treatment care facilities we have now. As the previous speaker said, we seem to be putting the cart before the horse.

[5:30]

If one argues, as the parliamentary assistant did, that we need more chronic care, we had better provide that before we cut the active-treatment beds. We can't do it the other way around.

The study I referred to a moment ago pointed out that in northwestern Ontario we have a shortage of chronic-care and nursing-home beds, as well as psychiatric-care beds. When you consider that we have the shortage already, and the distances that are involved in my own riding, in the northern part of Algoma, we are having a terrible time attracting doctors. This is a problem throughout the province. Unless we can provide adequate services, we are going to have an even more difficult time. Even when you have those facilities, it is sometimes difficult to attract doctors; if you do not have them, it is even more difficult.

We have to take into account the geographic factors in northern Ontario. If the government cuts hospital beds in Thunder

Bay or in the small hospitals throughout the northwest, with the result that there just are not beds available, people are going to have to travel much greater distances if they need care. We cannot accept that.

The government might argue that the 10-bed cushion it has given to small northern rural hospitals this year is dealing with that kind of flexibility. Frankly, I do not think it is good enough, because we do not know what is going to happen next year. Are these hospitals to continue having a 10-bed cushion or is it going to be denied next year? If it is going to be denied next year, are we going to be able to maintain viable hospital services?

The problem that a small hospital has, unlike a larger one, is that it cannot cut a ward, because it has only one ward. How do you cut a ward? You cannot lay off a technician, because you have only one technician. You cannot lay off nurses, because you only have enough to provide the one service now.

If I feel emotional about this, it is because I have dealt with small hospitals which have difficult times now in attracting doctors and in providing the services necessary. And what do we have? The government is cutting budgets to them.

Just look at some of the things we see in northwestern Ontario. Look at Kenora, Rainy River and Fort Frances. For La Verendrye Hospital, there is no budget increase this year. For Red Lake, there is an increase of only 0.87 per cent in money this year. When you consider that, you wonder what happened to the Ministry of Health's commitment that hospitals with fewer than 50 beds would receive at least a 5.3 per cent increase. Those hospitals do not have more than 50 beds. Red Lake, for instance, has only 44 beds now, and yet it is getting a 0.87 per cent increase. Why is it not getting the 5.3 per cent? That is true also in Geraldton District Hospital, Manitouwadge General Hospital and Nipigon District Memorial Hospital. The first two are not receiving any increase this year, and Nipigon is getting 3.6 per cent. Well, 3.6 per cent is not 5.3 per cent. I would like an explanation from somebody on that side as to the reason for this.

Altogether, these six rural hospitals from Geraldton to Terrace Bay are receiving only a 2.8 per cent overall increase in funding this year. I know the Speaker is interested in this. I would like to hear an explanation. How does the government justify it?

Throughout the north we have this problem, of course. Cochrane is being hit par-

ticularly hard. If you consider Bingham Memorial Hospital in Matheson or Anson General Hospital in Iroquois Falls, they also qualify for a 5.3 per cent increase, and yet they are receiving a zero increase.

The eight hospitals in Cochrane district have been the hardest hit: 71 beds are to go next year, or 141 altogether, if the small-hospital allowance of 10 beds is not taken into account; and we do not know that it will not be next year.

I would like to have some explanation from the people on that side. When they started off with a 4.5-bed-per-1,000 ratio a few years ago, that was completely arbitrary. They could not justify it at that time; now they are cutting it, and they do not give any justification.

Overall, we are getting a 3.6 per cent increase in funding for this year in northern Ontario. That is a long way from the eight per cent that was mentioned by the parliamentary assistant. It is not enough to have a general bed formula where you say 4.5, 4, 3.5 or whatever number of beds per 1,000 for a geographic area, because when you talk about the districts in northern Ontario you are talking about a lot bigger area than the counties that were mentioned by our colleagues from southwestern Ontario; and they've got problems. If you don't have the beds in Hornpayne and you don't have beds in White River or Wawa or Geraldton, it's a hell of a long way to Thunder Bay or Sault Ste. Marie.

I would like some explanation from over there.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join this debate and to express the concerns of Four Counties Hospital at Newbury. This hospital is not in my riding. It is about four miles outside in the riding of the honourable member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton). It serves four counties. About 50 per cent of the patients, I believe, come from the two townships in Elgin that I represent, approximately 40 per cent from the county of Middlesex and approximately 10 per cent from Lambton.

A total of 15,950 days of care were given from January 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978. This is one of a group of seven small hospitals in southwestern Ontario coming under group nine in the hospital statistics. These are hospitals with from one to 49 beds.

I note that only two of this group of seven have no chronic beds. I visited the hospital last Friday and talked with the administrator and with the nurse administrator. They tell me they have not sought chronic beds in

the past because the area is well served with nursing homes.

In this hospital they do carry out a very extensive out-patient commitment. Their people go to the various nursing homes and assist them in their care of chronic patients so that they prevent bed sores and debilitating diseases such as those that result in rehabilitation care within the hospitals. So this hospital is going to the people.

While they do not require these chronic beds, or they have not in the past, they do require the finances to carry out this program. Now with the reduction of five beds, starting April 1 their budget is reduced by \$60,000. By 1981 they are supposed to go down to 19 beds so they would have only a total of 26. This brings up the point the honourable member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) brought up: when they reach that figure of 26, how economic will the hospital be? It will have lost economy of scale and will probably cease to exist; or at least the people certainly feel that.

This hospital has a somewhat different problem than those mentioned by other speakers. Their problem is not so much in active-treatment beds; their problem is a matter of having the finances to carry out their out-patient work.

I would mention that a number of years ago this hospital attracted a specialist from London who over the course of years attracted other specialists. Today we have people visiting the hospital on a daily basis—an eye man today, internist tomorrow, a bone specialist the next day and so on. These people come out from the city of London and do a great deal of their diagnostic work in that hospital, a hospital that operates on a cheaper per-bed item, than say in the city of London where some of these patients are eventually sent for very serious treatment. They receive the diagnostic evaluation in the smaller hospital because of these specialists coming out there. So they have a very active in-patient and out-patient program that is somewhat unique in the hospitals, so they tell me, in Ontario. This is carrying out, I believe, some of the aims of the ministry in that they talk of shifting from active-treatment beds to preventive medicine. This hospital has been carrying this out to a very high and excellent degree but the people find now that their finances are being threatened and they're very concerned.

Their occupancy rate is not as high as others that have been mentioned. It's about 80 per cent. They can possibly survive the five beds that they are going to lose on April 1, but they cannot survive the loss of money. I would point out, as others have

pointed out, that the people are proud of the hospital and they regard the assaults on their hospital as an assault on a small community. They ask, if the hospital is reduced to only 26 beds, if the hospital will survive.

I understand that the board has asked the ministry for a team of officials to visit and examine the total operation of the hospital. They have told me that the honourable member for Middlesex has indicated that such a team exists and we would certainly urge that if this is so that work go forward.

Mr. McClellan: Send one up to Cochrane too.

Mr. Eaton: All you have to do is work on it.

Mr. Kerrio: Just think, we've got a champion looking after your hospital, Bob.

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I've been sent a petition from just over 50 local people and I received many letters, which I have in my hand. I'd like to read you one letter which I think eloquently expresses the—

Mr. McClellan: How many people?

Mr. McGuigan: About 50; just over 50. I'd like to read a letter that eloquently expresses the feelings of the local people.

It says: "As your constituent, I am respectfully submitting the following concerns for your action. As you are aware, the budget for the Ministry of Health has included the cutback of services of various hospitals, including that of Four Counties, Newbury, which serves your constituents. As a previous patient of that hospital, as a present volunteer member of the auxiliary of that hospital"—and this person goes on to list many activities within the community—"I urge you to use all the political clout you possess to halt the present cutbacks of hospital services especially in the area you represent."

The writer asks: "Have you personally noted the list of consultants"—I did this last Friday—"outside the door of the emergency room at Four Counties? Have you noted the varieties of disciplines from which they come? Have you computed the miles of travel and hours of heartaches of your constituents that have been saved by these services? Do you know that surgeons from London, the best, who have performed operations at this hospital also return the next day to check on their patients? Do you know what the daughters of many of your constituents have served and are now serving as candy strippers daily in that hospital? Do you know that as of April 1, 1979, five beds will be unavailable to your constituents and that in future months many more will

be unavailable?" It just asks for acknowledgement of the letter, which I have done.

I would point out in closing that this hospital is somewhat different in its situation than others that have been mentioned but the people there have a very real concern for the quality of care that they can offer to their patients both in and without the hospital, and they have urged me, and I through you, Mr. Speaker, that the government seriously consider measures to maintain the very excellent services which this hospital has been able to perform.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to leave some time for another colleague of mine—

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Speaker, the rotation is going this way. We should be next.

Mr. Riddell: You really don't want to speak on Newbury, Bob, do you?

[5:45]

Mr. Eaton: Oh, yes, I do. I would like to continue and add a few remarks to what the member for Kent-Elgin has said in regard to Four Counties General Hospital because it is a very fine hospital and performs an excellent service in the community and will continue to perform that service.

Mr. Kerrio: Even if they have no beds.

Mr. Eaton: I suppose I reacted rather hastily, as I usually can when something like that comes up, and I expressed a few strong feelings to my friend, the Minister of Health, as I can. When someone reads in the paper that a hospital is going to be cut from 45 beds to 26, he naturally gets pretty damned concerned pretty quick—

Mr. McClellan: Doesn't the minister talk to you?

Mr. Eaton: —and gets a little hot over it. We went into the matter a bit and, as members know, they weren't cut that much in the first cut that was made. In fact, the budget worked out for this year not as \$60,000 less, as the member for Kent-Elgin has stated, but they have a one per cent increase in their budget. With inflation, that's pretty hard to take. But I sat with the board and we discussed that and the board said: "We can live with that. We can do it." That's the attitude of the people in that community in regard to their hospital. They know they want to operate it. They know they can do it that way.

Mr. McClellan: Despite the government.

Mr. Eaton: The member for Kent-Elgin mentioned the chronic-care situation. It was indicated to them a number of years ago that

they should be applying for chronic-care beds and the board did that at their last meeting. They have now applied for the chronic-care beds that will be necessary in that area. I understand from the ministry that they are going to be approved and that they will be supplied with those chronic-care beds, which will almost take up the number of beds that is being cut from active-care treatment. It just stands to reason if that's the kind of service that is being provided, a chronic-care situation, then that's the kind of beds they should be classified as.

In some instances in large hospitals, where a whole ward could be converted to that, it would probably mean fewer dollars in the budget because they can operate a complete ward for less money when it comes to chronic-care services. In the case of a small hospital, they are probably going to get the same dollars for the chronic-care bed as they are getting for the active-treatment bed, so they are still going to end up with the same budget. In fact, if there's an increase coming next year, they will be eligible for the same increase as other hospitals are based on their active-treatment beds and based on their chronic-care beds.

Mr. Bradley: That ought to make them happy.

Mr. Eaton: That's right. It should. The member can be sarcastic but when we sat down and examined the situation and worked out with the ministry what was really happening, we are going to have as many dollars for that hospital. We are going to have the increases that are going to be necessary each year to operate that hospital and we can continue to provide the services that are being provided there now. They are fine services and the people have a very great right to be proud of what they have developed in that area.

Mr. Sterling: And proud of their member.

Mr. Eaton: One can go a little farther. I think one of the members over there referred to the fact that there are many people coming from Brantford to his hospital and they weren't considering the people that came from outside there. When I saw the first figures for our hospital down there in Newbury, I reacted the same way. I said, "Jesus, there are more people in that area than that."

We sat down and examined it. The ministry has the exact figures of how many people came out of Wardsville and went to that hospital, how many people came out of Wardsville and went to London, how many went to Chatham. It is the same thing for the townships in the area of the member for

Kent-Elgin. They know exactly how many are involved in the particular area and have worked it out very well.

When we sit down calmly and work at this, when we work with the boards, then the situations can be worked out. I think if some of the other members who have reacted in the same way as I probably did in the first instance would sit down and work their way through these, we can find that the hospitals can still continue to provide the services. I don't think that anyone on this side or that side wants to see any health services cut in any way. What we are interested in is seeing that health care is delivered efficiently in those areas. It can be done and it will be done—

Mr. Foulds: And humanely. It is a humane thing. Didn't you hear the member for Fort William? Humanitarian.

Mr. Eaton: —with the administration of our Minister of Health and this government. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Riverside? The member for Lakeshore—finally.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you. I shall try to be brief and allow time for my colleague.

May I just put it rather bluntly to the minister in the empty spot he is occupying over there—I mean the blankness that I received from him this day is just about equal to the hiatus that exists as I look across the floor. You get about as much response in one circumstance as in another, so it doesn't really matter very much whether he is here or not, does it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Hennessy: He is, Pat, you can't see him.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is making a very bad mistake in closing Lakeshore. He only has three psychiatric hospitals in this greater Toronto region serving as far out as Halton, including south Halton. He just won't have the capacity in a very short time, certainly in two or three years, to—I find it much more palatable talking to him this way than I have to do normally.

Mr. Breaugh: He is much more intelligent.

Mr. Roy: Well, he is doing just as well there as he did in the question period this afternoon.

Mr. Lawlor: I have to do this quickly. So I say the minister hasn't got the capacity. The figures are all set out for him in a brief submitted to his office, and which I trust he has looked at, by the union involved.

Mr. M. Davidson: I wonder where he is.

Mr. Bradley: He is here in person.

Mr. Lawlor: At page two, they say—indeed, this is a quotation from your own McKinsey report—ah, here he is. Now, I may as well sit down.

According to the McKinsey report—indeed at least as measured by in-patient beds, by international standards—both Ontario and greater Toronto have already reached a minimal level of psychiatric hospital resources. I quote: "We believe it would be unwise to plan on a reduction on the rate of admissions to cut the growth in beds needed at any of the psychiatric hospitals, especially Lakeshore."

Then, if the minister would peruse what is contained on page 24 of this brief: "It is seriously questionable whether Queen Street will be able to cope with the physical transfer of 296 patients and 286 staff to its facilities. Despite all official claims of excess capacity at Queen Street, the government's own study indicates that there are only 125 to 150 beds realistically available to accommodate the transfer."

"Originally built for 700 beds, Queen Street has 416 beds currently set up and staffed, leaving 284 beds theoretically available. However, of these 284 beds, 68 are dedicated already to Metro court referrals for assessments and cannot be used."

"The use of another 138 beds would require the physical relocation of several programs and interfere with the utilization of the psycho-geriatrics unit in the 1956 building and, therefore, only one third to two thirds of these could be used and only with difficulty. Only 78 of the beds could be used without disruption. That brings the number of beds that could realistically be available to 125 to 150." This was borne out in further figures contained later on.

I recommend to the minister and have recommended and will continue to recommend to the minister that, first of all, he cannot place human lives over against a balanced budget and that is precisely what he is doing. The impersonality and the arbitrariness of the whole thing—

Mr. Riddell: That's right.

Mr. Lawlor: —and the impact on mental health care—which is what I am concerned with today—is just too great in terms of human suffering and the minister is responsible for that.

What I recommend he does is not move in with new facilities immediately. But he says there will be no capital expenditures throughout the 1980s. That is totally absurd. There must be fairly substantial capital ex-

penditures on hospital construction, renovation and whatnot throughout the 1980s. So, don't move in on Lakeshore immediately; use a phasing or a planning concept. If the minister wants to take down one of the older buildings, let him place a smaller hospital or some portion of a smaller hospital on those very extensive grounds. It doesn't have to use all the grounds by any means. In 10 years' time—or, trusting that the economic conditions will improve, in lesser time—the minister would have a 150-bed hospital there; he would take down the other buildings gradually and phase it in.

That would save the minister all his difficulties with respect to this out-patient scare. In my opinion, he is just not going to find the facilities in Lakeshore to accommodate the Alcoholics Anonymous unit, the utilization of the vocational and therapeutic training that people presently get on the grounds—and, incidentally, in fairly new buildings too, which the minister is going to have to raze to the ground.

Why does the minister not work it in a far more intelligent and long-sighted fashion? Unless he has a peculiar animus against Lakeshore, or even possibly against me, he would reconsider his position in that light. He would give further thought to how this could be worked out with retention of the present facilities without the disruption he is going to cause and leaving his own hand short, because he is going to spend five times as much money in capital expenditures by 1985 on a location somewhere else. We are going to have to buy new land because he will find that he is going to be dreadfully short of hospital beds and the dearth will come home. He may not be the minister at the time but he must look forward. It is his responsibility now.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, in the last few minutes available to us, I join this debate and express the concern that many of the members of the Legislature have expressed this afternoon, whether it be on matters that directly affect their own constituency as they relate to the closing down and cutback of certain areas of hospitals, or whether it be on a province-wide basis.

I had the opportunity to sit for a number of years on a hospital board in the city of St. Catharines and saw evolving the financial problems which hospitals are running into. The member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) mentioned that the members of hospital boards had the opportunity to analyse what the province was doing over the years, and that to a certain extent they were prepared

to live within the confines. Few of us would deny the fact that there was a need for a rationalization of services, that there was a need to move towards efficiency.

At the same time, I think we recognize, certainly from the input of our own constituents, that the public by and large supports extensive expenditures in the field of health, for the purposes of health care and specifically for hospital facilities within communities. This is something I think we have to keep in mind, because the public, while it may not tolerate expenditures in other areas—and I heard the member for Fort William mention that people can do without certain other services—I think we would have to recognize that the public sees as at least within the top three essential services being provided through the auspices of the provincial government, indirectly or directly, the provision of health care services.

I think we see frustration at these cutbacks in those who are involved directly in delivery of medical care services, because the potential is very great. We have evolved and developed in this province an excellent health care system. Many from other jurisdictions in North America and certainly across this world look upon us with a good deal of envy. We have the potential to further develop this to a great extent, except that we have the possibility of losing good medical people to other areas when they see extensive cutbacks, when they become frustrated by the fact that the equipment may not be available, the facilities are not available, and that the potential exists in other areas to a greater extent than in our own.

We also look at the fact that research in this particular province has a lot of potential and that if there were funds available for the facilities for this research we would attract even more people to the province of Ontario and to our country to provide services that would be excellent for those of us who live in the province.

So I urge the Minister of Health to re-examine very carefully the program of cutbacks that he has announced from time to time and that he take into consideration the feelings of the people of Ontario as expressed through their members in this assembly that we want to see a high level of service continue in this province. It can continue if we are prepared to fund it efficiently, yes, and rationally, yes, but fund it also in a humane manner so that the cuts that are made are not made at the front line. They are becoming very noticeable particularly to those at the nursing level, the actual care level. When the minister is looking at cutbacks, and he must, of course, look over the shoulders of local authorities, he can ensure that some of the administration shares those cuts which are forced.

So I plead with the minister, and with the members opposite to put the pressure on the minister, to maintain an excellent health care system in this province, one which is supported by the people and certainly by the opposition in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The time allocated for this debate has expired.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 272)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON
NOTICE PAPERNON-RESIDENT LAND TRANSFER
OR SPECULATION TAX

1. **Mr. Ziemba:** What are the names, addresses and realty transactions receiving exemptions or deferrals by way of application directly to the Ministry of Revenue itself with respect to the Ontario non-resident land transfer and/or speculation tax? What are the addresses of the exempted properties and the reasons for the exemptions? [First tabled November 17, 1978. Interim answer December 1, 1978. Tabled March 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Maec: Questions similar to the above have been asked on three occasions in the past by the honourable member. The ministry has answered these questions. The present question asks for the provision of additional information to that provided in the answers to earlier questions. The additional information is not readily available without a review by the ministry of each file. Such a review would, in the opinion of the ministry, entail the probable cost in time and effort of approximately \$10,000. The ministry does not feel that in view of the information already supplied, the additional cost is justified; but the ministry will be pleased to provide any additional detail required by the honourable member for any of the specific properties about which information has been given in the answers previously provided by the ministry to similar questions from the member, or for other properties to which his question may now refer.

LOTTERY FUNDS

3. **Mr. Grande:** Will the Minister of Culture and Recreation table: I. (a) the amount of Wintario funds coming in from the Ontario Lottery Corporation to the General Revenue Fund on a monthly basis, beginning from November 1, 1977, to the end of October 1978; (b) table for the same months, November 1977 to October 1978, the capital commitments the ministry has made on a monthly basis; (c) the non-capital commitments; (d) the actual money that has been sent out in

capital and non-capital grants for those months. II. Since the Ontario government receives 50 cents per Loto Canada ticket sold in Ontario, will the minister responsible table what funds were passed from the federal government to the Ontario government in the last three years? Will the minister also inform as to what specific purpose these funds have been used for? [First tabled November 9, 1978. Interim answer November 23, 1978. Tabled March 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Answer to question 3 I(a): Amount of Wintario funds from Ontario Lottery Corporation to general revenue fund:

Months	Funds
Nov. '77	\$ 6,000,000
Dec. '77	3,000,000
Jan. '78	9,000,000
Feb. '78	4,000,000
Mar. '78	8,000,000
April '78	3,000,000
May '78	8,000,000
June '78	4,000,000
July '78	4,000,000
Aug. '78	2,000,000
Sept. '78	6,000,000
Oct. '78	2,000,000
Total	\$59,000,000

Answer to question 3 I(b):

Wintario capital commitments:

Year	Month	(\$000s)
1977	November	5,521.3
	December	5,743.1
1978	January	4,370.4
	February	3,589.2
	March	3,639.7
	April	6,706.4
	May	4,363.0
	June	3,931.3
	July	3,211.2
	August	6,471.8
	September	6,417.2
	October	7,869.7
Total for 12-month period		\$61,834.3

Answer to question 3 I(c):

The ministry does not enter into "commitments" on the Wintario non-capital program. Grants for Wintario non-capital projects are processed and paid as they receive approval.

Answer to question 3 I(d):

(1) Wintario grant payments — monthly totals November 1977 to March 31, 1978.

Months	Capital	Non-Capital	Total
November 1977	5,542,421.10	1,164,886.60	6,707,307.70
December 1977	3,703,520.65	524,875.31	4,228,395.96
January 1978	4,345,275.96	1,422,636.45	5,767,912.41
February 1978	5,478,471.35	894,950.96	6,373,422.31
March 1978	3,655,886.92	1,396,061.66	5,051,948.58
Sub-total — November 1977 to March 1978			28,128,986.96

(2) Wintario grant payments — monthly totals April 1978 to October 1978.

Months	Capital	Non-Capital	Total
April 1978	2,483,693.10	354,880.12	2,838,573.22
May 1978	4,020,393.12	1,166,293.14	5,186,686.26
June 1978	5,798,150.62	2,058,491.01	7,856,641.63
July 1978	2,587,137.35	1,736,124.76	4,323,262.11
August 1978	2,882,923.18	1,434,969.60	4,317,892.78
September 1978	5,172,190.47	1,309,441.22	6,481,631.69
October 1978	2,574,346.36	913,298.22	3,487,644.58
Sub-total — April October 1978—			34,492,332.27
			Grand Total \$62,621,319.23

Answer to question 3 II:

Revenue from Loto Canada is remitted to the province on the basis of 12½ per cent of net proceeds on the tickets sold in the province.

Revenue has been remitted as follows:

December 31, 1976	688,000.00
March 31, 1977	388,827.00
June 30, 1977	553,499.00
January 3, 1978	1,089,102.00
March 31, 1978	752,360.00
June 30, 1978	620,266.00
October 4, 1978	495,220.00
January 2, 1979	779,945.00
	\$5,367,210.00

Final arrangements in regard to the use of these funds have not yet been concluded.

WINTARIO GRANTS

4. Mr. Grande: Will the Minister of Culture and Recreation table a report on the 23 golf and country club applications for Wintario capital grants including the following information and documentation: (a) the amount of the grant given; (b) any or all documentation between the ministry and the principal agents of the golf club from the receipt of the application up to and including the letter of final approval; (c) any or all post-audits that have been done by the ministry in order to satisfy itself that the golf clubs in question have applied the moneys granted for the purpose for which the grant was given; (d) any information, documentation or both which indicate what steps the

ministry has taken if the post-audit was not satisfactory? [First tabled December 4, 1978. Tabled March 6, 1979.]

7. Mr. Grande: Will the Minister of Culture and Recreation table a report on the 30 yacht and sailing recreation amenities applications and on the 29 flying club applications for Wintario capital grants including the following information and documentation: (a) the amount of the grant given; (b) all documentation between the ministry and the principal agents of the establishments in question from the receipt of the application up to and including the final letter of approval; (c) all post-audits that have been done by the ministry in order to satisfy itself that the moneys allowed have been applied for the purpose for which the grant was given; (d) any information, documentation or both, which indicate what steps the ministry has taken if the post-audits were not satisfactory? [First tabled December 5, 1978. Tabled March 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Answers to questions 4 and 7:

Each Wintario capital project file contains all documentation between the ministry and principal agents of the organizations from receipt of applications up to and including the letter of final approval. Documents would include the application form submitted to the ministry field office, any correspondence between applicant and field consultants, internal memoranda, records of approvals, further correspondence between the applicant and ministry, breakdowns of cost, certifications of

private support and other sources of funding, in many cases submission of all bills and invoices, letters of endorsement by municipal officials and statutory agreements where applicable.

Because of the size of the files, it is simply not practicable to table the requested information. However, the ministry would be pleased to make available for inspection by honourable members any specific file.

Every Wintario grant is subject to three kinds of scrutiny:

Ministry inspection: All documentation is inspected by ministry staff both in the community and at Queen's Park. Capital projects in particular are examined for their relevance to community need, community support, public participation and ability of the applicant organization to handle ongoing operating costs, among other concerns. The ministry has paid particular attention to situations where public access and participation may be in question, and has entered into legal agreements with such organizations to ensure acceptable terms and conditions relating to these issues. Any breach in these agreements may result in the ministry requesting that the Wintario grant be returned.

Ministry audit: The ministry internal audit unit performs regular audits of Wintario grant recipients, selected on a stratified random sampling basis. The audit goes beyond the normal financial audit of an organization's records and includes an audit of compliance to any terms and conditions agreed to by the organization when receiving a Wintario grant. Internal audit reports are made available to the provincial auditor, who reports directly to the Legislature.

Public scrutiny: A press release is issued to announce every Wintario grant. The release is sent to all media in the community to help ensure that the public is made aware of the facilities and projects which Wintario has assisted. Any citizen having knowledge of any inappropriate use of Wintario funds is encouraged to contact the ministry so that a

formal audit may be undertaken and compliance assured.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAM

5. Mr. Grande: Now that the Heritage Language Program has been in operation for a full year and the former Minister of Education stated that a full review of the program would be done in order to ascertain whether a change in the funding formula is indicated, would the Minister of Education table the review and also table any communications the ministry has had with boards of education across the province and responses to that communication? [First tabled December 4, 1978. Table March 6, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: A "full review of the program" has not yet been completed because it was felt that the program has not been in existence long enough for a valid assessment to be made. Also, there has not been extensive communications between the ministry and local boards subsequent to the initial announcement dealing exclusively with the Heritage Language Program.

However, the funding formula has been reviewed by officials of the Ministry of Education as part of the continuous reviews of all parts of the general legislative grants provisions. Over the past year, special attention has been given to continuing education funding, which includes Heritage Language funding, and as a result, changes will be made in the funding of summer school programs effective July 1979, and the Heritage Languages Program and driver education classes effective September 1979.

The work that has been done with specific reference to the Heritage Language funding has included an internal ministry review of the cost of the program and the funding provisions. A survey prepared by the Association of Continuing Education School Board Administrators with respect to the actual cost of instructional salaries related to heritage language classes is attached.

Instructors' Salaries in Heritage Languages Program
May 1978 Survey by The Ontario Association of Continuing Education
School Board Administrators

Board	Instructor's Pay per Hour
Durham Board of Education	\$10.00-\$11.00 (\$15.50 certified)
Halton Board of Education	\$13.00
Hamilton Board of Education	\$12.00-\$13.00
Leeds and Grenville Board of Education	\$12.50
Lincoln Board of Education	\$14.00
London Board of Education	\$10.00
Niagara South Board of Education	\$12.75 (\$14.75 certified)
Norfolk Board of Education	\$12.50
Northumberland and Newcastle Board of Education	\$12.00
Oxford Board of Education	\$14.00
Peterborough Board of Education	\$12.75
Toronto Board of Education	\$ 9.50 (\$10.50 certified)
Wellington Board of Education	\$11.00 (\$13.00 certified)
Windsor Board of Education	\$12.50 (\$15.00 certified)
York Region RCSS Board	\$10.50 (\$13.00 certified)
North York Board of Education	\$ 9.50-\$10.50

ESL PROGRAMS

6. Mr. Grande: I. Will the Minister of Education inform the House how Metro Toronto Board of Education disposed of the \$3 million that were generated from the English as a Second Language grant formula for the academic year 1978-1979? II. Will the Minister of Education report as to the status of the negotiations between the provincial government and the federal government on the proposal of the ministry that there is a need in English as a Second Language costing about \$20 million? Will the minister table any communication and reports from the ministry officials on these negotiations? [First tabled December 5, 1978. Tabled March 6, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I. The language instruction weighting factor introduced by the Ministry of Education in 1978 generated \$6.9 million for the Metropolitan Toronto School Board for the 1978 calendar year—\$4.9 million at the elementary school level and \$2 million at the secondary school level. This revised approach to weighting factors provided the Metropolitan Toronto School Board with an additional \$3 million in respect of English as a Second Language programs and services for the 1978 calendar year.

These revenues, including the \$3 million, were used by the Metropolitan Toronto School Board to offset the cost of teachers, supplies and support services for English as a Second Language programs. The number of English as a Second Language teachers employed by the six area boards as of September 1978 was approximately 252 at the

elementary school level and 130 at the secondary school level.

II. At present, there are no negotiations between the Ministry of Education and the federal government for financial assistance for English as a Second Language. We are, however, pursuing the issue through the Council of Ministers of Education.

My predecessor as Minister of Education had informal discussions with Mr. Roberts, the Secretary of State, on several occasions in 1977 and 1978. The response to our request for funding assistance was negative. Mr. Roberts had indicated that this problem should be discussed between the federal government and all the provincial Ministries of Education. Because of the federal government's unwillingness to provide funds in response to Ontario's request we are taking this approach through the council of ministers.

This matter has been discussed by the Advisory Committee of the Council of Ministers of Education. I am tabling for information in this connection the summary of provincial positions on funding of ESL programmes prepared by the secretariat of the council of ministers.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF EDUCATION, CANADA

19th Advisory Committee Meeting,
August 23-24, 1978

Topic: Federal funding for children of immigrant parents.

Item No. 15.

Reference: Attached.

Source: Ontario—Education.

Budget Implications: None.

Background: At the 18th advisory committee meeting, the Deputy Minister of Education in Ontario raised the subject of possible collective action in seeking federal funding for educating children of immigrant parents.

In order to get a clearer picture, the advisory committee directed the secretariat to prepare a summary of provincial positions for further discussion by the advisory committee. From the information received, it seems that Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia have signed agreements with the federal government, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec have not yet signed, and the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island do not find the financial problems associated with the education of immigrant children to be a significant one for their respective governments.

A summary of the responses received is set out below:

Saskatchewan: The Saskatchewan Department of Education identifies two problems relating to costs associated with the education of children of immigrant parents. The first involves the situation where immigrants of a "refugee" situation are placed in a province by the federal government. As this situation involves entire families in a resettlement program, full support and training for all members of the family, including school-age children, should be financed by the federal government on a project basis.

The second situation involves school-age children of landed immigrant parents, to whose children the requirement of teaching English as a second language is necessary. The Department of Education feels that as a reflection of federal immigrant policies, a cost-sharing formula for the education of school-age children of immigrant parents should be considered covering probably the first two years after arrival.

Alberta: Alberta has not yet signed an immigration agreement with Canada, but has concerns regarding the provision of services to the several categories of immigrants to the province. Alberta's concerns focus generally on the broader issue of providing required settlement services to immigrants. A significant dimension of settlement services is of course the education of children of immigrant parents and the provision of language training for adult members of the family.

In providing educational services to the children of landed immigrants, Alberta has

adopted the position that since school-age children are required by law to attend school and since language training forms a part of our general education program, the matter remains a provincial responsibility. However, where immigrants arrive in Alberta under strictly federal auspices, the province would favour federal assistance for language instruction under a funding arrangement which clearly safeguards the provincial education jurisdiction against federal intrusion.

Alberta is in the process of opening negotiations concerning their citizenship training and textbook agreement with Canada. Under the current agreement, the province recovers 50 per cent of salary costs for providing English as a Second Language (ESL) training and a five-year averaged cost for providing textual materials for these programs. Federal support under the current agreement is considered to be inadequate.

Manitoba: Studies done in the province of Manitoba indicate that the province receives a significantly large number of immigrants speaking neither French nor English and that Manitoba's expenses related to the education of students of immigrant parents is quite substantial.

Whereas no new agreement with the federal government has been signed, a number of changes are being proposed by Manitoba. These changes are intended to obtain greater assistance from the federal government in meeting the costs associated with providing immigrant services through the provision of social services and language training.

For your information and reference, the detailed report on this subject prepared by the provincial immigration co-ordinator is attached as Appendix I to this summary.

Ontario: Financial assistance was requested at the federal-provincial meeting held in Ottawa on December 2, 1976. No further discussions have been held on the matter.

An independent request was made by the Board of Education of the borough of Scarborough to the Honourable Bud Cullen, Minister of Employment and Immigration on September 16, 1977. The school board was advised that his department could not provide funds.

In 1978, the Ministry of Education, Ontario, established a weighting factor that recognized the cost of providing additional language instruction for new Canadians in English and French. The new weighting factor recognizes the additional cost of providing instruction for new Canadians programs and services that are in excess of the cost of a basic level of four teachers per

10,000 elementary pupils and two teachers per 10,000 secondary pupils. The cost to the province in 1978 is estimated to be \$8 million and this amount is in addition to the basic expenditure ceilings of \$1,299 per pupil elementary and \$1,841 per pupil secondary.

Quebec: The Ministry of Education authorized school boards to establish various integration procedures for children of immigrant parents who might have difficulty adapting to the school system because their knowledge of the French language is insufficient.

The provisions include: Full-time integration kindergarten for four- and five-year-olds (normally kindergarten classes accept only five-year-olds and for half-days only); integration classes for children at the primary and secondary levels; various individual integration arrangements for cases in which the number of students does not warrant setting up integration classes.

The Ministry of Education also established a co-ordinating board for integration classes (Bureau de co-ordination des classes d'accueil).

The additional costs entailed by these provisions are fully supported by grants from the Ministry of Education. An allocation of approximately \$10,000,000 has been made for this project, as well as an additional \$2,000,000 for transportation costs.

The Ministry of Education did not enter into negotiations with the federal government concerning this matter, but stands ready to

participate in any meeting which the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, would arrange with the federal immigration authorities.

New Brunswick: It appears that this particular problem is not a relevant one for New Brunswick, with the possible exception of one school district in which children of parents immigrating from Portugal received special curriculum materials provided at additional cost to the school district.

Prince Edward Island: The number of children (0 to 17 years) of immigrant parents coming to Prince Edward Island annually is quite low. The costs of educating these children are absorbed by the province in the same manner as the educational costs of regular non-immigrant children. School boards within the province do charge tuition for the education of students who now qualify for landed immigrant status.

Comments by the secretariat: The advisory committee may wish to consider the following alternatives: 1. That an interested ministry develop a discussion paper on this subject for the consideration of provincial officials who would be brought together to discuss the issue and to develop recommendations for the consideration of the advisory committee; 2. that no collective action be taken and that each province agree to share information on developments in their respective jurisdictions through the secretariat.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH CENTRES

61. Mr. Breaugh: Would the ministry table a list of children's mental health centres in Ontario? [Tabled March 7, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: The Ministry of Community and Social Services licences children's mental health centres under authority of the Children's Mental Health Centres Act

Item and Location

1. Ailsa Craig
2. Aurora
3. Aurora
5 Tyler Street
4. Aurora
5. Barrie
371A, 371B, 371C and 371D Blake Street
102 and 104 Bayview Avenue
19, 48 and 50 Broadmoor Avenue
140, 144 and 170 Cundles Road
22 Eugenia Street
120 and 122 Grove Street
170 Letitia Street
8 and 10 Murray Street

RSO 1970. These are listed under Ontario Regulation 32/71 of the act. At any given moment in time the regulations may contain minor errors as specific addresses may change and there is some small time lag as the change is submitted through the regulations process.

Under the provisions of that regulation, the following are designated as children's mental health centres at present:

Name

Craigwood
Blue Hills Academy
Browndale (Ontario)

Youthdale Residential Treatment Centres Ltd.
Browndale (Ontario)

Item and Location	Name
Huron School, 212 Huronia Road (Township of Innisfil)	
6. Beaverton	Chimo Youth Services
Pt. Lot 16, Concession 4, Thorah	
7. Burlington	Children's Assessment & Treatment Centre
2243 Lakeshore Road	
8. Burlington	Mount St. Joseph Centre
69 Flatt Road, R.R. 3	
9. Chatham	Lester B. Pearson Centre for Children & Youth
10. Clarksburg	C. M. Hincks Treatment Centre
11. Clarksburg	Kerry's Place
12. Clinton	Huron Centre for Children and Youth
160 Huron Street	
13. Etobicoke	Stothers Pre-School Child Care Centre
14. Haliburton (R.R. 1)	Browndale (Ontario)
Township of Guilford	
Art Barry Farm	
Cranberry Farm	
Ira Barry Farm	
Pine River Farm	
Township of Minden	
Nesbitt House	
Tallpines	
Township of Stanhope	
Airport Farm & Trailer	
Carnarvon Farm	
Stanhope School	
15. Hamilton	Chedoke Child & Family Centre
16. Hamilton	Hamilton Wentworth Regional Health Unit
74 Hughson Street South	
1239 Main Street East	Child and Adolescent Service.
17. Hamilton	Lynwood Hall Children's Centre
18. Hamilton	Mount St. Joseph Centre
66-68 Canada Street	
19. Islington	Etobicoke Educational Clinic
19 Glen Agar Drive	
20. Kenora	Lake of the Woods Child Development Centre
21. Kingston	Sunnyside Children's Centre
22. Kingston	The Therapeutic Nursery School
23. Kinmount	Chimo Youth Services
24. London	London Family Court Clinic
25. London	Madame Vanier Children's Services
6 Cherry Street	
35 Bruce Street	
871 Trafalgar Street	
26. Magnetawan	Youthdale Residential Treatment Centres Ltd.
27. Midland	Browndale (Ontario)
243 Hanley Street	
239, 243 and 251 Jeanne Street	
309 Midland Avenue	
792, 816 and 822 Ottawa Street	
503 and 527 William Street	
Verkuyl Schools (Lot No. 12, Concession 3, Township of Tay No. 1; Lot No. 12, Concession 3, Township of Tay No. 2)	

Item and Location	Name
28. Mississauga	West End Creche Child & Family
29. Newmarket	Browndale (Ontario)
1 and 2 Gorham Street	
40 Main Street	
319 Park Avenue	
644 Srigley Street	
53 Wilstead Drive	
12764 Yonge Street	
Township of Georgina	
Red Wheel Farm	
12700 Yonge Street	
30. Niagara-on-the-Lake	Niagara Centre for Youth Care
R.R. 4	
31. North Bay	Browndale (Ontario)
Tower Drive	
239 Francis Street	
957 McIntyre Avenue	
677 Copeland Street	
147 Worthington	
1020 Scollard Street	
249 Leonard Street	
32. North York	Adventure Place
33. North York	The Dellcrest Children's Centre
34. North York	Mercury Youth Services
2 Doverwood Court	
35. North York	Powell-Brown Children's Centre
36. Orillia	Tamarac Treatment Centre
105 Douglas Street	
48, 54 and 60 Peter Street South	
37. Oshawa	Frontenac Youth Services
433 Eulalie Avenue	
331 Frontenac Avenue	
66 Simcoe Street	
38. Oshawa	Durham House
1521 Simcoe Street North	
39. Ottawa	Centre for Educative Growth
40. Ottawa	Child Study Centre
41. Ottawa	Family Court Clinic
1335 Carling Avenue	
42. Ottawa	Ottawa-Carleton Regional Residential Treatment Centre
1199 Carling Avenue	
34 Cramer Drive	
50 Putnam Avenue	
156 Sunnyside Avenue	
43. Ottawa	Royal Ottawa Hospital—Regional Children's Centre
1145 Carling Avenue	
44. Peterborough	Browndale (Ontario)
876 Barnardo Street	
1388 Heather Lane	
245 Macwell Street	
351 Charlotte Street	
Township of Smith	
R.R. 2 (Part of Lot 6, Con. 3)	
Parkhill School, Wolfely Street	
45. Port Bolster	Chimo Youth Services
46. Richmond Hill	The York Centre for Learning Disabilities
11225 Leslie Street	
P.O. R.R. 2, Gormley	
47. Sarnia	Sarnia-Lambton Centre for Children and Youth
253 Cromwell Street	

Item and Location	Name
237 Ontario Street	
301 George Street	
48. Scarborough	East Metro Children and Youth Services
184 Galloway Road	
777 Warden Avenue	
614 Brimley Road	
49. Scarborough	Sacred Heart Children's Village
23 Eagle Point Road	
3275 St. Clair Avenue East	
3277 St. Clair Avenue East	
50. Scarborough	West End Creche Child & Family Clinic
Fairmount Junior Public School	
31 Sloley Road	
51. Simcoe	Blue Hills Academy
East half of Lot 12, Con. 1, Township of	Ferguson House
Tosorontio	MacDonald House
52. Sudbury	Sudbury-Algoma Sanatorium Association -
680 Kirkwood Drive	Regional Child Centre
53. Thunder Bay	Browndale (Ontario)
400 Arthur Street	
Bowlker Park Farm	
600 Leland Avenue South	
160 and 162 Limbrick	
108, 110, 181 and 183 Newberry	
Crescent	
524 Red River Road	
316 River Street	
339 and 341 Toledo Street	
54. Timmins	South Cochrane Child and Youth Services
55. Toronto	Browndale (Ontario)
29, 31 and 43 Madison Avenue	
59 Wilson Park Avenue	
56. Toronto	Cecilia Smith Nursery School
57. Toronto	Central Toronto Youth Services
696 Yonge Street, 8th Floor	
801 College Street	
58. Toronto	Borough of York Child Guidance Clinic
59. Toronto	C. M. Hincks Treatment Centre
60. Toronto	The Dellcrest Children's Centre
61. Toronto	Earls court Children's Home
62. Toronto	The Geneva Centre
18 Baycrest Avenue	
63. Toronto	Huntley Youth Services
12 Maynard Avenue	
34 Huntley Street	
64. Toronto	Integra Foundation
25 Imperial Street	
65. Toronto	Jewish Family & Child Service of
122 and 196 Keewatin Avenue	Metropolitan Toronto
66. Toronto	Oolagen Community Service
33 Dalton Road	
336 Dundas Street West	
67. Toronto	West End Creche Child and Family Clinic
68. Toronto	Youthdale Residential Treatment Centres
110 Admiral Road	Ltd.
182 Dowling Avenue	
635, 591 and 592 Huron Street	
193 Madison Avenue	
20 and 39 Spadina Avenue	
308 St. George Street	

Item and Location

- 69. Waterloo
- 70. Welland
- 71. Wellandport
- 72. Whitby
- 93. Willowdale
5151 Yonge Street
- 74. Windsor
- 75. Windsor
- 76. Windsor
- 77. Windsor
- 78. Windsor

Name

- Lutherwood
- Child Development Centre
- Horizons' Homes
- Durham House
- North York Centre for Youth Services
- Children's Achievement Centre
- Maryvale
- Windsor Child's Place
- Windsor Group Therapy Project
- Windsor Western Hospital Centre

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH CENTRES

62. Mr. Breaugh: What new programs are available to establish children's mental health centres? Are any financial incentives being proposed? [Tabled March 7, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: The Ministry of Community and Social Services has previously announced its intention to develop children's mental health capacity in special areas such as for francophone populations, particularly in the east and north, and for the native peoples of the north. Financing, albeit at a moderate level, is available for such programs, and indeed I would draw your attention to the successful development of programs in the counties of Prescott-Russell and Renfrew, and in the north.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH RESEARCH

63. Mr. Breaugh: What programs are available to undertake research into treatment effectiveness and costs for children's mental health centres? [Tabled March 7, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: A great diversity in both treatment philosophies and the nature of agencies responsible for provision of services makes a simple answer impossible. Children's mental health services are provided to children in an age range from pre-school to early adulthood, and for a variety of problems ranging from the very special and unique, such as autism, through to more broadly defined emotional disorders. A vast majority of agencies are operated by private boards which, individually, have the responsibility for program effectiveness. In many cases, program evaluation is identified as a separate activity for the agency. One of the reasons for the creation of the children's services division was to improve our ability both to understand and manage programs so that effective improvements could be achieved.

The division is at present developing a policy on research and has been awarded \$4 million of provincial lottery money to be spent on research.

CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

64. Mr. Breaugh: What new programs for children's mental health are being established to correct or prevent early child development problems? [Tabled March 7, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: The correction or prevention of early childhood development problems is a matter requiring application of many disciplines. The children's services division has commissioned Dr. Naomi Rae-Grant, a prominent child psychiatrist with a strong academic background, to produce a paper on prevention. Resulting from this paper the division will be identifying ongoing areas for both new funding and possible reallocation for prevention activities, including early childhood development problems.

KINDERGARTEN CLASSES

86. Mr. Grande: Will the Minister of Education table all the research that was undertaken by Boards of Education across this province that ran one or more senior kindergarten class on a full-day basis? In particular, will the ministry table any reports or research articles from those boards of education which the ministry funded to provide all-day kindergarten classes? [Tabled March 8, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The Ministry of Education is not aware of any research conducted by boards of education pertaining to full-day senior kindergarten classes. However, the ministry has undertaken one research project in this area—Kindergarten Programs: Effects of Regular Half Day, Alternate Full Day, Daily Full Day Programs—A. Biemiller, Principal Investigator and a copy of the report including an abstract is attached. (See sessional paper 21.)

ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS

89. Mr. Cooke: Will the Minister of Colleges and Universities table the following: (a) the average dollar value of grants and loans received by students under the OSAP program in the year 1978-79; (b) the mean dollar value of the grants and loans received by students under the OSAP program in the year

1978-79; (c) the number of males receiving: (i) grants, (ii) loans; (d) the number of females receiving: (i) grants, (ii) loans; (e) the average combined income of the parents of the students that received: (i) grants, (ii) loans; (g) the comparable figures for the above for the academic year 1977-78? [Tabled March 8, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson:

(a) As at February 28, 1979:

Average and value of grants	Average \$ value of loans (both CSL and OSLP) for students who received both grants and loan assistance	Average \$ value of loans (both CSL and OSLP) for students who were eligible for loan assistance only
\$1,553	\$861	\$1,759

As at May 31, 1978:

Average \$ value of grants	Average \$ value of loans (both CSL and OSLP) for students who received both grant and loan assistance
\$1,063	\$1,059

(b) As the word "MEAN" is synonymous with the word "AVERAGE", the answer to (b) would appear to be the same as the answer to (a)

(c) As at February 28, 1979

Number of MALES receiving

(i) Grants 21,595

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Loans 16,575

As at May 31, 1978

Number of MALES receiving

(i) Grants 32,331

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Loans 10,839

(d) As at February 28, 1979

Number of FEMALES receiving

(i) Grants 23,813

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Loans 11,730

As at May 31, 1978

Number of FEMALES Receiving

(i) Grants 29,438

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Loans 8,543

(e) As at February 28, 1979

Average combined income of the
parents of students that received

(i) Grant Assistance \$13,562

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Assistance
only \$20,596

As at May 31, 1978

Average combined income of the
parents of students that received

(i) Grant Assistance \$11,175

(ii) CSL and/or OSLP Assistance
only \$16,225

(f) As the word "MEAN" is synonymous with the word "AVERAGE" the answer to (f) would appear to be the same as the answer to (e)

(g) The figures identified above for May 31, 1978 represent the final figures for the academic year 1977-78.

PATIENT ABUSE

90. Mr. Blundy: How many investigations into resident abuse at each and all provincial institutions took place in 1978? What were the charges laid in each case and how many ministry employees were held culpable of the charges? Who or what agency conducted the investigation in each case? What was the outcome of each charge, ie. suspension, reinstatement, total absolution, further charges, further investigation? [Tabled March 8, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: In 1978 the ministry undertook 12 separate investigations involving 28 incidents of resident abuse or suspected cases of resident abuse in provincially operated facilities for the mentally retarded. The following charges were laid in each case:

Nature of Instance	Number of Instances	Facility
• Placing tape across the mouth of a resident	(1)	Huronian Regional Centre
• Striking residents	(18)	(8) Rideau Regional Centre (4) Northwestern Regional Centre (1) Prince Edward Heights (1) Midwestern Regional Centre (1) Huronia Regional Centre (1) CPRI (1) Southwestern Regional Centre (1) Muskoka Regional Centre
• Provoking residents to strike each other	(2)	Northwestern Regional Centre
• Sexual intercourse with female residents	(2)	(1) Muskoka Centre (1) Rideau Regional Centre
• Cigarette burns inflicted on residents	(2)	Rideau Regional Centre
• Pouring cold water on a resident	(1)	Northwestern Regional Centre
• Lacerated penis	(1)	Rideau Regional Centre
• Crushed penis	(1)	Rideau Regional Centre

It should be noted that in the case of Rideau Regional Centre, Smiths Falls, of the 13 instances of resident abuse, 11 of these were attributed to one employee. Further, at Northwestern Regional Centre, Thunder Bay, of the seven incidents outlined above, all eleven were attributed to one employee.

Twelve employees were implicated in the foregoing incidents of alleged resident abuse. All 28 incidents were thoroughly investigated by senior ministry personnel while the Ontario Provincial Police or the respective local police force conducted their own investigation into 23 of the 28 alleged instances of abuse. In the remaining five cases, senior ministry officials did not feel that the allegations warranted the involvement of the police, as a result of their own investigation at the time.

The outcome of the ministry investigations was as follows: three dismissals; two removals from work without pay for extended periods of time; four written warnings; three allegations not proven due to insufficient evidence.

(Note: charges were laid by the police in five of the above-mentioned incidents of abuse.)

It should be pointed out that two employees were involved in 18 of the 28 reported incidents of resident abuse. Both of these individuals have since been dismissed by the ministry although one has grieved his dismissal before the grievance settlement board.

In addition to the above, it should be noted that at the request of the ministry the criminal investigation branch of the Ontario Provincial Police conducted an in-depth investigation into a number of alleged resident abuse incidents at Huronia Regional Centre. The Ontario Provincial Police were unable to substantiate any of the allegations due to a lack of evidence. This investigation was the subject of a statement made by the minister in the Legislature on March 8, 1979.

UTDC TENDERS

91. Mr. Philip: Will the ministry provide details of all tenders for which UTDC has successfully bid? Will the ministry also provide details of all tenders for which UTDC has unsuccessfully bid? In all cases, will the ministry provide the total value of the contract and details of what was or is to be developed or built as a result of the contract? In cases where UTDC was unsuccessful, will the ministry provide all details of the successful tender? [Tabled March 13, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Snow: Because of the difficulty of preparing a response in the time permitted, the final response will be introduced on or about April 10, 1979.

LAKE ST. CLAIR COMMERCIAL FISHING

92. Mr. Bounsall: For the last full year (1969) of commercial fishing on Lake St. Clair, would the Ministry of Natural Resources indicate the different types of nets used and the numbers of different species of fish taken in each of the lot divisions of the lake; the number and names of the active hoop net fishermen, pound net fishermen, and seine net fishermen, and in what lot areas they fished, how much did the government pay to each of the active commercial fishermen and of the \$250,000 paid by Dow, which fishermen received what amounts? (Tabled March 13, 1978)

Hon. Mr. Auld: In 1969, the Lake St. Clair fishery used pound-nets, hoop-nets, seine and baited-hook lines (trot lines).

By long-standing agreement with the industry, the ministry does not publicize the details of individual fishermen's catches. Attached is a table showing landings by species for the years 1966-70. Following is a table showing the names of active licensees in 1969, the gear type for which each held licences, and the lots on which each fished when this was applicable. All fisheries were not licensed by lot.

G. A. Archibald	— pound net and hooks	— lot No. 3
Mrs. U. Archibald	— pound net	— lot No. 2
George Bence	— pound net	— lot No. 5
S. Blackbird	— seine net	— not licensed by lot
W. Broadbent	— pound net	— not licensed by lot
C. Brusseau	— pound net	— lot Nos. 10 and 15
Ed Brusseau	— pound net	— lot Nos. 14 and 16
A. Chauvin	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
P. Daudlin	— pound net	— not licensed by lot
I. Durocher	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
S. Durocher	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
G. Drouillard	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
L. Drouillard	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
P. J. Hamilton	— pound net and hooks	— lot Nos. 1, 2 and 6
E. M. Hamilton	— pound net	— lot No. 3
M. Jubenville	— pound net	— lot No. 11
D. Jubenville	— pound net	— lot No. 4 and 6
P. K. Jubenville	— pound net	— lot Nos. 7, 8 and 9
A. Kulman	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
A. F. Labatte	— pound net and hooks	— lot Nos. 8 and 11
F. L. Labatte	— pound net and hooks	— lot Nos. 7 and 12
G. Laforet	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
Leonard Laforet	— pound and seine nets and hooks	— lot Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 17
Lawrence Laforet	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
R. Laliberte	— seine net	— not licensed by lot
A. Leduc	— seine net	— not licensed by lot
S. MacDonald	— pound and seine nets	— not licensed by lot
P. MacDonald	— pound nets	— lot No. 1 or 5
L. Montpetit	— seine nets	— lot Nos. 2, 3 and 12
H. Martindale	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
E. Meloche	— seine net	— lot Nos. 1, 41 and 42
J. Meloche	— seine net	— lot Nos. 34 to 39
L. Meloche	— seine net	— lot Nos. 22 to 27
C. W. Riberdy	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
V. Speed	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
G. Steinoff	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
C. Suzor	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
Mrs. P. Thibodeau	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
R. Williams	— hooks	— not licensed by lot
W. Williams	— hooks	— not licensed by lot

Loans to all fishermen on Lake St. Clair totalled \$237,445 in fiscal year 1970-71, \$180,504 in 1971-72, and \$90,067 in 1972-73. Details of individual loans are shown in public accounts as follows:

1970-71 Page 11-15
 1971-72 Vol. III, Pages 80, 81
 1972-73 Vol. III, Page 101

The ministry was not informed of the division of funds paid by Dow.

LAKE ST. CLAIR LANDINGS BY SPECIES AND AVERAGE PRICE
 PER POUND, 1966-1970

Species	1970		1969		1968		1967		1966	
	Quantity (lbs.)	Average \$/lb.	Quantity (lbs.)	Average \$/lb.	Quantity (lbs.)	Average \$/lb.	Quantity (lbs.)	Average \$/lb.	Quantity (lbs.)	Average \$/lb.
Bowfin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	525	0.03
Bullhead	—	—	5,040	0.18	3,120	0.17	6,107	0.17	8,790	0.16
Carp	2,628	0.09½	81,978	0.04½	289,711	0.05	214,621	0.05	325,482	0.05
Catfish	58	0.30	66,871	0.31½	108,813	0.27	74,118	0.28	48,297	0.27
Freshwater Drum (Sheepshead)	292	0.06	17,739	0.03½	19,318	0.03	11,734	0.03	10,941	0.02
Northern Pike	837	0.15	27,458	0.28	23,999	0.26	18,038	0.24	14,352	0.23
Rock Bass	2,465	0.28½	47,689	0.29	84,952	0.29	31,715	0.28	62,692	0.24
Sauger	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,282	0.30	156	0.00
Sturgeon	—	—	17,289	1.15	12,809	1.18	11,743	1.26	11,329	1.18
Sucker	30,611	0.04½	106,483	0.06	122,552	0.05	80,246	0.04	67,157	0.04
Sunfish	35	0.00	73,218	0.29½	78,212	0.29	64,219	0.29	43,061	0.25
White Bass	266	0.30½	40,496	0.27	56,943	0.30	22,895	0.30	19,695	0.19
Yellow Perch	3,171	0.20	48,307	0.16	59,071	0.18	63,861	0.18	36,049	0.17
Yellow Pickerel	42,523	0.88½	328,158	0.66	225,808	0.55	184,462	0.53	249,451	0.61
Animal Food (Unclassified)	4,067		58,368		36,015		23,605		40,804	
Total Landings (lbs.)	86,953		919,094		1,121,323		809,646		938,781	
Total Landed Value (\$)	\$41,090		\$332,056		\$270,626		\$200,119		\$238,526	

INTERIM ANSWER

Re questions 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, and 88:

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: These questions, because of their large number and technical nature, cannot be answered today. I expect to have all answers ready on or about April 30. Answers will be tabled as they come in up to that date.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Transmitting Supplementary Estimates, the Honourable Administrator	225
Public Officers Act, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller	225
Cleanup of spills, statement by Mr. Parrot	225
Interflow Systems Limited, statement by Mr. Parrott	256
Home Renewal Program, statement by Mr. Bennett	258
Grievance arbitration, statement by Mr. Elgie	259
Disposal of hazardous wastes, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Ms. Bryden	259
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Breagh, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roy	262
Discrimination by police, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Bounsall ..	267
Brantford hospitals, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Nixon	268
Chest disease cases, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Pope, Mr. Martel	269
Niagara River pollution, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Kerrio	270
Health insurance, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. Renwick	271
Hospital bed allocations, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Hennessy	272
Motion re committee of supply, Mr. Welch, agreed to	272
Motion re standing general government committee, Mr. Welch, agreed to	272
Motion re standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Welch, agreed to	272
Motion re statutory instruments and members services committees, Mr. Welch, agreed to	272
Motion re standing social development committee, Mr. Welch, agreed to	272
Tabling answers to certain questions on notice paper, Mr. Welch	272
Re member's book of poetry, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Davis, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Lawlor	273
Environmental Protection Amendment Act, Mr. Parrott, first reading	274
Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Elgie, first reading	274
Huron District Hospital Act, Mr. G. E. Smith, first reading	274
Village of Cookstown Act, Mr. G. E. Smith, first reading	274
Consumer Protection Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	274
Portable Fire Extinguishers Safety Act, Mr. Stong, first reading	274
Innocent Persons Protection Act, Mr. Stong, first reading	274
Motion to suspend normal business to discuss matter of urgent public importance, Mr. Foulds, agreed to	274

Hospital bed allocations: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Turner, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Hennessy, Mr. Wildman, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Eaton, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Bradley	276
Recess	299
Appendix, answers to questions on notice paper	300
Non-resident land transfer or speculation tax, questions of Mr. Maeck: Mr. Ziemba	300
Lottery funds, questions of Mr. Baetz: Mr. Grande	300
Wintario grants, questions of Mr. Baetz: Mr. Grande	301
Heritage Language Program, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande	302
ESL Programs, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande	303
Children's mental health centres, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breaugh	305
Children's mental health research, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breaugh	309
Children's mental health programs, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breaugh	309
Kindergarten classes, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Grande	309
Assistance to students, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Cooke	310
Patient abuse, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy	310
UTDC tenders, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Philip	311
Lake St. Clair commercial fishing, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Bounsall	312
Interim answer to certain questions, Mr. Timbrell	313

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McGuigan, J. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Pope, A. (Cochrane South PC)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg D. (Wilson-Heights PC)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
 (York Mills PC)

Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 9

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament
Tuesday, March 27, 1979
Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Drea moved second reading of Bill 20, An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It is really self-explanatory. It extends the provisions of the current rent review act for another 90 days to enable the committee to continue its deliberations on Bill 163.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I think this is perhaps the fourth time we have been called upon to extend this legislation because of the continuing involvement of the committee and of the House in the procedure which is currently going on with respect to Bill 163.

We recognize, of course, it is necessary to ensure the whole project of rent review continues without interruption or delay to have this kind of an extension until the new legislation is in place. As a result, of course, this bill is in the tradition of the one line bills that require a certain extension. We will, of course, support the bill and I hope, particularly being the critic although not a member of the committee which is currently continuing the discussions with respect to Bill 163, that bill will soon be reported back to the House with the hopes that a continuation of rent review will be in place as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Ruston: The one and only.

Mr. Warner: There's only one member for Scarborough-Ellesmere here. Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting Bill 20, in a spirit of co-operation of course. It is to be understood, of course, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you understand, this bill is made necessary because of the seriously flawed bill which the committee has before it, Bill 163. I think members of the committee understand the bill is quite substantial and we're not likely to see, before the committee or before this assembly, major changes to the Landlord and Tenant Act for some time. I think all members in the assembly can appreciate that if we are to make needed changes in the legislation and

ensure those changes will benefit the tenants of the province of Ontario, time must be taken and care must be given to ensure the legislation is the very best we can get. Therefore, that is going to take a while. Unfortunately, the bill we were handed was not as good as it perhaps should have been so the extension becomes legally necessary. That is why we have Bill 20 in front of us today. So we will support Bill 20, which makes the extension and allows us to carry on our work in the committee with Bill 163. Hopefully, in the not-too-distant future that work will be completed and the bill reported back to the House. We support Bill 20.

Mr. Nixon: There are many things for which I personally am grateful. Near the top of the list is that I have never had to sit on a committee dealing with the series of abominations—these bills the member has brought forward—which have complicated the whole aspect of rent review to such a great degree.

Did it ever occur to the minister that the two concepts might very well have been separated so that we would not have to deal with these individual bills in this specific way? Landlord and tenant relationship and the law pertaining to it, as the minister knows far better than I, and my colleagues know far better than the minister, is a complex matter. It has been before this House for a decade in its more recent emanations, and even longer.

It seems really—and I feel this often as House leader—that we're asking a great deal of our colleagues when they have to sit month after month after month—

Mrs. Campbell: Year after year.

Mr. Nixon: My learned colleague, and friend, corrects me—year after year dealing with the intricacies of the changes that the minister, in his wisdom, has put before this House, and which apparently have been so unacceptable to the community and to many members of the committee.

My colleague, the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt)—he's always an optimist—has expressed the hope that the bill from the committee will be before this House. I forget his words but—

Mr. Breithaupt: I think "soon" was assumed.

Mr. Nixon: "Soon", perhaps, is the word he used.

Sensing the emanations from the representatives of all parties, but particularly the socialist party, I doubt if we will see this until June. I have a feeling that we may even commission the committee to deal with this matter for a further series of weeks during the summer. I really think that is an atrocious thing the minister is asking the House to do. I really think that's so.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Would you like me to withdraw the bill?

Mr. Nixon: I really regret that he could not have brought forward a landlord and tenant bill that could have moved forward in the grand traditions that have been recorded in the Hansard records of this House by Vernon Singer, QC and so many other learned and advanced spokesmen on these matters.

As a House leader, and I think perhaps my colleague the government House leader would agree, I hesitate to ask my colleagues to work on that committee which has gone on for so many months.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It hasn't gone on for so many months.

Mr. Nixon: It's certainly gone on for more than a year. This is the fourth time we've had this kind of artificial extension. I just think it is really a shame the way the government has dealt with the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? If not, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Just to set the matter straight for the House leader of the opposition party: First of all, the decision to bring forward the Residential Tenancies Act, which combined the existing Landlord and Tenant Act and rent review, was a decision made by all three parties. I draw that to his attention.

Mr. Hennessy: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It was a decision made in the committee report.

Mr. Nixon: You should have had the initiative to cut them.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I wasn't the minister then.

Mr. Nixon: You are now.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I just draw to the member's attention that the bill, in the combination form it is in now, was brought forward by all three parties. Second, there has been—

Mr. Foulds: Too bad you don't take all of our suggestions.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I take a great many of them, like this afternoon's. I would say this, too. The experience with rent review—and prior to going into Correctional Services I did have experience with rent review—showed that the most common difficulty was the lack of one-stop service. People were coming to rent review because they had a landlord and tenant problem; therefore, they should properly be put together.

Rather than saying that this committee is acting with a flawed act, the truth of the matter is that no committee has ever dealt with an act in such a participatory manner, where the public can come in and talk on any clause at any time. There is no question that when that happens progress sometimes is slow.

I, for one, prefer that with regard to something that is going to affect people for a great many years; something that I happen not only to know, but which as I have just learned from some of my colleagues in the province of Quebec, is considered now to be the finest piece of residential tenancy legislation in this province.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, you are catching that old Tory disease.

Hon. Mr. Drea: No, no, no. The government in the province of Quebec is not of my party, and not of yours.

Mr. Nixon: But you have the disease of repeating these carefully selected comments from among your ministerial colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Drea: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons I don't want to get into a debate with the Liberal House leader tonight, but I say to him in all seriousness—

Mr. Nixon: Want to step outside?

Hon. Mr. Drea: —that when he does this type of thing he does a grave disservice to tenants across the province; and really, for the public perception of himself, coming from a non-tenant area, I would suggest that perhaps he might consult with his colleague, the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), about the process by which this is being done.

Mr. Nixon: I just thank my lucky stars I wasn't associated with you in this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for BON has already spoken.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX ACT

Hon. Mr. Henderson moved second reading of Bill 2, An Act respecting the County of Middlesex.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable minister have an opening statement?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put two or three items on the record.

Firstly, this bill came about as a result of certain negotiations. Many members will remember that a year ago there was concern by the members from London about a similar bill that was proposed to be brought in as a private member's bill. Following that concern, I have had the opportunity to meet with the federal officials and I have had the opportunity of meeting with the Middlesex county officials, and we agreed to a scheme whereby the province of Ontario will introduce this legislation which will remove a cloud from the title of the previous courthouse. At the same time, the federal government, in a letter dated some two years ago, suggested that they would share on a 50-50 basis with the province of Ontario the cost of the actual refurbishing of this bill-building.

The actual cost, as the architect appointed by the county—

Mrs. Campbell: What did you refurbish? The bill or the building?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The building. The federal officials suggested that they would share the costs equally with the county and the province, or they would share equally with the province on a 50-50 basis. The Middlesex architect suggested that the total cost of the building refurbishing would be \$2.2 million. One point six million dollars will go towards the refurbishing of the building. The other \$600,000 will be for additions that were not actually part of the previous building.

Mr. Peterson: What about the jail?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will come to that. The air conditioning, elevator and other items are not part of the refurbishing. For this reason I met with the county, and I could read the members the letter; the members for that area have all had a copy of the letter. I pointed out that we as a province are willing to supply \$800,000 towards refurbishing, providing the federal government puts up \$800,000, and providing that Middlesex county finishes the job at an expected cost of \$600,000.

[8:15]

There was a question with respect to the jail. There was concern a few months ago about preserving the county jail.

I have made it clear to the member for London South (Mr. Walker) and to others who have requested what are we doing with the jail, that before Middlesex will receive a

clear title we will have an understanding with them that they keep the jail for five years.

Mr. Peterson: Why only five years?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We don't feel that we should keep the building sitting out there for generations to come if no organization is interested in it.

Mr. Peterson: If they have clear title it is clearly theirs.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The purpose of it was that Middlesex, the day after they get clear title to it, can't come along with a bulldozer and bulldoze it down. We want to preserve it. If there is a group in London which thinks it should be restored as a historical building, we want to keep it that way for up to five years.

Mr. Peterson: Then they will tear it down in five years?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We will remove the restrictions at the end of five years.

Mr. Peterson: But you are not accomplishing anything.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Maybe not, but I think—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the honourable minister conclude his opening statement?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, we think we are accomplishing a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Ruston: We certainly have no objections to this bill. I am sure the member for London Centre may want to speak on the bill, and the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) will, I am sure, be speaking in favour of the bill.

Mr. Peterson: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Ruston: I would just like to put on the record the official stand of our party. We agree with this bill and will support it. I may have to use my whip a little, but I think we will manage all right. There may be some discussions on it, but we have no objection to the bill and will support it.

Mr. Nixon: Okay, Jack.

Mr. Riddell: This bill resolves a dispute which has been going on for some time now involving the city council in London, Middlesex county council, and other agencies I expect.

I want to commend the minister. It is not often I do that, but I want to commend him for bringing this thing to a head and in getting this thing moving to the point where we are going to get, hopefully, a federal grant out of it, although it is too bad we didn't have a chance to debate this bill before the federal election was called. I don't

know what that is going to do; whether that will hold up the \$800,000 that we were hoping to get from them or not.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: They will be quick to pay now, Jack.

Mr. Riddell: We certainly were hoping we might have had a chance to debate this bill before that time.

Mr. Nixon: Count on Trudeau; he will look after us.

Mr. Riddell: It involves the courthouse block in London, which is all of the property which has been used for the administration of justice since London was first surveyed.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you have ever had occasion to read the book *The Black Donnellys*, about a group that came out from Ireland and settled in Lucan. There was a little bit of feuding that was carried over from the days back in Ireland and there was a massacre.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Any relation, John?

Mr. Riddell: The trials were held in this courthouse in London and I believe there were maybe even some hangings at that time, if I am not mistaken, in this jail in London.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The rope broke.

Mrs. Campbell: Are you sure that is not discrimination?

Mr. Riddell: Originally it was the courthouse block and as buildings were needed for special purposes they were built by the county. I want to stress that fact to my colleague to my right. These buildings were built by the county. The city did participate in some of the costs, I will have to admit that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Not much.

Mr. Riddell: That is right, not enough. Since the province took over, the buildings in the block were abandoned. I believe only the registry office building is presently being used, but this is only on a very temporary basis. The buildings take up one whole city block and yet only one of the buildings is a modern building.

As a matter of interest, the courthouse goes back before there were counties or districts established and probably was started by the government of Upper Canada in 1827; I believe it was opened in 1828. That gives members some idea how old these buildings are.

In 1846 the district of London, the antecedent of the present county, built the county jail. The counties were formed in 1850 and

the county was responsible for the administration of justice at that time.

The county had to build its administration building in 1860. At that time the province deeded this property to the county of Middlesex, but it was deeded to be used strictly for a courthouse, a jail and a registry office. As time went by, the county added on buildings as they were required and maintained them. The county bought land in London township and as a centennial project built a library. It was always felt when the present building could be sold a new one would be built on the land the county had purchased.

They approached the province to see if it would be interested in the present building, but the province didn't want it. Then they approached the city—and again I must stress this for the benefit of my colleague to the right; the reason I say that is because he's going to get up and talk about how these buildings should be turned into something of great historical value, with fancy restaurants and all this kind of stuff.

Mr. Peterson: How could you possibly allow my colleague to put words in my mouth? I think you have to call him to order immediately, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hennessy: Which one of you fellows is the conservative man in the party?

Mr. Riddell: They did approach the city to purchase the property but the city didn't want it. The federal government declared the courthouse a historical building and therefore was willing to contribute to the restoration to the extent of \$800,000 to which the Minister of Government Services alluded.

The province has also agreed to pay 50 per cent, or \$800,000, for restoration costs. As the county is involved, if they were going to use it as offices they would be responsible for certain additional costs, such as installing an elevator, lighting and to meet the standards of the building code and fire code. The estimated cost for this was \$600,000.

It was going to be left up to the county whether to restore the jail for a public hall and banquet room. In addition, there is landscaping for a park area and additional costs for the parking area to fit in with the landscaping. The property, Mr. Speaker, and you'll have to come to London to see it, looks down to the forks of the Thames River, which is a very historic site, just simply beautiful.

The county will use the building as an administration building and maintain it out of funds for administration. It will be open to the public. When completed the county will conduct tours. I've already indicated it's a

very historical building. It's the original courthouse, although it was altered and a major reconstruction took place in the 1870s. People are very concerned that it be preserved as a historic site.

A group was incorporated back a few years ago known as the Middlesex Court Centre Board, and I believe my colleague here was a member of that if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Peterson: That's right.

Mr. Riddell: They saw a potential and they wanted to turn the property into a people place; build restaurants, have arts and crafts, theatres and all the rest of it. However, they did not include the county in their plans. They had a study made of the uses of the property. They had considerable funds committed to them from the province by the then Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett). They included the county later by asking them to make an appointment to the board. They never approached the county to buy the property; they wanted it given to them, plus funds for the project.

As indicated previously, the county had equity in the building, particularly the modern building that is standing now. They paid for it and they certainly were not going to walk away from it. They wanted some equity out of the place. If the county can obtain funds for restoring the courthouse, and providing they get clear title to the property, they can use it as the county administration building. We have a bill before us that vests the title of the land in the corporation of the county of Middlesex in fee simple. The county can now go ahead and turn the building to the purposes for which they want it. I think it will make an outstanding county building in the city of London, despite what my colleague may say in a few minutes time.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak on this bill because it's a project we have been working at in Middlesex for some time. I had a private bill before this House about a year ago to try and clear the title, which was turned down by the commissioner of estates. I want to thank, on behalf of Middlesex county council, our colleague from Lambton, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Henderson), for his assistance in bringing this bill about and assisting in bringing about the funds to see this project through. As my friend from Huron-Middlesex has mentioned, it is a very historic site in Middlesex county, in fact in Ontario. It is modelled after Malahide castle and designed originally by Colonel Talbot.

Once, in fact, it was even designated the capital of Ontario when Colonel Talbot was first seeing that area of the province settled—

Mr. Peterson: John Roberts was representing the riding.

Mr. Eaton: I guess at that time it was the capital, when we had John there.

Mr. Nixon: Weren't those great days, Bob?

Mr. Eaton: I would say that this site will be a credit to the city of London. There has been some considerable amount of work carried on already; and if my friend from Huron-Middlesex had been around there lately he would know that the registry office disappeared last fall, it isn't there now.

Mr. Riddell: The building was still there.

Mr. Eaton: They have done some work on landscaping already. They actually own the modern building the member for Huron-Middlesex made reference to. The land it is on is owned outright by the county now, and the land that has been in dispute is the land the courthouse itself and the jail sit on. There hasn't been a movement by the people in Middlesex, really, to raise the funds to see the jail preserved; although they have done some preparation in their plans for the refurbishing of the courthouse in that they did make provision for a museum and a large reading room and banquet hall in the top of the jail facilities. If there are people interested in coming forward with funds or other forms of support, people who want to see this section of the building preserved, then the county is willing to work with them to try to preserve that part of the building as well.

But it's not as old, it's not as historic, as the courthouse itself, and the county just doesn't feel it has the funds to put directly into the jail project. They feel that by putting the funds into the courthouse, they can preserve it for history and at the same time use it for a practical purpose, maintaining their administration within that building and keeping the building open to the public as a historic site in Ontario.

I would certainly like once again to thank the minister for his support of the bill. I am sure with the support of the Liberal Party, no matter what the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson) might have to say about the project, it will go ahead and it will be a credit not only to Middlesex but the city of London and the province of Ontario.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, although the member for London Centre may be opposing the bill, I wish to speak in favour of it. After all, any bill which spells jail g-a-o-l can't be all wrong. I think that was the first indication

this was a bill definitely intended to help preserve a bit of history in the province of Ontario.

Mrs. Campbell: Don't bring in Magna Carta tonight.

Mr. Warner: Certainly the Minister of Government Services has had an interest in preserving things. We are certainly in favour of preserving old jails and old courthouses. We are just not in favour of preserving old Tories. So we certainly will lend our unqualified support for Bill 2 and assist in its passage so that the jail and the courthouse can be preserved. Now perhaps we can hear from the one member of the assembly who is opposing the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[8:30]

Mr. Peterson: I want to bring sober rationality into this entire debate, Mr. Speaker, and I want you to know this probably has been one of the most difficult issues faced by our caucus in my brief tenure here. We had a major division today in our caucus; it occupied a considerable amount of time in the agenda. There was a major spread in the caucus; the Nixon wing of the caucus sort of went against me, Mr. Speaker, I should point out. You can identify the Nixon wing in our caucus; they are all the guys in the polyester suits and the white shoes.

I know it is going to take time but, with a lot of goodwill from my brethren and my sister in the caucus, I hope that we will be able to repair this damage, because it has been a most difficult matter of principle.

I have got a little surprise for you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to support the bill, just because I do not like to be left out; I have a feeling that, if it is 124 to one, there must be something the matter with me.

However, I do appreciate the opportunity to put a few facts on the record. We have been treated to an excellent historical dissertation by the two rural members who represent various pieces of Middlesex county, and I think they have done an admirable job of presenting the background.

Let me say that, in my judgement, this is the single most important historical asset in the city of London. It is the focal point; it is the centre; it is at the forks of the Thames; it is almost the geographical centre of the city. We had a marvellous opportunity to make something out of that historic site at the forks of the Thames. It was the end of the old Highway 2; it stopped right there, coming all the way from Hamilton and indeed from Toronto. As my colleague from Huron-Middlesex pointed out, it is steeped in history.

Now we have taken that marvellous old building and turned it into an office structure, a county office building. I am not saying, given the circumstances of today, that it may not be the best choice. I just think that the local politicians, the former mayor of our city, fumbled this ball so dramatically that I, for one, am dramatically disappointed.

We had an opportunity, a wonderful opportunity, to turn this into a people place, into a building at the historical centre of our city where people were welcome all the time. It had flower shows, it had ethnic shows, it had art galleries the kinds of things that create activity. In so many of these county buildings, even though they are there for public access, who wants to go there unless you have official business, unless you want a severance, unless you want to go to a county council meeting or whatever?

We have lost the opportunity to breathe life into that old girl, and we will never be able to salvage a situation that we have lost. This was part of a whole redevelopment scheme along the banks of the Thames River, involving the old Eldon House, the Labatt's restoration—some of the most marvellous restoration you could possibly imagine in any urban area in Ontario. Then we had juxtaposed thereto, right on the banks of the Thames, the old courthouse—and the old jail, I should add, which is of a different period in terms of architecture but is equally significant and equally meaningful, in my judgement at least, in the history of that particular city.

Of course, there were many other complications that went on with this issue because of the mishandling, as I deem it; essentially by the former mayor, but by the council and by a lot of meetings that went on in private. I will not bore you, Mr. Speaker, with all of the details attendant thereto, but a very strategic and important piece of property owned by the city that could have been park land at the end of a wonderful mall down Dundas Street, the main business street in London, which could have created one of the most magnificent urban atmospheres in this province. We blew that opportunity because we decided to build a brand-new concrete-and-glass art gallery in the middle of this historical skyline. We would have had an unparalleled vista in this province; we have lost that opportunity.

I have been intimately involved with this situation from the beginning and, with some humility, I say that I lost on almost every position I took on this matter. I am sorry about that, but I am sure that thoughtful people 20 years from now will say we made

a mistake. We could have located that art gallery—I grant that London needed an art gallery, and I would point out that the original concept some seven or eight years ago was that the entire courthouse and jail could have been turned into an art gallery; and it would have made a magnificent art gallery. Again, it would have breathed new life and purpose into that old structure.

We cannot afford the luxury of historical buildings sitting around doing nothing. The challenge is to breathe new life into them and to give them a new vitality and a new purpose. An art gallery would have been a marvellous thing and we would have had, beside it, a magnificent park on the banks of the Thames, with bicycle paths and paths all along the Thames from Fanshawe right through to Springbank Park.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I know that you have a daughter at the University of Western Ontario, a very intelligent girl like her father, and I am sure she has told you the identical thing. I am sure that if you are ever in a position to leave your nonpartisan role you would come down and agree with every single word I am saying in this House tonight.

We had that opportunity. Then, certain people decided they wanted a new, magnificent glass-and-concrete structure, an art gallery modelled on the Fort Worth Louis Kahn art gallery; and so it was brought and placed right plunk in the middle of this historic skyline. That is a reality and London will have that. I think it could have been much better planned. I think we could have used the strategic area to create, as I said, a totally unique area.

The art gallery proposition having failed then, Mr. Speaker, as I said the people looked for new purposes. Again, they wanted to make it a people-oriented place, to have it a community centre for ethnic clubs, for service clubs, for banquet halls; a gathering place in our community right smack in the middle of the city, and again a place of great historic and strategic advantage. That was another opportunity we lost.

I have to support this bill, because in fairness to the county the county had no other options. There were no other takers for the building. Had the county not come in to salvage this building it probably would have fallen to further wrack and ruin.

But the concept I have been talking about, of the people place and the magnificent structure in the middle of the city, had at one point the support of the province of Ontario. I remember coming, long before I was elected, as a private citizen to a committee. I remind you that the leader of our

committee, the chairman of the Middlesex Court Centre Board at that time, was none other than J. P. Robarts. We came down before a committee of cabinet; we gave a presentation. I think perhaps the honourable House leader was there at the time, I am not sure. It was a magnificent presentation, I think members will agree.

The province at that time agreed to give us \$50,000 for a feasibility study by Marshall, Macklin, Monaghan; a feasibility study which said that the concept could be done, done cheaply, and done well. As I recall, the province committed \$2 million at that time. That money was held back because of the failure of the city and the internal politics carried on in secret; it was one of the most reprehensible series of transactions in municipal politics anywhere.

I wish some day I could stand up in public and tell members everything that I know went on. Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of London were the only losers because we had missed this great opportunity.

Of course the county was resigned to this. The county had bought property in Arva, five or six miles out of London. They were prepared to sell their one modern structure, the beautiful green building with funny green glass, to the city or whoever and move out to Arva and be in a brand new structure. Because, you see, logically, even though London is the county seat for the county of Middlesex, the people of the county don't necessarily identify with the old Middlesex courthouse in the same way that the people of London would, because it is physically in the middle of the city. This clearly should have been the city's responsibility. I look back with great regret, I look back with great sorrow; because we had an opportunity to preserve something for our children, an opportunity to do something magnificently unique, and we blew it. I am convinced, as I said earlier, that people 20 years from now will look back and say: "We had so many good options then, why didn't we take the far-sighted view?"

I just want to put in one disclaimer, one thing that worries me. I say this to the honourable minister, to the member for Middlesex and to my colleague from Huron-Middlesex. I am not very impressed with the sensitivity of the county towards that historic structure. The first thing they did, when it appeared they were going to get title—and I remind my friend the county didn't own it; if the county had owned it we wouldn't have this bill here tonight. There was a reverter. The county had title for the

purpose of the administration of justice, with a reversion back to the province. We are here to clean up that title tonight.

There are various legal opinions on it. The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) had a legal opinion on it, as did various other people, but the consensus seemed to be, clearly, that titled probably rested in the province. When it appeared that the county was going to get title to this building they moved in and immediately tore down some walls around this jail, a unique property. Those jail walls that were the scene of various hangings could have been incorporated with all the local history in a beautiful plan, and they started to tear the walls down. Any organization that shows such lack of respect for a historical building I think has to be considered somewhat suspect.

I am disappointed, and I can say with some pride that my colleague the member for London South (Mr. Walker), who is the Minister of Correctional Services right now, and I were intimately involved in trying to prevent the county from doing something precipitous in tearing down an asset that in no way could be rebuilt—and it can't be, and we have lost that opportunity.

I say to the honourable minister, when we are dealing with a group that has displayed that lack of sensitivity towards a historical object, a historical monument, I would like to be assured by him that they are going to treat the jail and the remaining walls with great respect.

I understand the problem of raising the money to resurrect that building; but I am disappointed that the time limit on that is only five years. I would ask the minister, as a reasonable man, to extend that in perpetuity. They can close that building up now if they don't have the funds to preserve it; but some day they will, and let us prevent them in perpetuity from doing something silly, from destroying a precious heritage—at least in my opinion it is, and in that of various other people that I respect.

Let's prevent them from destroying it, because I can assure the House that at some time in the future, and I cannot assure the members that it will be less than five years, some far-sighted, conscientious citizen concerned about the environment of the city will come forward with a viable proposition on how to salvage that jail. Let's not let them tear it down. As I said before, I am somewhat sceptical, when they have demonstrated a lack of sensitivity in the past. I would like the minister's assurance, and I hope he will give it to me, that he will use his good offices as well as the power of this Legisla-

ture to make sure the county does not tear down that jail.

I can say that I have seen the plans for the old courthouse and frankly I think the plans are magnificent. I think they are doing the best that can be done at this stage, now that the city has totally fumbled the ball. They have a magnificent architect in Norbert Schuller, who breathed new life into that old building. It will be an asset to the city; but it could have been a much greater asset. It could have been a public place, rather than a quasi-private place; it could have been a place that invites people to come in. It could have been a historical centre; it could have been a tourist centre. Now it is going to be a glorified, but beautiful, office building.

We lost the opportunity. I'm sorry about that. I am only imploring the minister to reassure me on that one point and then I will comfortably vote for this bill in the circumstances.

Mr. Lawlor: I have, Mr. Speaker, confessedly never been so moved by a speech in this House. I will not unduly prolong the fandango of the debate. Nevertheless, I can well understand how the Liberal Party must have been torn to pieces in caucus on the issue.

I know nothing of the issue, nothing whatsoever. But, of course, that doesn't matter. I am standing here now to try to prevail upon the honourable member who spoke so glowingly, so bitterly and with such brilliance on this particular subject. I would ask him to be a Don Quixote, if he will. I will vote with him, I promise the House. I will do anything for art—I learned that a day or two ago.

Mr. Peterson: And I will buy your book, Patrick. That's fair enough.

Mr. Lawlor: With that in mind, I just simply want to say I join forces with the members on this particular issue. Let's give the House a real bad time.

[8:45]

Mr. Roy: The reason I am standing is the minute courthouses are mentioned in this Legislature anybody from Ottawa—and my colleagues know that and I think the minister is aware of that—get very hyper, get very enthusiastic, because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, I have raised on many occasions the deplorable court facilities in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Is that in Middlesex county?

Mr. Roy: Well, I'm just coming there. I started in Ottawa. Just be patient with me. What I wanted to tell you, Mr. Speaker, is we always look on London, Ontario, with envy, because what my colleague from

London Centre did not mention is the fantastic court facilities they now have in London, Ontario. I want to say this: We're so desperate for court facilities that if we in Ottawa can be of assistance in any way to solving this dilemma—especially a dilemma between some of my colleagues—we will.

As my colleague the member for Lakeshore said, it was a vicious debate in caucus today about the situation about this bill. If I can be of assistance to the minister and propose this to him about the county courthouse and the restoration, if he has problems and if there is some conflict within the community, we will take it in Ottawa. We will take it and move it down there. We are so short of facilities in the Ottawa area that we would accept anything, and especially something of historical value.

Mr. Sterling: You can't get the land from the feds.

Mr. Roy: My colleague from Carleton-Grenville is mentioning something.

Mr. Speaker: Now I see why you had so much trouble in caucus. Does anybody else want to speak to Bill 2?

Mr. Roy: I was just on my way to saying those are the only comments I have.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be able to respond to the proposal that has been brought forth tonight. If I might answer in reverse, any problem I am having with the court facilities in Ottawa will be corrected May 22, so that is not a worry to me tonight. I was in Ottawa yesterday morning and I had the assurance the people there would correct the problem I am having with court facilities there.

Mr. Roy: You mean the Tories federally will give you the land the Liberals won't give you?

Mr. Sterling: That's right, Albert.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, while the member for London Centre was speaking, I have been looking over the notes. I wouldn't want to read everything I have in the notes, but I find myself tonight in the position of an arbitrator. All members here tonight remember a year ago when the member for London South (Mr. Walker) and the member for London Centre and the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) appeared before some court down the street to oppose the clearing of this title. Two of those three people who appeared have been here tonight, the member for London South and the member for London Centre.

The member for London South has given in and I now find he supports the five years.

Mind you, we had to whip him pretty well to make him support it. We really had to go after him. I find the member for London Centre wants a further extension.

In the position of an arbitrator, let me say as chairman maybe for the moment, I would have to support the member for London South and the statements attributed to the Minister of Government Services, so that I will give the House the assurance that before an order in council is passed with respect to this bill making it effective, I will have an agreement with the city of London that this county jail will be kept for five years for any organization that wishes to assume the responsibility and preserve that jail for future generations.

There is just one further thing, Mr. Speaker. The previous speakers have not brought out what I felt they would—maybe the former speakers can help me, but I am not sure whether it was during the mid-1950s or the mid-1960s, and I've been rushing through my notes and I haven't found it—that the courthouse we are preserving was designated as a historic building. The jail we are referring to was not designated, so there is a distinction between the two buildings. Middlesex was caught in a very difficult position. They were caught with a building that they were not permitted to tear down.

I believe this bill is very acceptable to everybody.

Mr. Peterson: On a point of clarification, and I wanted to share something because I think it's important. I just wanted to make a point—

Mr. Speaker: It's not permitted on second reading, after the minister has wound up the debate.

Mr. Peterson: I know that, but I think the House would indulge me on this one particular point because I think it's important. My point was earlier that it just was inappropriate. It was sort of like taking Bob Nixon to Winston's for lunch. It just doesn't fit. He's not comfortable there. That was the point I wanted to make about the county having—

Mr. Nixon: Throw him out.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask if you plan on getting to the committee stage of this bill tonight?

Mr. Warner: Not this evening.

Mr. Eaton: Why do you want it to go to committee?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: If I might interject for a moment; honourable members over

there and the member for Middlesex have mentioned the urgency of this. And it is urgent. The federal government has demanded this bill be through before we can go any further.

Mr. Peterson: On a point of order, the minister has no right to contest the decision.

Mr. Speaker: That's right.

MILK AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. McNeil, on behalf of Hon. W. Newman, moved second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Milk Act.

Mr. McNeil: This bill is necessary to resolve problems in milk levies arising out of the Supreme Court decision in the egg reference case. It has been concluded that the remittance of levies to the Canadian Dairy Commission collected from producers by the Ontario Milk Marketing Board was no longer legally defensible. The Ontario Milk Marketing Board has therefore ceased remitting such levies.

It is considered that the soundest approach would be to delegate levy authority directly to the Canadian Dairy Commission under the Commodity Boards and Marketing Agencies Act of Ontario. The CDC does not have any powers of regulation over regulated products marketed locally within Ontario, and therefore does not qualify under that act as a marketing agency to receive a delegation of levy authority.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Milk Act, to provide in a manner similar to that already found in the Farm Products Marketing Act for a delegation of marketing authority to the Canadian Dairy Commission. Implementation of this bill will qualify CDC as a marketing agency and allow it to receive subsequently a delegation of levy authority under the Commodity Boards and Marketing Agencies Act.

As a further explanation, section 1 of the bill enacts a new section 26 to the Milk Act which provides, first, for delegation to the Canadian Dairy Commission by the Lieutenant Governor in council of authority to regulate marketing of regulated products and milk products marketed locally within Ontario. Secondly, it provides for specific provisions aimed at ensuring that the Canadian Dairy Commission will come within the terms of the Commodity Boards and Marketing Agencies Act.

Honourable members will be interested in knowing that this bill will not affect provincial government expenditures or receipts.

Mr. Riddell: I'm certainly pleased to see that my good friend, the member for Elgin,

is piloting this bill through the House. I've attended a number of agricultural functions where the member for Elgin has represented the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. I think he does an admirable job. But it makes my blood boil when I go to agricultural functions and I see that they have completely bypassed my good friend, the member for Elgin, and have sent the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) to speak on behalf of the ministry at some of these functions.

I do not know who is responsible for this, whether it is the Minister of Agriculture and Food or the Premier. I have no idea whether it is an indication of some grooming they are doing for the next Minister of Agriculture and Food. But until my good friend the member for Elgin throws in the towel—prior to the next provincial election, I assume—I would hope they would get him to act on behalf of the ministry instead of the member for Chatham-Kent.

Mr. Hodgson: That's not your problem. Don't worry about it. You don't have to worry about those problems. Worry about the bill.

Mr. Riddell: It's nice to have the member for York North around.

I am pleased that we are dealing with a bill that does not make the collection of levies by a provincial marketing board retroactive. I well recall the lengthy debates and the concerns that were expressed in the committee after Bill 48 was introduced by the minister. Bill 48 was introduced as a result of a Supreme Court decision in the egg reference case, indicating that the collection of levies by the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board under the authority of federal statutes was questionable.

The Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board was collecting levies under the authority granted to it by federal statutes, and the court decision indicated that for eggs marketed in Ontario the levies had to be collected under authority given to the board by provincial statutes. The question was whether the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency could collect levies for eggs marketed in Ontario.

This led to the introduction of Bill 48, which gave the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board the authority to collect levies under provincial statutes. It did not give the board authority to turn the levies over to CEMA, which is a problem the board now faces. However, it is my understanding that the Lieutenant Governor can be asked to cancel the authority of the provincial

board to collect levies and turn it over to CEMA, in which case CEMA would appoint the provincial board as a collection agency. In other words, the Lieutenant Governor by regulation could give CEMA the authority to collect levies.

We have the same situation in the dairy industry. The Ontario Milk Marketing Board has been collecting levies and turning them over to the Canadian Dairy Commission. If this practice were challenged in the courts by dissident milk producers—and thank goodness there are none, to my knowledge—similar to that in the egg industry, then it is likely the same decision would be arrived at as in the egg reference case. In other words, the remittance to the Canadian Dairy Commission of levies collected by the Ontario Milk Marketing Board would no longer be legally defensible.

With this in mind, the Ontario Milk Marketing Board has ceased remitting such levies. Thus, the Canadian Dairy Commission, in view of the reduction in its income, finds it difficult to continue payment of milk subsidies to Ontario milk producers.

Taking a leaf from the book in the egg case, the Minister of Agriculture and Food, after consultation with the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, the Canadian Dairy Commission and federal government officials, has considered that the soundest approach to resolving this problem would be to delegate levy authority directly to the Canadian Dairy Commission under the Commodity Boards and Marketing Agencies Act of Ontario. The Canadian Dairy Commission, as was the case with CEMA, does not have any powers of regulation over regulated products marketed locally within Ontario, and therefore it does not qualify under that act as a marketing agency to receive a delegation of levy authority.

The purpose of this bill, therefore, is to amend the Milk Act to provide in a manner similar to that already found in the Farm Products Marketing Act for delegation of marketing authority to the Canadian Dairy Commission. Implementation of this bill will qualify the Canadian Dairy Commission as a marketing agency and allow it to receive subsequently a delegation of levy authority under the Commodity Boards and Marketing Agencies Act which would allow the commission to collect levies directly.

The bill was inevitable, and I certainly intend to give it my full support on this side of the House.

[9:00]

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our party, I rise to support the bill as well.

I recall the debate that the member who just spoke referred to on the egg case, and wonder what the position of the member for Lincoln will be in this particular situation, but considering the—

Mr. Roy: That was a much different situation.

Mr. Riddell: Nothing retroactive about it.

Mr. Wildman: I wasn't trying to be derisive about his position.

Mr. Roy: You should understand the legislation you are talking about.

Mr. Foulds: It never stopped you, Albert. It never stopped you.

Mr. Wildman: When you consider the effect of the court decision, which makes it very difficult for the Canadian Dairy Commission to exercise what was considered to be its authority previously, since the OMMB has stopped remitting to the commission, this would make it very difficult for the whole orderly marketing and control of that commodity, milk marketing in this country, and in this province, to continue. We certainly support it.

I wonder if the ministry's representative could relate this to the decision of the court, the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Agricultural Products Marketing Act reference, in which the court said it agreed the Legislature may delegate powers to an agency as much as it sees fit. If that is the case, then that is what we are doing here, if the two relate. I wonder if he could answer that for me, since in that particular case the court stated that undertakings where primary agricultural products are involved are within provincial jurisdiction.

I wonder if the member can clarify that for me. Certainly, we in this party have argued for years in favour of orderly marketing and will support any legislation which makes it possible for the marketing boards and the federal agency to carry out that objective. For that reason we support the legislation.

As I recall the debate on the egg situation and the fact that there were dissidents who were concerned about retroactive payment, I realize, since the board is collecting levies and is just holding them, it is a somewhat different situation, so in that case we again will support the bill.

Mr. McNeil: Mr. Speaker, first of all, on behalf of the minister I do want to thank the opposition party and the New Democratic Party for their support of this bill, which means so much to the milk producers of this province.

In answer to the member for Algoma, we are delegating in a manner approved by the court.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for committee of the whole House.

TREES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Trees Act.

Mr. Nixon: No opening statement from the minister is necessary.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I bow to the honourable member.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I know the hearts of many members leapt when we saw the Trees Amendment Act was being introduced. I recall at the time of the election recently that the Brampton charter dealt with trees extensively. The Premier (Mr. Davis) himself, after widely consulting with his colleagues and others, had come to the conclusion that it was time the government, after 35 years, should make the commitment that two trees would grow where one had grown before.

I can recall the embarrassment with which this cornerstone of the Brampton charter was greeted by the people knowledgeable in forest resource matters. Members of the public service were turning pale, white-lipped and trembling when they felt at one stage that this tremendous breakthrough was going to be ordered by the head of the government himself.

The bill before us, although of great importance and significance, hardly comes to grips with the matter that we had hoped for and truly expected. Like so many of the other concepts put forward in the Brampton charter, it has really turned to ashes in the hands of those who had expected something of worth. For this reason, we have a great deal of regret that the bill, while important in its own way, does not deal with the matter that we really had hoped would be brought to our attention at an early time. Nevertheless, after careful consultation with my colleagues, the many members of the Liberal Party from northern Ontario, we feel that the bill, disappointing though it is in that particular, should be supported.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker, we in our caucus first thought, when we saw the title of this bill on the Order Paper, that finally we were going to get in legislative terms a commitment to regeneration and reforestation in this province. We do not have that commitment in legislative terms and, in my view, that is unfortunate.

When we made the first dip into the background material and saw that it dealt with

permissive legislation, which largely has to do with municipalities passing bylaws about whether a person can cut trees on his own property, we were somewhat disappointed. However, we will come to the debate on two for one, three for one, one for one, an acre for an acre, a kingdom for a horse, or what have you, at some later time during this session, I am sure, when the minister announces his definite contracts with the pulp and paper companies with whom he now is negotiating for private reforestation. I am sure we can have a special emergency debate in the Legislature, if legislation is not necessary, or it can be worked out amicably among all parties when we come to discuss that matter.

I must say that our caucus supports this bill in principle, although we have some questions having to do with the detail of the clauses, particularly the exemptions that it grants—from my reading of the bill—to certain crown agencies and certain ministries to cut trees.

It would appear to me that, if this bill does not cover it, we should have some kind of protection to meet the situation that we ran into along a heritage highway in southwestern Ontario a few months ago, when the Ministry of Transportation and Communications got itself embroiled in a controversy about cutting trees along the side of what was in fact a heritage highway. I do not believe that this act covers that situation, and we will have some questions at the clause-by-clause stage.

For that reason, while we approve of this bill in principle, we would like to see it go into committee—committee of the whole House is satisfactory to us—so that some of those questions can be answered during clause-by-clause consideration.

Mr. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. For those people living close to a metropolitan area, such as those I represent in the region of York, which is just half a roadway away from Metropolitan Toronto, it is very important that we have a bill of this kind.

A good many of the people I represent have asked me for this bill over the past two or three years. I am glad that this minister has had the fortitude to come forth with this particular piece of legislation at this time, which we hope will become law, particularly in areas in southern Ontario where our forests are getting scarcer and scarcer. They are being used up by land that is being developed for housing, industry, Hydro rights of way, highways and so forth. This will preserve some of our old forests.

An hon. member: You might not be able to get out of the forest.

Mr. Hodgson: Well, maybe not. But, however, we will go around the forest, we will go around the bush to get out of the trees and we will go into where there are no trees. I fully support this bill 100 per cent and I hope the members of this Legislature will see fit on third reading to pass this bill.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Very briefly, I was touched by the comments of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, although he wasn't talking about this bill really.

Mr. Nixon: I hoped you would be.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Honourable members will be delighted to know that I expect to bring in an amendment to the Crown Timber Act which will deal with the matter of reforestation and that sort of thing. I am happy that there is support for this bill in principle and I would suggest that it go to committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

Ordered for committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole.

PROVINCIAL OFFENCES ACT

Resumption of the adjourned consideration of Bill 74, The Provincial Offences Act, 1978.

On section 94:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I understand that when the committee last considered this bill, we arrived at and passed up to section 93. Any questions on section 94?

Mrs. Campbell: Weren't we bogged down on the appeal provisions, paying fines pending the appeal?

Mr. Sterling: That was section 95.

Section 94 agreed to.

On section 95.

Mrs. Campbell: I regret that I don't recall the stage of our debate, but one of these matters which was raised during the course of the debate on section 95 was the question of the mandatory provision to pay the fine as a condition precedent to launching an appeal. I think we tried to point out at that time that one of the problems with this bill has been that most people tended to view it as a bill which related to somewhat minor offences, such as some of the minor offences under the Highway Traffic Act.

[9:15]

In view of the fact that we are dealing now with the major offences, it seems we

need to have some clarification, because some of the fines and penalties could be very major and could preclude the appeals. I think that is the basic concern, although my colleague from Ottawa has a concern about the general principle of it. So I wouldn't like anyone to think that in dealing with the major problems we are precluding debate on the principle itself: that is, as to whether or not someone should be required to pay a penalty as a condition preceding the launching of an appeal.

We would like to hear from the ministry on that point.

Mr. Sterling: I think one of the things that was not pointed out in the previous debate was that, in fact, this section deals with part III offences only. It does not deal with part I or part II offences. There is no parallel section later on in the bill, when we deal with appeals on part I and part II sections—there is no parallel to this particular section in that part of the act.

You will notice from the section that there is, under subsection 2, a considerable power given the judge to aid compliance with subsection 1. If the fine should be of a higher amount, then it is our feeling that a recognizance could be put forward in order to alleviate a problem of the pecuniary penalty being too great for someone to launch an appeal.

As to the general principle we discussed: perhaps I could summarize the Attorney General's position on that particular matter. Basically, the position is that there have been too many frivolous appeals which either have been abandoned or the defendant didn't show up when they got to trial. This is both costly and time-consuming to the whole justice system.

It is our submission that by putting in this provision that the penalty must be paid prior to filing the notice of appeal, the appeals will be made more bona fide in their intention.

We mentioned that we suspect the majority of the offences deal with demerit points. I realize the problem relates to demerit points and the solution relates to money. It is hard to marry those two. So we feel at this time, after discussion with the many people involved in the practical experience of the criminal courts, that this will act as a deterrent by diminishing the number of frivolous appeals.

I know it is hard. I have spent some time grappling with the total situation. But I think, because of the problem we have encountered, that we should allow the section

to stand; especially because subsection 2 is there and the judge has a wide discretion to allow recognizance in lieu of paying the penalty.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I just have this to say. In so far as it relates to demerit points, I sometimes think we are in the position, on occasion, of some jurors who have general conversations with people out there. So far as the demerit points are concerned, I wonder if you have ever discussed with people how they can put off the inevitable until such time as they drop some of the demerit points they have picked up along the way.

I don't think, with the greatest respect, this is any kind of a deterrent, and I don't know how anybody dealing generally in the business of the courts in this respect could seriously think that is effective if that is what it is supposed to be doing. If people have gathered so many demerit points along the way and they see that by such and such a date some of them will be dropped off the record, there is nothing in the world that is going to prevent them from continuing their appeal and holding off the evil day as long as possible.

In any event, I have great sympathy with those of my colleagues who feel very strongly that if there is an appeal open one should not be faced with the payment of a penalty as a condition precedent to launching an appeal. I cannot withdraw from that position.

Mr. Lawlor: I disagree.

Mrs. Campbell: Pat, and I bought your book, too.

Mr. Lawlor: In this particular matter, again, this is not supposed to be criminal stuff. It has been too long an abuse and I have been a party to it on too many occasions—saying simply to appeal it and tie the whole thing up. I know the appeal courts are months and months in arrears of the cases and it has been a trick whereby you can retain the licence and you can keep the money in the bank in the meantime. I see no reason in these kinds of cases, since such a large number of the appeals are either fallacious or fictitious, that if they are in good faith they will pay that fine and give subsequent reimbursement.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment I think I made two weeks ago when we first started discussing this section. I am a bit surprised by the comments of my colleague the member for Lakeshore, because I know he is a man who deals in principles. One of the principles of an appeal is that once you give the right to appeal and that

principle is enacted in legislation, it presumes that you feel there was an error made, or for some other reason. If that right of appeal is given it should be an absolute right; it shouldn't be given partially or otherwise. If the right is given, then all the benefits that flow with the right should follow.

One of the rights is that people not serve any penalty, or suffer the consequences of the penalty, pending an appeal, because at that point there seems to be some impediment to that right of appeal. That right should be given unfettered. There should not be some attempt to discourage people from going on appeal if they feel they should be going on appeal. That is why I agree with my colleague the member for St. George.

If it wasn't for the fact that there is a subsection 2 where the judge may waive compliance with subsection 1, and I quote my colleagues in the House who are with me, we would take serious objection to agreeing to letting this part of section 95 go through. But the fact is the judge can waive compliance.

As my colleague from St. George said—and we have discussed this section together—we are not only talking about situations where there is a \$25 traffic fine. It may well be that this law will apply in circumstances where the fines are very substantial indeed, and where it is harsh punishment for the defendant to pay the fine pending the appeal.

But hopefully the courts will have an out in subsection 2, and may look at the situation and may feel that in no circumstances are they justified in not enforcing compliance with section 1. I take it I am correct in saying the provisions of subsection 2 say that a judge—that is an appeal judge, I presume—may waive compliance with subsection 1, one of the compliances being that the fine be paid in full.

If it wasn't for that, I can say to the parliamentary assistant, I would take serious objection to section 95(1) in forcing an individual to pay the fine. Either we give him the right to appeal, or we don't. If there is an abuse of that right of appeal, there are other ways of curbing that abuse.

What I am trying to say, basically, is that I am still concerned that we give a right of appeal, and that in some ways we are imposing an impediment to that right by forcing him to pay the fine.

Section 95 agreed to.

Sections 96 to 100, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 101:

Mr. Lawlor: I just want to make a comment. There was an alteration made: "An

appellant who is in custody as a result of the decision appealed from is entitled to be present at the hearing of the appeal." That was something that we argued and moved and fought for, and which is now embodied. I want to point out that it is an alteration and a beneficent one.

Mr. Sterling: I wanted to indicate that this has been dubbed by the committee "the Lawlor amendment."

Mr. Deputy Chairman: He has a number of those, Mr. Parliamentary Assistant.

Section 101 agreed to:

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are there any sections that members want to speak to up to the end of 122 before we get into rules of appeal?

Mr. Lawlor: Just 121(2).

Mr. Roy: I wanted to ask one question on section 110—on trial de novo.

Sections 101 to 109, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 110:

Mr. Roy: I take it that the gist of that section is that under the provisions of this statute the only way one will get a trial de novo is by way of an application. I want to get confirmation of this from the parliamentary assistant. It appears also that the only way the judge can grant it is if something has happened to the condition of the record of the trial, or for a similar reason.

The other thing, as I read that section, is that even though you don't have a trial de novo, in the appeal process the court nevertheless has the discretion to hear viva voce evidence. Is my understanding of section 110 correct? I will wait for a response from the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Sterling: The member for Ottawa East is correct in noting you can only obtain an appeal and a trial de novo by an application. Secondly, the intent of the section is to limit the number of trials de novo that will come from an appeal. Basically, the section says the only time the appellate court should order a trial de novo is when there has been a problem with the record. In other words, the record has not been transcribed, perhaps, and the recorder is no longer available to transcribe the record or something similar of that nature, in terms of what has gone on during the trial. Something else has been wrong with the record of the trial; something is missing.

[9:30]

Mr. Roy: I understand that. The criminal code, in fact, a few years ago, amended the provision for trial de novo as well. Because,

as my colleagues here were saying, in talking about abuses, there were clearly abuses in the trial de novo when the trial de novo statements were being used as extensively as they were. I understand the purpose of that.

Moving on to subsection 2: As I read that section it says that even though you have a trial de novo, you can put in evidence, I take it, with the consent of the appellant and respondent and if the court is satisfied that attendance of witness cannot reasonably be obtained. I take it that, even though it is a trial de novo, you could still read in evidence of the previous hearing; the evidence does not have to be all viva voce. Is that how I understand subsection 2?

Mr. Sterling: Yes, your understanding of subsection 2 is right.

Section 110 agreed to.

Sections 111 to 120, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 121:

Mr. Lawlor: Section 121(2). Just basically the same comment as before, for the purpose of the record, and in case anyone would be interested in this debate: I think it should be specifically pointed out that this section has been substantially changed—that is, where the court directs a new trial be held in the provincial court presided over by a justice other than the justice who tried the defendant in the first instance. But here is where the change came. With the consent of both parties to the appeal, the same judge who heard the case previously, and who is being appealed from, may rehear the case. That is a very interesting and, I think, worthwhile change.

Mr. Roy: As I read it—I think it's a good amendment by the way; the fact that it should not be directed before the same justice unless the parties consent—but, as I read that, even the judge granting the appeal can hear it. That's the way I read it: that the new trial can be held before the justice who tried the defendant in the first instance, or before the judge who directs the new trial. You can have your new trial right there, can you?

Mr. Sterling: I think the section is self-explanatory. The appellate judge can order that the new trial be held before the justice. But he has to do a positive act in order to direct the trial by that same judge. The reason is that perhaps there is an exhibit missing in terms of the original trial; or, perhaps in certain areas of the province there is a limitation on the number of judges; that is why this particular part of the section is put in.

Section 121 agreed to.

Sections 122 to 137, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 138:

Mr. Lawlor: Section 138, subsections 3 and 4, particularly subsection 3: The reason I am standing up is because I don't remember why we did this and I would like clarification of the purpose. Previously, at the end of subsection 4, the words "for non-appearance" were not present. What is this subsection 3 being directed at, particularly as subsection 4 covers the same ground but appears to be a little more restrictive? In other words, explain it all to me.

Mr. Sterling: I'm surprised the member for Lakeshore doesn't remember, because that was a direct result of the delegation we had from the Quakers. We wanted to clarify the fact that the surety would only be responsible for a non-appearance and not for another condition of the recognizance.

Mr. Lawlor: I see. In other words, you say the surety only for non-appearance; the principle for everything; okay.

Section 138 agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Where shall we go next? I'm looking at the member for Lakeshore, or St. George or Ottawa East. Can we go right to the end of the bill?

Mr. Roy: Maybe I can make a facetious comment. I notice that when we are dealing with search warrants in section 142 the bill seems to cover everything, you have really looked at every aspect of this. I take it one of the reasons you didn't talk about eavesdropping or wire tapping is because you have no jurisdiction on this. I see one of my good friends smiling to the parliamentary assistant. You seem to have covered everything else.

As I was following through this, I was anxious to reach the point where we start talking about eavesdropping and wire tapping. I take it the only reason you have not gone into it is because you do not have any jurisdiction, is that it?

Mrs. Campbell: That's a very good reason. Sections 139 to 150, inclusive, agreed to.

Mrs. Campbell: I was going to have a comment at the conclusion before we finished with the bill, but do we have a section to go back to?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: It's my recollection we had to go back to the definition section.

Mrs. Campbell: That's correct. I would like to speak before we finalize the definition section.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: We're finished the bill except for the definition section.

On section 1:

Mr. Sterling: I think there was some question in relation to section 1(1)(f). The reason for defining a police officer as a chief of police or other police officer or constable is that under the Police Act a police officer doesn't include such people as a corporal, an inspector, a police chief, a deputy chief, and various other people whom the public recognize as police officers. So this is put in to define police officers as including everyone who in fact the public deem as being police officers. It's because there's a difference in the Police Act and this particular act in the definition of police officer.

Mrs. Campbell: As we're coming to the close of this bill. I must just once more indicate my very real concerns in some general terms, notwithstanding the point at which we've arrived with the bill. It seems to me there should be something on the record here from the ministry indicating its intent so far as the educational process is concerned, and so far as the tightening up, which is now apparently all too obviously needed in the system which is currently in place. It seemed to me that at some point before we disposed of this bill there should be some such statement for the benefit of those who still have deep concerns about what is going to happen once the bill is through.

Mr. Sterling: I know that during the committee sittings when the Attorney General appeared before the committee he made a commitment to the committee. It perhaps should be repeated here in the House so that it can be on record. There will be an extensive education process of the justices of the peace as to their function under this act and under Bill 75.

The act itself, in the way it's structured, will lead to a continuing education program of justices of the peace because of the appellate provisions, in that a decision of a justice of the peace will be directly appealed to his senior judge, so to speak, by the provincial court judge; so that not only will we have an education program but we will also have a continuing education of the justices of the peace through that force supervision.

I think the Attorney General and the ministry have also indicated to the committee and to this House that this bill will take approximately one year to come into full force. We also indicated to the committee that we will use this particular educational process to continue the education of the JPs with regard to problems in relation to other

areas of jurisdiction that a JP has. I think that was mostly pointed out with regard to the surety problem the Quaker group brought to us. We have no hesitation in giving that commitment to this Legislature.

Section 1 agreed to.

Bill 74, as amended, reported.

PROVINCIAL COURTS AMENDMENT ACT

Consideration of Bill 75, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Mr. Sterling: This bill basically sets up the provincial court to implement the provisions of Bill 74 which we have just dealt with. It is really a bill which deals with the nuts and bolts of setting up the court for purposes of using Bill 74.

Mrs. Campbell: Speaking for our party, I accept the fact that this is indeed the implementation bill to be the companion piece for Bill 74. I would just like to say that it is interesting to me that we have made every effort to somewhat decriminalize the provincial offences, but I note that we keep the rules committee the same. I suppose one can have two different approaches even in that area.

I have nothing to say so far as the bill is concerned. It has to be passed.

Mr. Lawlor: I think the very least one can do is bow obeisance to the fact that we spent time on this bill.

I do always find section 1 not so much of a puzzlement as a bemusement, I suppose. It reads in the last lines: "In the absence of express provision for procedures . . . the judge, justice of the peace or provincial court judge shall exercise the jurisdiction in any manner consistent with the due administration of justice." I am sure the parliamentary assistant, his advisers before him and any members of this House haven't got the remotest notion of what that particular section means, but who would we be to question such omniscience? Therefore, I don't want to make any major issue, unless you are particularly anxious to reply.

[9:45]

As for the rest, with the rules committee, that is very much in order. By the way, I

would like to see Williston's thing one of these days—it should be due about now—and then the contempt proceeding.

The bill is fruitful and worthwhile, but there is nothing contentious about it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Any comment on that, Mr. Parliamentary Assistant?

Mr. Sterling: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any comment. The only point is I believe that there is a certain law in relation to the criminal procedure that if the code hasn't got a procedure for it, then in fact, the magistrate can't do it.

This particular section 1 of Bill 75 is put in there in order to allow the justice of the peace or the provincial court judge to fill in between the cracks where there doesn't appear to be a procedure for a small technical point.

Mrs. Campbell: Catchall.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Shall all sections of Bill 75 as it appears before us, carry?

Agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Shall Bill 75 be reported?

Agreed to.

Mrs. Campbell: If we didn't report it, we'd be in trouble.

On motion by Mr. Sterling, the committee of the whole House reported one bill with amendment and one bill without.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 74, An Act to establish a Code of Procedure for Provincial Offences.

Bill 75, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

Mrs. Campbell: Isn't Mr. McMurtry remotely interested in these bills?

Mr. Nixon: Quitting time.

Mrs. Campbell: Have you run out of business?

Mr. Bradley: Emergency.

Mrs. Campbell: You haven't got your people here. Who's your whip?

On motion by Hon. F. S. Miller, the House adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

APPENDIX

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1979

STANDING RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The committee met at 8:10 p.m.

Clerk of the Committee: Ladies and gentlemen, I see a quorum. The first order of business is the election of a chairman, and I'd call for nominations.

Mr. Johnson: I propose Osie Villeneuve.

Mr. M. Davidson: I second the nomination.

Clerk of the Committee: Are there any other nominations? If not, I declare the nominations closed and Mr. Villeneuve as chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Members of the committee, I want to thank you for appointing me as chairman.

The position of vice-chairman is open if somebody will nominate someone for that.

Mr. Lane: I nominate Andy Watson.

Mr. M. Davidson: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other nominations? If not, I declare Mr. Andy Watson as vice-chairman of this committee.

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, before we begin, there are a couple of procedural things I would like to raise with you, if I might.

First of all, is there any indication that the minister is going to be here during these hearings?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Whip, I will have to ask you.

Mr. Haggerty: The chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board is here.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the minister will be here. He has been detained for a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Fine.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: Before we go on to the Workmen's Compensation Board report, which is the subject of consideration tonight, could we deal with a scheduling matter for the committee for future sittings so that we have a timetable?

Mr. Chairman: I thought that we should settle our itinerary for this week at least, because I hear through the grapevine that some are not too anxious to sit tomorrow evening and that some request we should

use up this time if it is needed; so I am open for any suggestions that may come from the members of the committee.

Mr. Lane: I think we can find time while the House is in session. I am not prepared to sit tomorrow night.

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, will you accept a procedural motion for debate, if necessary?

I would move that this committee sit Thursday afternoon following routine proceedings to make up for the time that might be lost.

If I may speak to that, it is my understanding that there was an agreement among the House leaders that we would have 15 hours in which to deal with the Workmen's Compensation Board. If we follow the schedule that has been set out, we will have approximately 12½ hours; therefore, to make up the 15 hours, I would move that we sit Thursday afternoon following routine proceedings.

Mr. Lane: And not Wednesday evening.

Mr. M. Davidson: Not Wednesday evening; Thursday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: Is that acceptable?

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Chairman, in view of the motion, I would like to ask if there is any determination that we sit only this week, or if there is any preclusion of next week.

Mr. Chairman: I understand, according to what I have here, that we have until Friday. But on Wednesday, according to the schedule here, the times are 10 a.m. to 12:30 and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Personally, I have no objection to going until 5 if most members are agreeable to that.

Mr. Van Horne: If I may continue the question that I asked—in a sense you were not able to answer whether we could go into next week—my point is simply this: It is fine for House leaders to agree to whatever they feel might be right at the beginning of their determination of what the business will be for the following week or so, but it should be the prerogative of the committee members to determine what they feel they can justifiably and rightfully do in determining the business of the committee.

My point is that if we can't finish this week—and I am not prepared, either on my own behalf or on behalf of the other members of our caucus, to sit on Wednesday evening—if we can't finish this week, not sitting Wed-

nesday evening, we should request permission to sit next week, if in fact we don't have permission by whatever agreement the House leaders may have made.

Mr. McClellan: What is wrong with Thursday afternoon?

Mr. Van Horne: I am not excluding or precluding Thursday afternoon. I am submitting that the hours that may be allotted for this week should not cut us out of next week.

Mr. McClellan: Let's agree to sit Thursday afternoon and then see where we are on Friday; and if we still have some work to do—

Mr. Van Horne: Was that part of the motion that was made?

Mr. M. Davidson: I can include that if you like. My concern, and the concern of the members of our caucus, is that we do get in the 15 hours.

[8:15]

Mr. Bounsall: The shift from Wednesday night to Thursday afternoon does get the possibility of 15 hours in all this week.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that we would finish Friday at one o'clock; if we have to schedule extra sittings for Thursday afternoon and Wednesday afternoon, so be it, but let's not go beyond one o'clock Friday. If this is the case, then Wednesday and Thursday afternoon are not acceptable.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, if we accept the motion for Thursday afternoon, that does get 15 hours in by one o'clock Friday, sitting the agreed-upon times on Wednesday morning and afternoon, Thursday evening and Friday morning; if we add the Thursday afternoon and not Wednesday night, we do get 15 hours in by one o'clock Friday.

Mr. Johnson: And we'd finish Friday at one.

Mr. Bounsall: That's right. Call the motion then.

Mr. Chairman: Are you in favour of sitting on Thursday afternoon after question period?

Mr. Johnson: Yes. Conditional upon finishing Friday at one o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Van Horne: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman: It can't be conditional on that; if there are 15 hours and they're not finished by Friday, then it should be the prerogative of the committee to ask that it extend into next week to give those 15 hours that we are supposed to have.

Mr. M. Davidson: I would suggest, if I might, that when we get to one o'clock

Friday afternoon, we take a look as to whether or not we have the 15 hours; if not, then we make a decision as to where we go from there. Is that okay?

Mr. Van Horne: I would agree with that, but I don't want to see one o'clock Friday as an absolute.

Mr. McClellan: But the absolute is 15 hours.

Mr. Van Horne: That's right.

Mr. Chairman: I think we have a very good chance of sitting 15 hours this week. If we sit on Wednesday till five o'clock, we would gain an additional hour. If we meet on Thursday after question period, we would gain two and a half hours or thereabouts; and if we meet in the evening and on Friday, that would give us approximately 15 hours. Is that satisfactory?

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, that's satisfactory to me too, but I want to go on to deal a little with the following week, because we do still have to deal with the report of the hearings in February on acid rain, control orders and so on. I understand the draft report will be ready by the end of this week; so we could deal with it at the first meeting next week, on the Tuesday evening. But I would like us to decide that now so that people can read the report and prepare themselves for dealing with that report; also, some people who dealt with those hearings in February may wish to substitute on the committee.

I would suggest that we earmark next Tuesday, a week tonight, for consideration of the draft report on the environmental hearings that were held in February.

Mr. Chairman: Any more discussion on this subject?

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that a motion was introduced in the House on March 15 that we finish consideration of the Workmen's Compensation Board report by March 30.

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mr. Johnson: Which is Friday.

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mr. Johnson: Is this correct?

Mr. McClellan: As long as we have the 15 hours.

Mr. Johnson: If it is, is that not an order to this committee to finish by March 30?

Mr. McClellan: I think we have our 15 hours.

Mr. Chairman: I think it's understood, Jack, that we will.

Mr. Johnson: All right.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we get at and finish up the discussion of the report on the acid rain and the pulp and paper control orders. The staff we have hired to prepare an initial report for consideration by the committee is in a position now to circulate that to those members. I think we should get at it fairly shortly. If you need a motion I would make one that we consider that next Tuesday night. That is assuming that the Workmen's Compensation Board is finished by the 30th, as we have agreed.

Mr. Chairman: I see no reason why you shouldn't make the motion.

Mr. Bounsall: I so move.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, I have another procedural motion, if I may. I would like to move that the topics to be dealt with under the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board be carried out in the same manner that we would go through in dealing with normal estimates; and that we deal with them in the following order: main administration, claims, applications, review, appeals, rehabilitation, medical, vocational, benefits, payment levels, pensions, and investments.

I can give the clerk a copy of this.

My reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that in past years in dealing with the report of the compensation board we have had a great deal of difficulty, both as committee members and other members of the Legislature, in finding out exactly what topics were coming up. We have had the problem whereby members who would like to speak to specific points within the report have been absent and have come in at a later time and raised similar subjects to those that have been raised previously and have already been discussed. I think by following this line of order—and it is an order that Dr. Bounsall referred to in the discussion of last year's report and seemed to have some sympathy from the board on—they, too, felt it could probably expedite matters. I think it would give us a more thorough review of the report, and I think it will allow members who wish to participate to know exactly when these topics will be coming up, and they will be able to participate if they are interested in that certain section.

Mr. Chairman: Is the committee in favour of following this schedule?

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this with our committee members. A couple of them are not here at this moment, but the consensus was that this would be

reasonable, understanding or assuming that in fact we would make every effort to get through from one through five, starting with administration ending with investment, and not get bogged down with the claims section.

Mr. M. Davidson: If I may speak to that: When we talk about the claims section we are not talking about bringing in a truck load of individual claims and dumping them on to the committee or on to the chairman of the board. We are talking about the general, overall claims section more than anything else.

Mr. Van Horne: In which case we concur, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want me to read the items as they are listed?

Mr. Johnson: Yes.

Mr. Van Horne: Yes, please.

Mr. Chairman: 1. Main administration; 2. Claims; 2(i). Applications; 2(ii). Review; 2(iii). Appeals; 3. Rehabilitation; 3(i). Medical 3(ii). Vocational; 4. Benefits; 4(i). Payment levels; 4(ii). Pensions; 5. Investments.

I would ask the chairman of the compensation board to come forward.

Mr. M. Davidson: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I do have one more procedural motion. I would move, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, that Thursday evening be set aside, and that this committee be allowed to call witnesses other than people from the Workmen's Compensation Board, but witnesses who in fact worked with injured workers throughout the entire year.

Mr. Chairman: Is that agreeable to the committee?

Mr. Haggerty: Are you talking about the Injured Worker's Consultants?

Mr. M. Davidson: In this particular case I am talking about the Union of Injured Workers, the Injured Worker's Consultants, the legal consultants for injured workers; and the Ontario Federation of Labour if they so care to present themselves.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, that's rather short notice, I believe. If I had known that this resolution was coming forward, I and I am sure almost every member would have been able to bring in representatives from within certain unions and industry in Ontario.

If we accept the motion as it is now, that means there is only a certain privileged few who have the opportunity to come forward. I suggest at this time I don't think that I could accept such a proposal.

Mr. M. Davidson: The motion simply says "witnesses"; it doesn't say who they should

be. You asked me a question and I gave you an answer.

Mr. Haggerty: All I am suggesting is that I think it is a good idea, but I think on such short notice as this other members would have witnesses wanting to come in too. I don't think it would be quite fair. I don't have to tell you that from my dealings with workmen's compensation, particularly some of the union representatives who deal with compensation cases in the industry in the Erie riding would be only too happy to be here, but on such short notice I don't think it would be fair to them; and I don't think it would be fair to them to be left out of it.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the member who just made the proposal, he tested that on me earlier in the day and my reaction was not negative, and yet in fairness, I have not had the opportunity to canvass the people in our caucus.

As an afterthought to our conversation I had to wonder if that wasn't all bad. Perhaps it could be extended to such a thing as the committee visiting the Downsview Hospital and Rehabilitation Centre to have an informal meeting with some of the people who in fact are attendant there and get some input from them. Fair is fair on both sides of the fence, and with the little involvement that I have had—keep in mind that I have been in this position for only something less than two weeks in terms of being critic for our party; in that short span I have had a fair bit of representation from people who have been there in the last short while who have suggested that it may well be worth my while, or our party's while or every member's while, to go and be part of the Monday night input sessions they have.

Having said that, I can't suggest that we are against the motion, and yet on the other hand I am not sure it is either as broad as it should be or that we can go along with it. So I would submit that a motion to table would be in order so that we might come back and consider it at the beginning of the session tomorrow morning. I would therefore so move, that we table until tomorrow morning.

Mr. Chairman: Any other member wish to speak on this?

Mr. Bounsall: A motion to table is not debatable, I don't think, Mr. Chairman; is it? If it was a motion, is that a motion?

Mr. Van Horne: That's an old Windsor rule.

Mr. Bounsall: Can you imagine all the motions to table that are going to come up

here; because that's okay by us, I think, if we wait until tomorrow to decide.

Mr. Chairman: I think in fairness, since it is such short notice, that perhaps everybody will be in a better position tomorrow to give a decisive answer as to what procedure we should follow, whether we should visit this institution; because after all I can understand that everybody wants to be fair. Do you have any objection to that?

[8:30]

Mr. M. Davidson: I think we can table it for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1977, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, we have you here; and the first item is the main administration. Would you care to open it and then ask for the chairman to carry on?

Mr. M. Davidson: If I may, I think the chairman and the two leadoff speakers should be allowed the prerogative of doing a general, overall view and then we start following the procedure.

Mr. Chairman: That is what I think, but I just thought as a gesture of politeness to ask the minister if he had any—

Mr. Haggerty: The 15 hours, then, start at 8:30.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, some months ago I submitted to Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, the 1977 annual report for the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario. I do not intend to go into the details of that report at this time, unless there are definite points you wish to discuss at the conclusion of my remarks.

During the next few minutes I will touch on the highlights in that report and try to bring you up to date on the current work of the WCB.

In 1977 we processed 423,767 claims. Our total for 1978 will be 424,609, an increase of less than 1,000. These are impressive figures but I must say our work cannot be evaluated on the basis of statistics alone. What is important is the manner in which we handle claims rather than the number that we process.

While it is true that we receive 1,700 claims each working day, we deal with them one at a time. While we have computers and other modern facilities and machines to assist with our paperwork, we cannot judge the merits of a claim on a mechanical basis. Each one of those claims must receive indi-

vidual, personal attention. Our claims people are acutely aware that our claimants are individual men and women under stress, and because of this each claim deserves and demands prompt attention. To handle these calls for help in any other manner would be to fail in our mandate to assist the injured workers of this province.

We have been criticized for the length of time it takes to settle some claims. I would like to call your attention to the fact that 98 per cent of our uncomplicated claims are paid within five days of the receipt of the accident report in our mail room.

On claims where the doctor's report is the first notification of an accident, it is often necessary to request a report and, in some instances, further details from the employer; yet more than 93 per cent of these cases are paid within 30 working days.

Extended-disability claims may require a detailed investigation; yet more than 75 per cent of the claims of this nature are paid within 30 days.

Considering our workload, which increases by 1,700 claims a day, I do not consider criticism of our efficiency in this respect is justified. I will, however, be the first to admit that in handling 424,000 claims a year, there are bound to be some errors. I am very unhappy when this occurs, and we make every effort to make up for this unfortunate lost time.

Sometimes, however, delays are beyond our control. When an employer or a doctor delays in sending information to us, we must hold up the claim until we receive the details we need. Our guidelines for this are clearly laid down under the terms of the Workmen's Compensation Act. We must follow this act. Although we are allowed some discretion in applying its terms, it limits us in certain areas. For instance, we are very much the servants of the Legislature when it comes to minimum and maximum benefits.

I must mention at this time the dedication of the WCB staff which was very much in evidence during the latest mail delivery disruption. Anticipating a strike, our staff prepared more than 60,000 pension cheques in advance of the normal mailing date and forwarded them to the pensioners. They also set up and staffed 28 temporary depots throughout the province and at head office where claimants could pick up their compensation cheques during the mail stoppage. More than 25,000 cheques were distributed in this manner, preventing many cases of hardship on the part of the recipients.

The board's medical services division is continually conducting research in the field of

industrial medicine. Based on preliminary reports of research the board had commissioned, it was possible last year to set up guidelines to allow claims for cancer of the larynx. To date, 10 claims have been allowed.

Early in 1978, criteria were established which allowed the board to evaluate permanent disability in white-finger disease, which occurs among workers using vibrating equipment. To date, more than 70 new cases have been accepted, while pensions are being paid in 81 cases, including some which were approved prior to 1977.

During the year the back education program was commenced, and more than 600 patients now have been given this training. While the program appears to be working very well, it is still too early for a full evaluation. However, because approximately 25 per cent of all claims involved back problems, this program is of great importance to the people we serve.

Over the past few years the board has sponsored, wholly or in part, 29 medical research projects; all of these have been directly related to the assessment and treatment of injured workers. The benefits of some of these projects will, I am sure, be shared with and welcomed by the general public in the not-too-distant future.

Last November, our hospital and rehabilitation centre at Downsview celebrated its 20th anniversary. More than 100,000 patients have been treated there since it was opened. It admits and discharges 7,500 patients a year and carries out 2,500 treatment sessions each and every day.

Hospital and rehabilitation centre staff continues to develop and test innovative diagnostic and treatment methods. It has formed special clinic teams to provide the special expertise which is required to assess and treat complex cases. This is a new concept in patient treatment, and we have been among the first hospitals in North America to adopt it.

The Downsview centre is the largest facility of its kind in North America and is recognized as one of the leading rehabilitation treatment centres for injured workers in the whole world. Each year, hundreds of visitors from other Canadian provinces and from many foreign countries visit this centre. They study the work we are doing there and have adopted many of the procedures and treatments developed by the centre.

The centre does not concentrate only on the patient's physical treatment. Rehabilitation encompasses psychological assistance, assessment for new skills and the use of specially trained social workers.

Everything possible is done to ensure that the patient's recovery is as rapid and complete as possible. But we cannot casually write off an injured worker as a statistic merely because he or she has been released from the hospital. In many cases they are not able to pursue their former occupation, so we feel it is the responsibility of the Workmen's Compensation Board to assist them in finding gainful employment. To accomplish this, we attempt to match job vacancies with an injured worker's capabilities. To locate these vacancies, we have undertaken a promotion campaign which points out the advantages of hiring these rehabilitated workers. As a result of our efforts, more than 1,400 job vacancies have been listed and more than 400 workers have been placed in jobs suited to their capabilities. The high standards set by the rehabilitation counsellors ensure that a particular job is in keeping with the injured employee's skills and interests.

We anticipate they will become even more selective in the future, resulting in a higher placement rate. Certainly, as more employers become aware of this program, our placement rate will increase accordingly.

Part of the program consists of on-the-job training where we pay a decreasing proportion of the employee's wages, with the employer gradually assuming the cost as the worker becomes fully trained.

Midway through 1978, we increased the staff of our vocational rehabilitation division. This gave the counsellors a reduced caseload, allowing them to spend more time on individual cases. Overall, the rehabilitation staff was instrumental in returning close to 5,000 injured workers to suitable occupations.

I have mentioned that we process more than 1,700 claims a day. In handling a volume of this nature, we recognize that the continuous upgrading of our claims personnel and procedures is a matter of major importance.

I want to assure you, lady and gentlemen, that we are not content merely to function in a holding pattern; we are seeking new and better methods by which claims can be even more efficiently processed. To help accomplish this, we have added a new information office in Kingston to the eight area offices and five information offices already in operation.

Additional staff has been added to the claims information and counselling services branch. This additional staff was found to be necessary as the number of claims in which local investigators were involved increased by 20 per cent in 1978 over the previous year.

The efforts of the claims services division are being aimed at obtaining information and medical evidence more quickly, especially in cases involving reopened claims and claims that are complex in nature.

[8:45]

At our head office we have installed more modern switchboard equipment and added more inquiry clerks to be able to handle inquiries more efficiently.

By the use of courier services we have greatly reduced the delay in transferring documents between the head office and field offices. We have added 10 initial adjudicators and four co-ordinators to our claims staff, and they have undergone intensive training. Our more senior investigators have also taken part in this training program.

As I mentioned previously, the whole thrust of our claims procedure is aimed towards a considered, efficient and prompt appraisal of the claims we receive. We are continuing with our study on decentralizing our claims offices and are evaluating the possible increase in efficiency and convenience to our clients such a program might produce.

Because the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act are conveyed by law as a right, we have a moral obligation to make everyone aware of them. Our communications division has maintained an active program designed to acquaint as many people as possible with the services available to injured workers. A province-wide survey indicates that almost all Ontario adults are aware of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the vast majority of them have a clear understanding of its basic functions.

The survey also showed that the public tends to have favourable attitudes towards the board. The survey provided ample evidence that the Workmen's Compensation Board employees were regarded as courteous and helpful, and that the public felt the board was doing its best to settle claims as quickly as possible.

However, the survey also showed that many people were not aware of the full scale of benefits available, and we are taking steps to correct this deficiency. We have continued to maintain a strong liaison with the news media throughout the province and have found that this leads to greater accuracy in reporting.

We have added staff to set up direct lines of communication with Ontario's ethnic community. Immigrants to our province form a large proportion of the work force, and it is only fair not only that they be fully

acquainted with their rights under the act, but also that we provide this information in their own language.

Our appeals division continues as a key factor in our procedural process, not only because of its function, but also because it is there and people know it is there. I believe that no other compensation board in the world has a system with so many built-in opportunities for the worker to be heard.

The board authorized an increase in staff for the appeals division, with the result that the backlog of appeal cases has been greatly reduced. The average waiting period for an appeals adjudicator hearing in Toronto has been reduced from 12 weeks to four weeks. This was achieved by increasing by 20 per cent the number of hearings heard by adjudicators in 1978.

In an effort to make the facilities of the appeal board available to as many people as possible with a minimum of inconvenience, the appeal board now travels to major Ontario centres outside Toronto for the purpose of holding hearings. The board has increased its out-of-town schedule so that two centres are visited each month. The appeal board continues, of course, to provide the service of interpreters, and workmen's advisers are available should an appellant require assistance.

As you know, the Workmen's Compensation Board funds the nine safety associations which work with various industries throughout the province, and we have a keen interest in the promotion of safe working conditions. I am certain that, were it not for the programs sponsored by the safety associations and their acceptance by both the workers and the employers of this province, our accident rate would be much higher than it actually is.

The accident rate is, of course, a prime factor in establishing the assessment cost factor. But the sound actuarial practices of the Workmen's Compensation Board, combined with our administrative procedures, enable us to levy an assessment rate which can be favourably compared with any other compensation board in Canada.

We try to give good value for that portion of the assessment dollar that pays for our administrative services. Our administrative costs are approximately six cents for each assessment dollar collected. Here again, this figure compares very favourably with other jurisdictions and most certainly is lower than that experienced by most Canadian provinces.

At the request of many employers, we changed our method of assessment payments

to allow those firms whose annual assessment was \$500 or over to pay their annual fee on a quarterly basis; this commenced at the beginning of this year and will greatly improve the cash flow situation with many of these firms.

In concluding, I would like to repeat my observation that we are constantly striving to upgrade our methods and our procedures. We are also very much aware of the fact that the reason for our existence is to provide assistance to the injured workers of Ontario, and that we must provide this assistance in a humane, efficient and equitable manner.

We have sometimes been pictured as a big, uncaring bureaucracy, whose primary purpose is to say "no" to those who ask for our help. I assure you this is not correct. Every day our attention is called to examples of our staff members walking that extra mile to render some special assistance to a claimant.

We may have our critics and our detractors, but we have our boosters too. I would like to quote to you excerpts from letters we received recently, and have been receiving throughout the years; quotations like these: "I would like to thank you for your speedy and helpful assistance"; "The hospital and rehabilitation centre is one of the cleanest, best-run institutions I have ever been in"; "I request that you convey our thanks to everyone at the WCB who always give a person in difficulty the benefit of their patience and understanding"; "I must say that everyone was more than willing to help me"; "Your staff showed me a personal sincerity and concern which was greatly appreciated."

Those are some of the quotations from the letters we received. They are just a few of the many letters and messages of appreciation.

The WCB, lady and gentlemen, has a difficult job to do, but I feel strongly that it is doing it well. For this we have to thank a great many dedicated employees at that board. As I have on previous appearances before your committee, I would like to express publicly the appreciation the board and I have for their loyal work. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Starr. Do you want to go into claims as your first—

Mr. M. Davidson: I think Mr. Van Horne should do a general lead-off.

Mr. Van Horne: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the comment from Mr. Davidson; I do want to make a few general

introductory comments, again keeping in mind that my role as critic in labour is a new role to me and that my knowledge is probably on the short side. It does not, however, reflect a lack of interest or lack of desire to pursue these 15 hours of debate, and then further to that our general concern about the labour ministry beyond the Workmen's Compensation Board of course.

First of all, our committee members who will be present over the next few days include myself; Mr. Bolan, who is sitting beside me, the member for Nipissing; Mr. Riddell from Huron-Middlesex, who will be along later this evening; and Mr. Julian Reed from Halton-Burlington; and of course Mr. Haggerty is with us too, in a sense almost ex officio and by the same token as a member of our caucus who is extremely concerned with the Workmen's Compensation Board and its operation, and whose experience in the labour field is considerably more than mine.

We don't have an elaborate statement to make, although we have a few points that we would like to touch on. I would observe, having listened to Mr. Starr and having read the report, that for the layman, for the person who is not either an employee or totally versed in the Workmen's Compensation Board, that one's first reaction to this report is that everything is A-okay; you know, there is really nothing all that wrong and thank God for WCB and let it carry on.

Having said that, I would have to ask the question of myself: why, then, is my log in my constituency office about two thirds full of calls and complaints about Workmen's Compensation Board? I want to make it abundantly clear that the local office in my riding, and the local office in London, Ontario, which helps not only my riding of London North but the other ridings in and around London, that local office bends over backwards to try to accommodate us; I have every admiration for the people there in terms of their willingness to communicate with us whatever information they can.

Yet at the same time as I say that, I have to point out to Mr. Starr, and to the minister if he was here, that there is still a tremendous gap between what goes on in the local community for those seven, eight, nine, 10 per cent that can't be dealt with expediently, quickly, satisfactorily, and what is going on apparently in the home office, the head office—Metro, the government, whatever you wish to call it. You have to keep in mind that the people out there working in my community, in the General Motors plant or in the Minnesota Mining plant or the Kellogg's plant or

wherever, who have run into some kind of problem on the job and have had to go to workmen's compensation for assistance, they don't perceive the machinery as nicely as it is laid out in the annual reports.

The reports, again as you read them, are fine, but I would submit for my first round in this exercise that there should be a change made in the format. Let's tell the members of the Legislature, let's tell the people who take the time to read this report and the other reports that come along, that there indeed are some problems, and here is where they are and here is what they are.

As I read this report, I am sorry I don't find that. What is left to us as legislators, as people whom the first ombudsman has called the local ombudsman, we the members, the local ombudsperson or ombudsman, have got to try to explain to that injured worker or to that injured worker's wife, that in fact there are two or three levels of activity and we back in the boondocks in London are not able to resolve their problems, that we do in fact have to lean on what is happening here in Toronto.

But when we read these reports we don't find any of the problems listed; and in fairness, if you are presenting an annual report then you should devote some of your time and energy to pointing out areas where there are problems. And certainly, for whatever it's worth, if you do that, in my opinion, you would be helping the user whenever he or she comes along, and you would be helping the people who are trying to help the user—the members particularly—to identify some of the problems. You don't do that in this report. For openers, I would offer that as a criticism.

[9:00]

I would not like to get into too many specifics at this point, although I have 15 or 20 pages to read—not quite up to the 23 pages that the chairman, Mr. Starr, read. But mine are single-spaced and yours are double- or triple-spaced; so I suppose I could catch up and pass you. However, having gone through the exercise of spending some of the winter break trying to catch up with this, let me touch on a few points that concern me.

The first point, again, is: Let's have annual reports that point out some of the problems with workmen's compensation. That's point one. Point two: In reading through the Hansard reports from previous years, and for the last couple of years particularly, I find statements that concern me because I don't know that they've been followed up; if they have, please point out to me that I am wrong in drawing this to your attention.

From March 16, 1978, at page 773 of Hansard, I find a statement as follows: "The management committee's recommendation further said that the consultants should carry out detailed research and planning on methods of implementing a system of decentralized claims adjudication and provide us with an estimate of the associated costs." Maybe that has happened. I don't know. If it has, where are we going?

I have been in the Legislature just less than two years, but close to half, if not two thirds, of my time and my secretary's time in London is spent in trying to resolve problems centred on workmen's compensation. What we perceive as the major issue is that the local office really can't get into the decision-making process without some kind of contact or consultation with head office or with Toronto. Where have we gone with that statement I just read to you from Hansard? Is it happening? Will it be happening?

Again, I see the chairman, Mr. Starr, nodding his head in the affirmative. Perhaps when I've finished these statements he can come back and tell me more about this decentralization. I don't think decentralization is working as it should, no matter what I read here in Hansard. Perhaps you can prove to me where I'm wrong.

My other comments relate to political accountability and increased links with government. The task force of 1973—again, I'm digging into history—made a recommendation that there be a stronger and more formal link between the Workmen's Compensation Board and government. It was further suggested that the chairman and the Minister of Labour should meet regularly to discuss policy and administrative matters related to the act. It was also suggested that there be regular meetings between the minister and the Workmen's Compensation Board in general.

To my knowledge, the WCB has remained basically autonomous in spite of that recommendation, and whatever was suggested there isn't happening as it was intended to happen. Again, prove me wrong, please. Tell me if this is not happening as it was intended to happen.

Further, it was recommended that there be a direct relationship between WCB and Management Board through the Minister of Labour, thus providing Management Board with more information on WCB. Is that happening? I don't know. I've been reading and trying to find out. But it appears to me, albeit from casual discussions with some members of the cabinet, that they are not too knowledgeable about what is happening with WCB.

The 1973 task force also indicated that there was an absence of a complete set of regulations governing the benefit sections of Workmen's Compensation Act which has resulted in confusion and lack of awareness of WCB procedures and practices.

What about the guidelines? Are they different from or improved from that point up to now? Let me pick just an example or two to suggest that perhaps they are not. There are inconsistencies in the way the Canada Pension Plan benefits affected a claimant who was receiving total temporary disability benefits, and I can refer to Hansard for December 12, 1978, and a question asked by Mr. Laughren, the member for Nickel Belt. He said, at page 5943:

"Indeed, I have cases in my own constituency where workers receiving full benefits equivalent to total temporary disability benefits are receiving the Canada Pension Plan benefits as well as the total temporary disability benefits.

"How does the minister explain the inconsistency of one injured worker receiving CPP plus total temporary disability benefits on rehabilitation, and another injured worker who is willing to be rehabilitated, and indeed wants to be rehabilitated, having his benefits reduced or even terminated simply because he has applied for CPP?"

That question from Mr. Laughren in December of this past year—December 12, 1978—again reflects that there is still some inconsistency in the guidelines.

Further to that, I will get into specific cases later as we go through the procedure, as suggested by Monty. But let me add one or two final points.

There seems to be a degree of anxiety out there in the offices, and I have to go back to the question that I raised originally about decentralization. If you read the report, everything seems to be fine with WCB. But I put my secretary to the task of calling local offices in the last day or two to find out the number of investigators, how many people are on the waiting list and how long that waiting list is.

From the first couple of offices we called we got a very defensive answer and, in two instances, virtually no answer. My secretary identified herself as my secretary and assistant and gave my name. Within about three quarters of an hour, the London constituency office called here to Toronto, having been called by the London WCB office. The London WCB office said: "Hey, we are getting calls from Hamilton, from up north, wondering what in the hell this guy Van Horne is up to. What's wrong?"

That suggests to me that there is a kind of tension or anxiety out there in the boondocks that would reflect a degree of—

Mr. Bolan: Animus?

Mr. Van Horne: My colleague from Nipissing has another word here, but it tells me that they are concerned that perhaps they are not able to do the job as they perceive it should be done, or that there is some breakdown of communication between local office and central office.

If a member can't make an inquiry as to what is going on with a local office, I don't think just London has to answer me—and London helped me tremendously—as a member, I should be able to call wherever and get a reasonable response.

I submit to you that in the last two days we have had a very interesting exercise, with some of the folks saying, "Sorry, I can't answer." In a couple of instances we have been called back and told, "Now that we think of it, there aren't 22 on our waiting list; there are 35." Why didn't they give the story to us straight off the top? You don't know that, but it reflects a kind of attitude out there in the boondocks that maybe you should be taking a better look at it.

That's why I suggested, when the recommendation or the motion was made earlier, that perhaps witnesses be called in. Perhaps members are taking a very sincere and a very objective, hopefully very objective, look at WCB. I'm not here to grind an axe or try to crucify anyone. I'm here to try to speak for the people who have come to me in frustration, and they have come in large numbers. I'm trying to submit to you that we should perhaps, as members of this Legislature, and of this committee specifically, get out to take a look.

Let's go to Downsview. Let's get an insight into this and try to work toward providing better compensation for injured workers. That's my objective, that's the objective of our party; hopefully these comments will set us off on 14 or 13½ hours of meaningful discussion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Starr.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I've made some notes and I will try to answer the questions you've posed to me, Mr. Van Horne. If I miss any please bring it to my attention.

The question of decentralization was brought up and discussed here at the last opportunity we had to appear before this committee. Since then we have asked for tenders from five firms and the successful bidder, the management consultant firm that we engaged, is now working on the possi-

bilities of decentralization of adjudication in the province of Ontario by the Workmen's Compensation Board. They have not as yet made their report to us, Mr. Van Horne. We expect that report may be coming within the next two months, and of course the report itself will have to be dealt with by the corporate board of the Workmen's Compensation Board. That's where it stands now at the moment.

As to our connection with the government, and in particular with the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Labour which answers for us to the Legislature, we have established better communication. We are meeting now on a continuous basis, not only to discuss various other matters but any particular matter of importance that may come up which affects the Workmen's Compensation Board and injured workers. We are continually in meetings with the Minister of Labour to try to resolve them.

Mr. Van Horne: I would like to go back over that. How regular is regular and how often is the minister there?

Hon. Mr. Starr: The regular scheduled meetings are quarterly, and then there are meetings which are far more frequent on many other matters that may come up in between.

Mr. Van Horne: There are four quarters in the year so you'd meet four times a year. Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If I may interject: This is not just on a personal basis but this is with other groups of my ministry; the occupational and safety division, along with other representatives of the board just to air any problems there may be between the ministry and the WCB, and to clarify issues. As well as that, Dr. McCracken and I meet on a monthly basis to review problems that there are; and the chairman and I have developed a pretty good rapport and meet on a frequent but unscheduled basis. We've tried to establish this quarterly meeting which allows members of the staff to discuss problems and to develop policies and so on.

Mr. Van Horne: If I may interject again, Mr. Chairman. The problem is still that Mr. Starr may be a great guy, and I've only met him a couple of times and I've no reason to think that he isn't; and you, Mr. Minister, may be a great guy and I've met you more often than I have met him; however, that still doesn't solve our problems as members trying to get a funnel into WCB other than through raising hell in question period or trying to embarrass, or perhaps going through the diplomatic channel of send-

ing a note or a letter to the minister. I just have to wonder if there isn't some need that isn't being answered here; a need for members to have a more direct input. I don't know how we get that but I would submit that your meeting with the chairman isn't enough.

[9:15]

Hon. Mr. Starr: On this particular subject, Mr. Van Horne, prior to 1974 there wasn't the opportunity for this Legislature to have the Workmen's Compensation Board before it, as we are meeting now, to give an account of stewardship. It was in 1974 when I became chairman that I felt I should have that opportunity, and also the members of this Legislature should have the opportunity to meet with us so that we could give an account of our stewardship, so that you could give us some ideas as to what changes should be made, and would have the opportunity to be critical of the way we operate. This is how it came about, and it is an input that I welcome.

The other thing I was very much appreciative of in what you said was that the members of the Legislature should have the opportunity to visit Downsview hospital. I doubt whether many of them have had that opportunity; the opportunity is there, but they have not availed themselves of it.

Not only that, but I think every member of this Legislature should at one time or another visit our offices to see how we proceed with these claims, to see how our rehabilitation works, to see how our pensions operate, how our medical staff operates; to see eyeball to eyeball the situation as it exists, otherwise you are working in a vacuum. My door is always open; if there is any input that any member of the Legislature wishes to convey to me I am available, I am accessible for that purpose.

If there are any cases about which any members of the Legislature wish to enquire we have a special counsellor who will look after that particular member; he can contact that one person only, he doesn't have to phone all over the office.

So, many of these things are available, and if there are any suggestions where we can improve that liaison we are most acceptable to those suggestions.

You were talking about certain guidelines, sir. I am sorry I didn't understand exactly what you were driving at in those guidelines. Can you enlighten me on that, Mr. Van Horne?

Mr. Van Horne: Going back to the 1973 task force and quoting from it: "The ab-

sence of a complete set of regulations covering the benefit sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act has resulted in confusion and a lack of awareness of WCB procedures and practices."

Now I am going to notes, leaving the quote aside. It seems that those members of Workmen's Compensation Board who are clear on policy are few indeed. This has resulted in the shuffling of many claimant applications and inconsistencies in the settling of benefits. As an example, during the last session it was brought to the minister's attention—and this is the Hansard quote on page 5943, Mr. Laughren from Nickel Belt, whom I will be quoting in a moment—that there were inconsistencies in the way that the Canadian Pension Plan benefits affected a claimant who was receiving total temporary disability benefits. Apparently two other cases were recorded along the same lines.

In some cases those who were receiving CPP benefits were also receiving total temporary disability benefits; in other cases simply making an application to CPP resulted in an immediate reduction of total temporary disability benefits.

The minister's own feeling was that any changes in payment of benefits should take place only after the worker had received the benefits.

Mr. Laughren's question, in part, from December 12 reads: "... indeed, I have cases in my own constituency where workers receiving full benefits equivalent to total temporary disability benefits are receiving the Canada Pension Plan benefits as well as the total temporary disability benefits.

"How does the minister explain the inconsistency of one injured worker receiving CPP plus total temporary disability benefits on rehabilitation and another injured worker, who is also willing to be rehabilitated and indeed wants to be rehabilitated, having his benefits reduced or even terminated simply because he has applied for CPP?"

Hon. Mr. Starr: May I deal with the first part of your question about guidelines? I understand now what you mean by that.

We appeared before the select committee on the Ombudsman and they recommended to us that we make available publicly, or at least to them first of all, all of our policies, our manuals; and we also added directives and we made that available to them. We have made arrangements with the Government Services bookstore to make all of these available for sale to the general public. The libraries and universities throughout the

province will have available all of our policies, manuals, and directives. They will be updated as new policies are made or as any changes occur in the manuals or directives. All of these things are available now to the general public or to anyone who wishes to have them.

When Mr. Laughren brought up this question as to the claimant or pensioner for example, who is applying for CPP, the minister made a statement in the House that it should be based on him actually receiving it. Since then, based on that suggestion, we have changed our policy so that no action is taken in respect to his supplementary payment on the application to the Canada Pension Plan until he does receive it, in actual fact.

Mr. Van Horne: I will read over that one and think about it.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Have I missed anything in answering?

Mr. Van Horne: I don't think so, but let me take that under advisement. Thank you.

Mr. M. Davidson: First of all, I would like to say that I welcome the opportunity to be the leadoff speaker for the New Democratic Party in speaking to the 1977 report of the Workmen's Compensation Board. I have with me on the committee Mr. Ross McClellan, Mr. Ted Bounsall and Mr. Bud Wildman, who will be the principal participants during this week with regard to the report, but as Mr. Van Horne pointed out, we too will have other members who will be coming in and taking up specific areas in which they have a personal interest.

I would like to say in starting that I have always found the board to be compassionate, understanding and fair to the injured workers in Ontario. I would like to say that but I can't, because if I did I would be misleading not only the members of this committee but I would be misleading the people in this room and the injured workers in this province.

I have sat and I have read the report for 1977. I have sat and I have listened to the opening remarks made by the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board. I can only suggest that it is probably the most glossed-over piece of trivia that I have ever had the opportunity to read.

Nowhere in the report—as Mr. Van Horne cannot find it, neither can I—did I find any of the faults that exist in the board. Nowhere in the opening statement by the chairman—and I can only assume that it is the chairman's report; I am quite sure he wouldn't have read it without approving it—can I find any faults that exist within the board. It is,

in fact, an apologetic piece of literature for the actions that have not taken place and that have been brought to the attention of the board over a good number of years.

I was quite interested in some of the things that were contained in this report. I have to be honest, I was quite surprised at the number of claims that appear to be coming before the board, although I do notice there have been fewer in the past year. That kind of raises a question in my mind as to why that could possibly be, unless it is as a result of some of the information that we have received that employers are pressuring employees to go on sick benefit rather than lay a claim before the compensation board.

I would like to mention a couple of things in the report itself before I go into other detail. We talk about receiving 1,700 claims per day; we talk about receiving or processing 423,767 claims in 1977. We talk in percentages of cases, of 93 per cent being paid within 30 working days and 75 per cent of the claims which are on extended disability being paid within 30 days. We talk in general terms that somewhere along the line 95 per cent of claims in Ontario are processed without any great deal of difficulty.

I would like to point out that that may be true. I am not going to dispute that. If someone chops off a finger, the board knows he has a compensable accident. If he chops off his arm, it knows he has a compensable accident. If he is laid low by a blow on the head, it knows he has a compensable accident. But somewhere in this province, using this 1977 report, there are 21,000 injured workers for that year who have not had service that one could call complete and able or humane, as the chairman put it during his remarks.

They have had difficulties and they are the people who probably have compensable accidents that are not visible. They are the people who have occupational diseases that are not visible. They are the people who throughout the many, many years that the compensation board has been in existence have had to fight in order to get justice from the board.

I say that not loosely. Mr. Van Horne pointed out that since 1977 two thirds of his file probably relates to cases dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I can say on my own behalf and on behalf of my colleagues here that mine is approximately 60 per cent of my caseload. There are probably others within our caucus who have a greater caseload in comparison to the number of cases that they handle.

In addition to members of this House having to deal with these problems, every major union in Ontario has an established

workmen's compensation adviser within its plants. There are organizations, as I mentioned earlier, such as the Union of Injured Workers, the Injured Workers' Consultants, the legal consultants to injured workers, and various other groups throughout this province which exist simply because injured workers in this province are not getting justice through the compensation board.

There is something definitely wrong. My understanding of the reason that the board in fact exists is to work with and on behalf of injured workers in Ontario, to more or less take compensation to injured workers out of the political arena, to handle cases for these people, to advise these people and to treat them with dignity and respect. For some people in Ontario, that just isn't happening. It just isn't there.

Somehow or other we have to get it through to the people who are responsible for the administration of the board that this is the case, that there are workers in this province who are faced with very grave difficulties and that there are injured workers in the province who cannot get a cheque through when they are supposed to get a cheque.

I read with some interest in the report that people are no longer cut off benefits without being notified. I think it is in there in one of the things. I will tell you I don't know where that is occurring. Only last week in my riding office, in the case of one of the people who came to me for some advice and some assistance, that was the exact reason he was there. He had been cut off his benefits but he had never received a letter as to why and he had never been informed as to when.

This still goes on. It doesn't happen only in Cambridge. It doesn't happen only in the ridings of Mr. McClellan or Mr. Martel or Mr. Wildman or Mr. Haggerty. It is going on throughout the entire province. When I have someone suggest to me that it doesn't happen any more, I become a little dubious about that. It bothers me. It bothers me that any injured worker in Ontario, particularly if he has a family, has to sit around waiting for the Workmen's Compensation Board to send him a cheque in order that he could sustain his family, in order that he could put a roof over their heads, put bread on the table, whatever else is necessary.

[9:30]

Every time you call the compensation board they have a reason. They talk about, well, the file has been transferred from one department to another department, or they are doing this with it, or the file has been misplaced, or the information they are seeking has not been delivered to them. The

compensation board told me that about this gentleman I have been talking to you about. They said they were waiting for the doctor's report. I called the doctor because I was a little angry with him and wondered why he was withholding the report. He said, "I mailed that in three weeks ago." Still this man hadn't had his claim processed, and still he hadn't received the moneys that were due him as an injured worker in the province of Ontario, and he had a family to look after. No income, and I would ask anyone on this committee or anyone at the head table or anyone in this room how long you could survive without any form of income whatsoever. It ain't easy. You can't do it.

Also in here we talk about the appeals and how the waiting time for appeals has been reduced from, I think, something like 12 weeks to four weeks. I question that statement. I have to question that statement because we have appeals before the compensation board and we are still waiting anywhere from six to eight weeks to get an appeal set up. I don't know where the four week figure was established. I don't know who wrote it into the chairman's remarks. I don't know whether someone said to the chairman that this is what's happening and the chairman thinks that that's the case or believes that that's the case. But those people who constantly work with and deal with injured workers week by week know that that figure is not factual. They are fully aware, as the injured worker is aware, that that figure is not factual when you are trying to get an appeal in the province of Ontario. As I say, I don't know where the figure comes from, but perhaps the chairman can explain that to us.

In his remarks the chairman pointed out some success in dealing with back injuries in the back educational program and he points out with pride—and I could very well see why he should—that the compensation board in Ontario has finally embarked on a back educational program, that they have in the past—in the report at any rate—dealt with over 600 patients. What the chairman failed to put into this report was that there are approximately 100,000 injured workers in Ontario who have back problems; 600 out of approximately 100,000 are being dealt with by the Workmen's Compensation Board or put on to a back educational program.

I don't think that's a very good record, and I don't think the fact that they have finally established that kind of a program in Ontario is much to brag about, given that this has been a problem before the compensation board for a good many years. It's not

the first time that this kind of program has been raised with them.

I can remember when I first arrived here in 1975, Mr. Martel talked before the compensation board regarding people with back problems. He knows about back problems, he has one of his own—but he raised this program with the board. Mr. Laughren has discussed it. If I recall, Mr. Haggerty raised it during some of the hearings. It's not new to the board that these kinds of problems exist and that there are programs available, but only after having been told for many years have they established it.

I am grateful to see that they have established it. I am grateful to see that they are finally moving in that direction, but I don't think that it's—well, I don't want to use the word responsible because I don't want to say the chairman is irresponsible. I don't think it's wise of the chairman to try to fool the injured workers in the province of Ontario by making 600 out of an approximate 100,000 look like something worthwhile. It isn't. When he can show me that 60,000 out of 100,000 are on that program, when he can show us that they are in fact putting a program in effect that will be beneficial to the injured workers in Ontario who suffer from back injury, then it will be a worthwhile cause. Then he can come to us and brag about the progress that has been made.

Page 10 talks about rehabilitation encompassing psychological assistance assessment. I don't want you to answer me now, Mr. Starr, because maybe you don't know. I don't want to pose it as a question that you should answer now, but it's a question I would like to ask you.

Do you have any knowledge whatsoever of Sodium Pentothal being used at the Downsview rehabilitation centre? If you do, I would like to ask you why that drug is being used in the supposed treatment of injured workers.

For those of you who, like me, probably didn't know what Sodium Pentothal is, it's truth serum.

If that form of drug were being used in a rehabilitation hospital, my own mind would tell me that it was not used for the rehabilitation of the patient but to try to establish that the patient isn't quite as badly off as he's letting on. I'm not sure that's the role of the Downsview rehabilitation centre.

I'm only suggesting it's done, because it was brought to my attention by a constituent who happened to have been there and whose benefits were cut off. When we raised it with the people concerned it was never denied. It was never confirmed either; but it was

never denied. I took the lack of denial to mean that what I was being told was accurate.

I, and members of our caucus, do not believe that the purpose of the Downsview rehabilitation centre is to prove someone may be acting out a part. I'm sure there are many other ways that can be proved without subjecting a person to Sodium Pentothal.

In his remarks, the chairman says that we cannot casually write off an injured worker. But there are literally thousands of injured workers in Ontario today who perhaps have not been written off by the board—I'm quite certain their files still remain with the board, and the board still has records pertaining to those individual cases; in actual terms the board hasn't written them off because it still knows they exist—but, for one reason or another, those injured workers are still not receiving justice through the board.

Many of them, for many reasons, have gone through the appeal process and have been denied their claim. Even though they were able to produce their own doctor's medical evidence, and even though their own doctor's evidence contradicted the evidence that the board's doctors were able to produce, they were denied their claim.

As a result, many of these people now can be classed as unemployable, I would imagine. There are large numbers of them throughout Ontario who are collecting welfare benefits and, if they're able, unemployment insurance benefits. I, for one, don't think that's what the Workmen's Compensation Board is, or should be, about.

I know there are people who will try to beat the system. That's true of any system. But no one can convince me, and no one ever will convince me, that the numbers of people in Ontario—including the 21,000 who are having difficulty getting justice and benefits from the board—are such that there are that many people trying to beat the system. That's like saying that everybody who collects unemployment insurance is trying to beat the system.

To my mind, anyone who takes the attitude that injured workers who try to get justice for themselves in Ontario are only doing it because they feel they're getting away with something, really has not thought through the situation that these people find themselves in.

There is no great payment from the Workmen's Compensation Board in terms of injured workers. In many cases, they are only getting a percentage of 75 per cent of their actual wages at the time of injury. If any-

body thinks they can live on 20 per cent of 75 per cent of their wages, I would suggest that perhaps they try it. Take that amount of money out of the bank, say for a four-week period, and live on it—or try to live on it. You will find that you don't live very well. You will find that you don't do the things, or eat the things, or share with your family the things, that the average person in Ontario who is fully employed is capable of doing.

In Ontario we talk about vocational rehabilitation. We talk about putting these injured people back to work. Really, that is what should be happening. It is not an injured worker's fault in most cases that he is injured. In most cases—and I am talking now of the severely injured worker—you will find that the type of work he has been involved with does not lend itself to his rehiring in that particular job. I know there are those who say, "We will put you in a lower-paying job at light work." But you will find that the most severe injuries occur in industries where in most cases there is no light work available.

I had a visit from some people in the vocational rehabilitation department who are embarking on a new program of approaching industry and attempting to sell them on a new program that they have; that is, they are attempting to get these people to go back to work and to find suitable jobs for them. I think that's good. Actually I think it is something that is long overdue.

I was given to understand, by the gentleman to whom I spoke, that this program is only about two or three years old—two years old, I would think—in the manner that they are setting out to do it. If I understood him correctly, in the first year they had something like 40 employers who responded, in the next year it was something like 400, and they now are up to 600 employers, or somewhere in that neighbourhood, who have responded to this program. That's 600 employers in Ontario, or 600 jobs that have been made available to injured workers. I have to question whether that is good enough.

I understand that it's a new manner of approach. I understand that they have now added staff to that certain department. I understand that they have regional people out there working within the various regions of the province, trying to conduct this program and to sell it to the employers of Ontario. What I don't understand is, why has it taken so long?

For the thousands of injured workers in Ontario who need work, and who would prefer to work, we can only find at the

moment 600 jobs. It's rather sad to think that here, in the most highly industrialized province in the whole of Canada, with a progressive Workmen's Compensation Board—I know it has to be; the chairman told me that, and I am not one to doubt the chairman's word.

Mr. Bounsall: Make sure you get the tongue in cheek there.

Mr. M. Davidson: I've got my tongue in my cheek. I'm not one to doubt the chairman's word.

We have a program, recently implemented, to try to convince employers that they should hire the injured workers of Ontario. It's far too late, I say. It's a program that should have been implemented 10, 15 or 20 years ago. When we talk about being progressive, we haven't even started. Again, that's not something new to the board.

[9:45]

Like Mr. Van Horne, I spent my winter break, if one cares to call it that, reading old Hansards back to when the compensation board first came before the committee. And, in reading, I found that most of what Mr. Van Horne and I are saying has been said, and said many times. Prior to the board coming before the committee, if one wants to go back far enough, these things were said in the Legislature in many speeches. Mr. Haggerty has been around far longer than I—or Mr. Van Horne. I'm quite sure that Mr. Haggerty has brought to the attention of this board many times many of the problems that we have spoken about here today.

There is another problem, Mr. Chairman, a problem that you may not be aware of. I've got quite a bit more but I'll go in my turn, as Mr. Van Horne will, when we get into the main thrust of the report, and take it topic by topic.

One of the problems, or one of the things that was recently raised with me—I have to be honest—made me damn mad.

I have always been of the opinion, as I mentioned earlier, that the Workmen's Compensation Board in Ontario was the injured workers' place, just like this place is supposed to be the place for the public of Ontario. I don't like the idea that injured workers in Ontario receive threatening letters from the compensation board. I don't like the idea that somebody is told, "If you set foot on this property again, you'll be charged with trespassing." I don't think that's right. I think it's a very poor exercise on the part of whoever made that decision. I don't know if it's a policy decision. I don't know if it's an administrative decision. I don't know who

made that decision but I sure know that it's happening. I'll give you an example.

One gentleman in particular speaks very little English. He went to the board on two or three occasions, attempting to get some assistance. He had a great deal of difficulty in explaining to whoever it was he was talking to what it was he was there for. The person he was talking to got a little verbally abusive. He, in turn, got a little more verbally abusive, but nothing other than verbal abuse took place. He was finally convinced to leave and he did. He went back the next day and, again, attempted to see someone who could assist him with his problem. He was again ejected. He was finally sent a letter. That letter said, in effect, that if he came back without having an appointment there was a possibility of being charged with trespass.

All I can say to you, Mr. Starr, is that I don't know how you, as chairman of that board, can allow that kind of thing to go on in Ontario. No threats were made by anyone. No physical abuse was laid upon anyone and yet the board was threatening an injured worker in Ontario with trespass. I can only suggest to you that if you were not aware that this practice is taking place, you are now aware. That decision should be reversed as quickly as possible.

I have one final thing before I close off. Any organization—I don't care whether it's the compensation board, a company, a store, a Kiwanis club, or whatever—only functions properly if the morale of the employees or its members is such that there is a feeling of co-operation, a feeling of working together, a feeling of accomplishment.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Starr, that this is not the case in the total employment picture of the compensation board. I will raise some of the matters later on as we get into the topical discussions. I would suggest to you that you do have employment problems. I would suggest to you, as chairman, that you had better take a look at what some of these problems are. Perhaps as a result of that you may get better co-operation, better functioning of the operations of the board itself.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I don't think I have any answer to that. I've noted what Mr. Davidson said and I will take that into consideration.

Mr. McClellan: Does the minister have any response?

Mr. Haggerty: We're dealing with the first vote, main office administration, and that

deals with policy that perhaps I could get into.

I was interested in the chairman's opening statement. He mentioned, on page nine: "Over the past few years the board has sponsored, wholly or in part, 29 medical research projects." Could the chairman give us a list of those research projects?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think Dr. McCracken has that.

Mr. Haggerty: Can it be made available to the committee?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: It can be? Would this relate to anything on page seven, where it says that the board has allowed the board's medical services division to continually conduct research in the field of industrial medicine? Based on preliminary reports of research the board has commissioned, it was possible last year to set up guidelines to allow claims for cancer of the larynx. To date, 10 claims have been allowed. How many of those claims are related to the nickel industry in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We would have to get that information for you.

Mr. Haggerty: You have that available?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We can get that; yes.

Mr. Haggerty: I understand there have been some claims allowed for the former employees of Inco in Port Colborne.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I can't say off-hand but we will try to get you that list.

Mr. Haggerty: Is there a possibility that the claim numbers could be made available?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I see no reason why they couldn't be.

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to have that.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Okay.

Mr. Haggerty: The matter raised about the vocational rehabilitation—

Mr. Van Horne: May I interject, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Van Horne: I have a followup to Mr. Haggerty's question. In terms of the medical research question that was asked by Mr. Haggerty—and I ask this just for information—is there approval required, through any supervisory body, for the type of research? Secondly: is the medical research physical; or is it physical, psychological or psychiatric research?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I can't answer that question. I think that Dr. McCracken would be the proper person to give you the details that

you require. Do you want it in writing or do you want it verbally now, Mr. Van Horne?

Mr. Van Horne: I would like some indication from either yourself or from the minister as to whether or not there is some kind of sanction or supervision. Secondly: I would like an elaboration on the specifics. Are we talking about a new form of artificial limb for the amputee or whatever? I'd like some specifics on the type of research you're doing and I would gladly accept that in writing at a later date. Right now, I would like an indication of what kind of supervision there is on this research.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Van Horne, I understand Dr. McCracken is in the audience here; if he would care to come up, perhaps he could answer you more directly.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Dr. McCracken, could you answer from there?

Dr. McCracken: The research projects that are carried out by the board are in the areas where it has been identified research was required. For instance, our consultants at the hospital and rehabilitation centre will make a recommendation they feel it is well worthwhile to carry out a research project, for instance, in the efficiency of the new myoelectric upper limb prosthesis. It is deemed that this is indeed a very worthwhile project to evaluate how well they are functioning, whether they are meeting the needs of persons who have upper limb amputations.

It is discussed with the appropriate senior consultants, most of whom are professors or associate professors at the university, and the protocol is developed, following which the research is then set up and commenced. For instance, on this very item currently research is under way and we have a full-time orthopaedic research fellow, who is a physician trained in orthopaedic surgery, who has his fellowship as an orthopaedic surgeon but who wishes to take this year's extra research and he is investigating this particular aspect.

Other areas of research are set up when a need is identified; for example when the need was identified to determine whether or not there was a link between certain types of intestinal cancers and exposure to asbestos fibre dust. Evaluation of the research which had been done at that time indicated that no one study was adequate to answer this question and therefore, on consultation once again with outside senior consultants, it was determined that the appropriate study should be set up and this was carried out with the

study being conducted by the appropriate outside consultant.

This is how the research projects are identified and how they are set up. Essentially, it is to fill a gap in research that is not being done at that time, nor has been done in the past. By identifying this need we are then in effect utilizing the approach of applied research, rather than totally theoretical research, which of course is what we must do.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could table the 29 different research projects because we could get into them and cut down the time here. I think if they were tabled here for the committee members then later on proper questions could follow that wouldn't take up the time. I am hoping the committee can have those perhaps by tomorrow.

I was concerned about the matter raised by both leadoff speakers, by Mr. Davidson and Mr. Van Horne, concerning vocational rehabilitation. I suppose that is an area I could spend some time on because in a sense I don't have the confidence that the chairman perhaps has in vocational rehabilitation.

I did have two gentlemen in to visit me not too long ago explaining the new program that is available there now in that they are going to industry and perhaps in a sense begging them to take injured workers back. Hopefully industry will take them back and their income will be subsidized.

I suggested at that time they should be moving directly into the city of Port Colborne. There are a number of problems there from the mass layoff of Inco employees in 1977. Almost every person who had an injury—and he could have from 20 years down to 10 years of service—was told his employment would be terminated; he would have to take an early pension from the company. I have written you a letter on that, Mr. Chairman.

[10:00]

Perhaps the best thing for me to do is to spend a couple of hours with you at the board and go through this in detail, but I bring to your attention that a number of employees of Inco have been let go on that basis. I say that is a good place to start the program, down there. Whether they are going to get down to that area, I don't know, but I can tell you this: Every weekend I spend almost all of my time dealing with those injured workers who have been laid off from Inco. Perhaps when the strike in Sudbury is settled they will take the same approach there and

a number of injured workers will never be called back. I hope it doesn't happen, but it has happened in their operations in Port Colborne.

As I get into this matter of rehabilitation I find I just don't seem to be able to grasp it. I don't have the confidence in it the chairman has, as I have said. My experience with vocational rehabilitation—and I bring it to the attention of the employees in your St. Catharines regional offices—is that I find it is Canada Manpower that takes the initiative to get the injured workers enrolled into some upgrading and educational program, perhaps in Niagara College; that is where it usually takes place. Very little responsibility is taken by the Workmen's Compensation Board in this area.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I am surprised.

Mr. Haggerty: I am surprised too.

Hon. Mr. Starr: That should be our initiative, rather than Manpower, even though they require the men to register at Manpower.

Mr. Haggerty: I haven't seen it in my area.

Hon. Mr. Starr: But the actual training is provided by us in cost and compensation and we utilize all the facilities that are necessary to rehabilitate that person, both in the provincial and federal field of jurisdiction.

Mr. Haggerty: I have a claim here, and I will just give you the claim number, but it goes into detail here—I won't go into all the detail but here is a case where the person was injured in industry. He has asked vocational rehabilitation to finance part of his schooling.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I would have to know the claim number and have the file here in order to discuss it.

Interjections.

Mr. Haggerty: I will talk to you later on but the point I want to bring to you is that I feel you are not accepting your responsibility in this area.

Interjections.

Mr. Haggerty: I haven't mentioned the claim number but it has been the practice of other members to take time for claim after claim. Perhaps you'll see them roll in tomorrow.

The other matter I want to raise is the matter—

Mr. Yakabuski: We will cut them short.

Mr. Haggerty: No, I will be visiting the chairman myself with my complaints. I will go to the top. I won't haggle down at the

bottom of the totem pole; I think the best place is to go right to the top.

Mr. Yakabuski: You're absolutely right.

Mr. Haggerty: I raised the other matter a couple of years ago in committee here. There was a resolution supported by committee members which related to—in fact I raised the question again to the minister in April 1977. I will bring this to the attention of the Minister of Labour and Manpower anyway.

I said: "I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. During the Ministry of Labour estimates the standing resources development committee on December 14, 1976, adopted a resolution that directed the government, through the Workmen's Compensation Board, to carry out a study of all the benefits available to injured persons for the goal of integrating all the present programs of assistance to provide the measures or means of economic security to the injured employee and survivors."

This was the matter where you get a combination of the Canada Pension Plan and other sick benefit plans and workmen's compensation so the person would at least have a decent income, he wouldn't have to be going back to the board every six months trying to establish a new claim or trying to get his benefits extended.

The minister was kind enough at that time to send me a summary of the review that was supposed to be taking place and the terms of reference dealt with financial review, benefits review and so forth.

I know there has been one report but I haven't seen anything else since that time. In the benefits review the third term of reference was "review the inequities, if any, resulting from the fact that workmen's compensation benefits are non-taxable."

I thought I might see some changes, perhaps some amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act in this particular area. It is fine to say it is not taxable income. That may be well for just a married man and his wife, but if you take a person who has a family perhaps of six children, then I would say he is being short-changed. If you take 75 per cent of his income—with six children it wouldn't be taxable anyway. I suggest there should be some changes in this area—I think that where there is a large family, dependants and that, he should be given full compensation.

The other matter I have raised over the years is the one where an injured worker has been off work perhaps two years. He has lost about two years of contributions to the

Canada Pension Plan. I think in this instance even unemployment insurance should be continued under the Workmen's Compensation Act. That was supposed to have been looked into by the previous minister. She was going to check with Ottawa to see if it wouldn't be allowed.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Haggerty, I may inform you that the Canadian Association of Compensation Boards made an overture to the government on that score because the Canada health legislation has to be amended to provide for that purpose.

Mr. Haggerty: According to the information that has been passed on to this committee and questions directed in the House, we expected—

Hon. Mr. Starr: There has been no action.

Mr. Haggerty: That's right, no action. I don't know what more the committee members can do in this matter. But I suggest there are two areas where I think changes need to be made to the act, that is, to include contributions to Canada Pension Plan. Normally the person who is injured, even with a back injury, ends up on Canada Pension and he maybe loses two or three years of contributions to it and that short-changes his pension benefits.

The chairman agrees with me. Perhaps the minister will take the lead in this then and see if he can't get some results done with the government in Ottawa, whomever that may be.

There are other areas that should be looked at, too. The fifth one is review of alternative approaches for establishing the level of benefit for permanently disabled workers. That covers a rather broad area. I have known cases in which I have appeared before the board where these persons never will get back to work. They are pensioned off at about \$85 to \$115 a month and they say, "Here, you are on your own from now on." I feel there have got to be some changes in the Workmen's Compensation Act where these persons shouldn't have to lose their homes over an injury.

I have an appeal before the board now based upon just what I have discussed now—where he will lose his home, at a pension of about \$221 a month. I don't think that should be allowed in today's society in Canada—particularly in Ontario.

I will leave a copy of this for the minister. I don't think he is aware of those terms of reference. I suggest there is some good meat there that could bring about improvements in the workmen's compensation that would be of benefit to all the injured workers.

I think the chairman has seen a copy of that, have you not?

Mr. Chairman: No, I haven't.

Mr. Haggerty: You haven't? It must be top secret. That's all I have right for the present.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order if I might.

When the leadoffs were made, the chairman of the board answered all of the things raised by Mr. Van Horne and my colleague raised what he thought were some of the deficiencies in the board. In fact he didn't accept the statement made by the chairman of the board. The chairman of the board refused to respond to any of those problem areas that we see in the board.

If this is going to be the chairman's attitude throughout these hearings, that every time he is criticized or the board is criticized he is going to pout and not answer, as he did to my colleague, first I think that is an insult to my colleague that he chose not to answer those serious charges, and if this is going to be the conduct of the chairman throughout these hearings, then they are a waste of time.

Those are the problem areas that my colleagues and I are having to work in on behalf of thousands of people in this province. It seems to me he can't simply say, "I have no comment." He might as well not be here. He might as well go home now, because his failure to respond is not only an insult to my colleague but it fails to deal with the problems we see with the Workmen's Compensation Board in their delivery of services to the people of this province. You simply can't say, "I'm not going to answer."

Hon. Mr. Starr: Well, that's fine, you have had your opportunity to attack me now.

Mr. Martel: Nobody is attacking you. I wish you would stop pouting like a little boy.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'm not pouting.

Mr. Martel: Nobody is attacking you. We're saying there's a weakness in the board.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'm not going to try to out-shout you, Mr. Martel. I did say to Mr. Davidson when he got through that he brought to our attention a number of things and we said we would consider them. We will look at those suggestions that he has made and the observations. Obviously, you weren't listening.

Mr. Martel: I was listening. I didn't get your grunt.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You had better open up your ears a little better.

Mr. Martel: They are open. I want to tell you they are open. You didn't answer to one of those problems. You tell me what your solution is to the problems we raised.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Davidson nodded agreement he was quite satisfied with the fact—

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, I have not said I was satisfied.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You nodded your head when I said I would consider the suggestions you made and brought them to our attention.

Mr. Martel: You had better explain some of the things that are wrong, that he sees that are wrong, so we'll know what you're doing to attempt to overcome them, because that's what we're here for.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order: the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board said in his comments that he welcomed the opportunity to be here before the committee and to discuss with the members of the Legislature their problems and concerns regarding the board, and then he welcomed the opportunity for the members of the Legislature to be critical of the board. If his response is simply, "We'll consider what you had to say," it doesn't answer major questions that have been raised by our colleague.

For instance, I can just think of one at this particular time: Why is an injured worker receiving a letter saying he may be charged with trespass if he returns to the board? That's a specific question for which we would like a specific reply, and to have said, "We'll consider your comments," doesn't tell us whether it is the policy of the board to send out such letters or it isn't. I would like to know whether it is and who made the decision. It just doesn't tell us that, and what does it tell us?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Our employees have been threatened time and time again by various people that they would be killed and that they had better watch their backs. Our security people at the Workmen's Compensation Board feel it's too much of a risk as far as our employees are concerned to have anybody in attendance who has made such threats, who has raised a ruckus, has been shouting continuously time and time again and not listening to a reasonable explanation. Consequently, they receive these letters that they cannot come back unless they have an appointment to do so but they can come back if they have an appointment. I agree entirely that our employees should not be subjected to abuse to foul language, and to the

threatening of their lives, and I will stand behind our employees in that respect.

Mr. M. Davidson: Nor should the injured workers.

Hon. Mr. Starr: No injured worker has been threatened with his life.

Mr. Wildman: He's been threatened with non-payment. I would certainly agree, Mr. Chairman, that the employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board should not have to face threats and abusive profane language. However, it's interesting that the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board would admit that does occur on a fairly regular basis. If it does, that indicates there are some major problems at the board that leads people to be so desperate to react in such a manner.

Mr. Bounsall: I just might say I don't want to get into individual cases, but is that the case with Mr. Domenico Galea who received one of these letters and who is here in the audience tonight?

Mr. Martel: That answers the point I raised with the chairman of the board. My colleague raised some very serious points and the chairman was able, when we started to push him a little bit, to tell us what led to that problem and what led to that sort of letter. My point of order is, Mr. Chairman, he should have answered in a similar fashion to my colleague as he did to Mr. Van Horne, point by point which he wrote down when Mr. Van Horne was raising them. He should have done exactly the same with my colleague. Because my colleague disagreed, the chairman felt we were personally attacking him.

Let me tell you, Mr. Starr, we might be critical of the board, but we're not taking on personalities, we're taking on policies which we think might be deficient. Our aim is not to go after individual board people but we would like answers to serious problems that we see with the board. If you think it's a personal attack, that's long past, Mr. Starr; we're not attacking personalities, but policy, yes, that's what we're all about.

[10:15]

Mr. Bounsall: Further to the point of order, Mr. Chairman: If we continue to receive non-answers to the points we raise, then, as the spokesman for the board in the Legislature, the minister should be prepared to answer those questions in the absence of answers from board officials.

Mr. McClellan: And the minister was invited to reply.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Do you wish me to respond?

Mr. Bounsall: Somebody should.

Mr. Warner: Will the chairman be responding, too?

Interjections.

Mr. McClellan: The chairman of the board doesn't seem to understand that at all.

Mr. Chairman: Are you finished, Mr. Martel?

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, he's not finished yet.

Mr. Martel: I'm just looking for some answers.

Hon. Mr. Starr: There was a question you asked about the use of a particular drug—

Mr. Wildman: Sodium Pentothal.

Hon. Mr. Starr: —I'm going to ask Dr. McCracken to answer the question for you.

Dr. McCracken: I believe the drug you mentioned was sodium Pentothal? Is that correct?

Mr. Martel: That's right.

Dr. McCracken: Sodium Pentothal is an anaesthetic drug. It is not a truth serum and it has never been used at the hospital and rehabilitation centre. Sodium Amytal is not a truth drug but it has been used, not by any of the physicians at the hospital on full-time staff but by our consulting psychiatrist staff. It is an approved, recognized, medical form of psychiatric therapy.

Having said that, I should add that it is not used to any great extent anywhere and in the past four years it has been used six times. It was used on one occasion in 1978.

Mr. McClellan: For what purpose?

Dr. McCracken: As part of the treatment recommended by the consultant psychiatrist.

Mr. McClellan: What was that treatment?

Dr. McCracken: The treatment was to evaluate whether or not the patient had a psychiatric disease.

Mr. M. Davidson: Could I pose a question, Dr. McCracken? Was that treatment with or without the consent of the patient?

Dr. McCracken: There is no treatment carried out at the hospital without the consent of a patient.

Mr. M. Davidson: If I were to bring a gentleman before you who would disprove the statement you have just made, would you accept his word?

Dr. McCracken: No, I would not. I know the ethical standards of the consultant staff at the hospital.

Mr. McClellan: Are consent forms signed?

Dr. McCracken: Consent forms are not required for that type of treatment. Consent

forms are required for surgical operative procedures.

Mr. M. Davidson: In fact, we have your word and the other doctor's word against the word of an injured worker?

Dr. McCracken: Yes, that is correct. I think that it is pretty sufficient word. After all, we are ethically bound to make certain that patients receiving treatment understand exactly what the treatment is for and why it is being administered.

Mr. McClellan: Do I understand that you administer sodium Amytal in order to determine whether an injured worker had an organic disability or a psychiatric disability?

Dr. McCracken: No, not at all. It's part of the investigation to arrive at whether or not the individual has a psychiatric diagnosis. It is not to separate the two out.

Mr. M. Davidson: Perhaps you can explain how it works.

Dr. McCracken: I'm not a psychiatrist so I can't go into the minute details. But in essence according to the information I have received from psychiatrists, including our consultant psychiatrists on staff, the use of sodium Amytal where indicated will be of assistance in certain instances. It will allow a determination to be made as to whether or not an individual is able to carry through a certain range of movement of a limb or his back or whatever.

Mr. McClellan: In other words, to determine whether it's an organic disability or a functional disability?

Dr. McCracken: No, not at all. That's not the key to it at all. The key to it is that it allows the patient to develop sufficient relaxation and insight so that he will be able to carry this out, whereas prior to that he has been unable to do so because he was fearful it would give rise to considerable pain.

Mr. McClellan: May I ask that you keep the report anonymous on that particular case and provide it to the committee?

Dr. McCracken: We can obtain the case and get the details. I don't know how long it will take.

Mr. Bounsall: Are you saying it's only a relaxation drug?

Dr. McCracken: It's only a relaxation drug at the doses at which it is used.

Mr. M. Davidson: Is the patient subject to questioning following administration of the drug?

Dr. McCracken: The only questions the patient is subject to that I am aware of are questions as to whether or not his pain has

increased or decreased and what he feels in the way of movement of his extremities—the injured joint or limb or whatever it might be.

Mr. McClellan: We look forward to receiving an anonymous set of reports on that particular case.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Are there any other questions, Mr. Davidson, you would like to pose at this time?

Mr. M. Davidson: Most of what I said came off the top of my head so, like you, I probably can't remember.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think the chairman was apprehensive because during your remarks, Monty, you will recall you did say, "I'm not putting this as a question." The chairman took that to mean—

Mr. M. Davidson: I said that when I asked about the administration of what I felt was sodium Pentothal.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think there was an honest misapprehension. I think the chairman is quite prepared to review the minutes point by point.

Mr. M. Davidson: I think that was the only question I put a restriction on. I didn't want him to answer that at the moment because I didn't feel he was aware of what I was referring to and I was going to allow him time.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think the chairman is willing to review the minutes and answer you point by point then, Mr. Davidson. It's been a misunderstanding.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bounsall.

Mr. Bounsall: Was I next on the list? I think Elie Martel was first. He was speaking on a point of order.

Mr. Martel: I have one minor point on the administration. I would like the board to consider implementing a new policy to assist people who are advocates on behalf of workers. Too frequently, many of us have to go to the board with medical information which we really don't understand. Unless we have an adviser who can tell us what all of the medical jargon is about, then we are really at a disadvantage when we appear on behalf of that worker.

I think it is time the board put two or three medical people, or one or two very competent medical people who are working for the board per se, but in fact are put in that office at the disposal of those of us here who get these cases and don't understand what it is all about. Then we can go to this person or persons working for the board and they will sit down with people like ourselves

who are into this all the time and explain to us just what this is all about.

I think there is a terrible disadvantage for members of the Legislature or advocates out there who are trying to assist the worker and who go against a battery of doctors who understand the field and who can draw on other medical expertise to formulate the board's position. Those of us who are representing workers don't have the same advantage in understanding fully how something might occur. It might be the back, of which none of us in the Legislature except the minister, I guess, is aware.

I think the advocates on behalf of workers are at a tremendous disadvantage and don't do a service they should be doing. The same can apply to serious knee injuries because we don't understand them. Somewhere along the line it has to balance a little bit in favour as one tries to prepare a case to take to the board. Frequently, you simply don't have the background necessary to explain your position well on behalf of the worker you are representing.

I think the board and the minister should consider appointing or hiring several specialists to assist us in certain fields; maybe a neurosurgeon, an orthopaedic surgeon and someone specialized in the field of occupational health. In that way, there is going to be a kind of assurance that when we represent workers or advocates represent workers we and they are getting the best representation possible.

We then stay away, I think, to some degree, from always bringing lawyers in and making this more of an adversary system than it already is. I think the government and the board should consider that, so as to balance up the thing a little bit on behalf of the workers who have serious injuries.

Mr. Haggerty: That's a good suggestion by the member. I think, Elie, if you put a motion tonight we'd probably carry it. It does put equity into the system.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It's not a suggestion that you and I haven't talked about before.

Mr. Martel: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think it has some merit and we'll give it some consideration.

Mr. Bounsall: Just as a supplementary to the matter raised, which is an excellent one, you do have an advocate group within the board already to help workers prepare their cases if that's their need, and those persons could just be added by the board to that group of employees.

The supplementary question I wanted to ask is: Would that decision, to do that or

not to do that, be a decision that would be made by the corporate board? Would that be a policy decision that would be made by the corporate board? What is the relationship between a government decision here or a corporate board decision? Where would that decision be made?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It would be a decision made by the board.

Mr. Bounsall: It would be a decision made by the corporate board?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: This is my understanding.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Martel made the suggestion that they should not be paid by the board; they should not be employees of the board.

Mr. Martel: We have a feeling that he is going to be working on behalf of us as opposed to working on behalf of the board. He's not only got to be neutral, but appear to be neutral. You've got to have a sense of trust. If you're going to have a couple of doctors there to do this there's got to be a sense of trust that he isn't part of the ongoing medical staff of the compensation board.

Mr. Haggerty: A medical ombudsman.

Hon. Mr. Starr: In other words, in your opinion, could he be paid by the board and have that status?

Mr. Martel: I think he could. It depends on the quality of the doctor you hire.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Then it would be a decision of the board.

Mr. Bounsall: In that situation, will that decision be placed before the corporate board,

and when might we expect to have—and I assume the decision would be told to all of us—that decision made by the corporate board?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Just as soon as we can get through here and get a meeting of the corporate board and take that into consideration.

Mr. Johnson: May I say something? I think Elie has a valid point. Is there any merit in trying something like this on a trial basis? You mentioned several doctors, but even if we tried it with a couple of doctors in a certain area for a period of six months to a year to see whether it does work out; if there are some savings in lawyers' fees and maybe some expertise given to the members that could help us out?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think the people who would be the best judges as to whether this would work or not would be the legislative members who might be using this service.

Mr. Johnson: Let's try it in a pilot project and see if there is any merit in it, if it can work.

Mr. Chairman: Any more questions?

Mr. Bounsall: I have some on the main office administration but looking at the time it would be more appropriate to start tomorrow morning.

Mr. Chairman: The meeting is adjourned until 10 o'clock—and I mean 10 o'clock sharp if we want to get in the hours necessary. You will be first in the morning, Mr. Bounsall.

The committee adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Residential Premises Rent Review Amendment Act, Mr. Drea, second and third readings	321
County of Middlesex Act, Mr. Henderson, second reading	323
Milk Amendment Act, Mr. W. Newman, second reading	330
Trees Amendment Act, Mr. Auld, second reading	332
Provincial Offences Act, reported	333
Provincial Courts Amendment Act, reported	337
Third readings, Bills 74 and 75	337
Motion to adjourn, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to	337
Appendix, Annual Report, 1977, Workmen's Compensation Board	338

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
 Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Deputy Chairman, Committee of the whole House (Humber PC)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Van Horne, R. (London North L)
 Villeneuve, O. F.; Chairman, Resources Development Committee
 (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
 Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
 Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

Assisting the Resources Development Committee:

From the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario:

McCracken, Dr. W. J., Executive Director, Medical Services Division

Starr, Hon. M., Chairman of the Board



No. 10

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, March 29, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1979

The House met at 2:03 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1980, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, March 29, 1979.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege: Last Tuesday in the Legislature, on asking a question of the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell), I stated that three paediatricians at the North-western General Hospital and all of the anaesthetists at St. Joseph's Hospital had opted out of OHIP.

I want to set the record straight because, in fact, all of those particular physicians are in the plan. Our information arose from a misunderstanding in the telephone conversation between our researcher and the head of department, in one case, and one of the other anaesthetists in the other. Perhaps this illustrates the difficulties the general public is having in determining whether or not doctors are in or out of the plan.

Mr. Conway: The researcher is now the NDP candidate in Mount-Royal.

Mr. Speaker: To set the record straight is not a point of privilege. That is a point of clarification or to set the record straight.

HOTEL DIEU HOSPITAL

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a point of privilege. On March 13, I asked a question of the Minister of Health regarding a situation that arose at Hotel Dieu hospital in Windsor involving overcrowding on one evening when 14 patients had to stay in the emergency room. The minister's answer was misleading, I believe, in that he said the overcrowding was a result of a particular peak in one instance.

I would like to point out to the Legislature that in talking to the hospitals in Windsor I have found that since January of this year Hotel Dieu has averaged three nights per week on which it has had to use its emergency rooms because of lack of beds. Grace Hospital has also averaged three nights per week, and Metropolitan has averaged three nights per week. This clearly indicates there is a lack of active treatment beds in Windsor and that the information the Minister of Health presented to this Legislature was wrong.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to consider the comments of the honourable member and to talk with some of my staff who are regularly in discussions with the individual hospitals or the local health council. I do not have in front of me my exact response on that day, but I believe I pointed out that at this particular time of the year it is a period of peak utilization as a result of injuries and illnesses associated with winter and that it is not uncommon for there to be a peak utilization. But I will look at the member's concerns and see if they have any substance which requires followup on our part.

LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Lawlor: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: On March 15, 1979, the Minister of Health made a statement to the House that the average inpatient population at Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital over the past six months has been about 280. He has been misinformed, I put it to you, and has misinformed this House on this particular matter. It has been 337.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Again, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the information which certain individuals in this House and abroad, as it were, purport to distribute as being authoritative. Any information that I would give to this House would be based on a report from my staff. I am giving some thought to how we might effectively put to an end this growing spreading of incorrect information abroad.

Mr. Lawlor: By your being more accurate.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, any time any figure I use is wrong, I have said so. I can assure you that particular figure was one based on a question that was put repeatedly to staff, but I am always willing to ask the question again to make sure.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, later this afternoon my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) will be here to introduce a bill to amend the Business Corporations Act, and he has asked that I read this statement at this particular time in connection with that legislation.

This legislation means the company that is incorporating—not the government—will have to make sure the proposed corporate name and articles of incorporation are not in conflict with the law.

The new Business Corporations Act will provide substantial benefit to business. In recent years the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations has received numerous requests from business and from the legal community to speed up the process of incorporation. Unfortunately, the escalating volume of requests for corporate name searches and business incorporations received each year has made it increasingly difficult to handle them as quickly as business requires. Fortunately, within the past two years, facilities and technology have become available which will permit the government to hand over to the private sector the responsibility for corporate name acquisition. In practical terms this will mean the role of government in the process of incorporation can be reduced from 12 days to less than an hour.

On the subject of corporate name search, the Business Corporations Act states that a proposed corporate name should not be the same as or similar to the name of another corporation, association, partnership or individual if its use will be likely to deceive. Under the legislation as it now stands the minister must decide whether the proposed corporate name should be prohibited. The onus, of course, lies with the incorporator to select a proposed corporate name that will not conflict with the prohibition under the act.

Over the 1977-78 year, the ministry conducted almost 62,000 name searches. This represents a 70 per cent increase over the number of searches conducted in 1974. So, Mr. Speaker, you can appreciate the burden

which this workload has placed on that ministry's companies division. It now requires an average of five working days to clear a corporate name. In individual cases, the time to obtain a decision varies anywhere from three to 12 or more working days. This occurs before the incorporator even files the articles of incorporation.

Fortunately, within the past year and a half, three private search firms have begun operating a name search service directly to the public. These companies have on-line data terminals with access to the automated name search system operated by the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This system contains the trademarks and the names of all corporations from every jurisdiction in Canada, including foreign corporations carrying on business in Canada.

These search houses obtain for clients computer printout search reports from that system within 24 hours or less. The service means that this ministry can safely withdraw from the corporate names business.

The new act will privatize the name search and decision. To assist the business community in making appropriate name selections, the legislation will provide for expanded regulations and guidelines. These will require an ANS name search report to be delivered with articles of incorporation as evidence that a name search has in fact been made.

On the subject of articles of incorporation, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations has experienced similar problems with the process of proposed incorporation. Under the present legislation, incorporators submit to the ministry articles of incorporation together with a cleared name search report and the prescribed fee. The staff in the companies division examines the articles to ensure they comply with the act. If the articles of incorporation conform to the law, and all prescribed fees have been paid, the division then issues a certificate of incorporation.

Once again we have been unable to handle requests for business incorporations as quickly as the business community requires. The average service time has increased to 8.6 working days from 5.3 days in 1974. Those delays have understandably generated a number of criticisms from the business community.

To alleviate this problem, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations last year introduced procedures permitting lawyers to file legal opinions to the effect that the articles conform to law. Under this procedure, the articles are examined only for proper execution and to ensure they are accompanied by the prescribed fee and cleared

name search report. This has, of course, worked to the benefit of both business and government.

Under the new legislation, the incorporator would deliver to the minister articles of incorporation accompanied by an ANS name search report and prescribed fee. The staff will examine articles to determine that they are properly executed, that the accompanying name search report is for the name set out in the articles, and that the prescribed fee is paid. If these conditions are fully satisfied, the certificate will then be issued.

In conclusion, the amendment poses numerous benefits to both public and government. The service time will be reduced from the present average of 12 working days to, first, 30 minutes where articles are filed and the certificate of incorporation is issued, or, second, one working day where articles are delivered by mail.

Administrative expenditures will be substantially reduced, and the amendment is consistent with the 1967 recommendation of the select committee on company law that corporation law should impose minimum restrictions and afford maximum convenience and simplicity to incorporation and organization of companies.

The new Business Corporations Act will benefit everyone—business, the public and government—and it reflects this government's policy of simplifying the procedure for dealing with government agencies and for privatizing functions which the private sector can perform more efficiently.

HEALTH SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, if I may, in connection with the statement I am about to make, I would like to draw to your attention that in your galleries—

Mr. Speaker: Will honourable members keep down their private conversations, please? [2:15]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —among your guests today are Dr. William Vail, president of the Ontario Medical Association; Dr. Edward Moran, general secretary of the Ontario Medical Association; Dr. R. M. MacMillan, Dr. D. Y. Caldwell and other gentlemen from the executive of the Ontario Medical Association, as well as the members of the staff, and the president and the executive director of the Ontario Hospital Association, Professor John Wevers and Mr. R. Alan Hay respectively.

A solid, high-quality and universally accessible health system is, and can only be, the result of a partnership between health-care

professionals, the medical community, the public and the government. This partnership, despite some difficulties, has worked well in Ontario.

As the members are aware, in recent months we have been meeting frequently with representatives of the Ontario Medical Association to discuss areas of mutual concern. We have also had discussions with the Ontario Hospital Association.

Today I will outline a series of actions for the House, based on the following mutually held principles: that accessibility and universality of health care services must be maintained; that patients have the option to go to the doctor of choice and doctors have the option to practise within the plan or bill patients directly; that the patient should know in advance if an additional charge is to be made by a physician; that if a patient is not so informed, the patient should not be obliged to pay that charge; that the principle of self-regulation by the medical profession must be maintained, and that physicians should receive fair remuneration for their services.

Flowing from these principles, I would like to announce the following:

First, both the Ontario Medical Association and the Ontario Hospital Association have agreed to begin joint discussions immediately to devise a mechanism to ensure that in every public hospital in Ontario the patient will have a choice of access to physicians' services at OHIP rates. All parties have agreed this will be given the highest priority.

Secondly, the OMA, again recognizing the principle of accessibility to health services, will undertake to help citizens in obtaining the services of an opt-in physician. The OMA will immediately begin to assist the public in this way from its main office in Toronto and will be announcing further details of this service which will take into account those living outside the Toronto area. It is envisaged that the local academies of medicine across the province may be of assistance in this service.

The third action relates to the process through which the government and the OMA conduct fee negotiations. The OMA and the government have agreed on the key principles of a new procedure, which recognizes the OMA as the sole negotiating agency for physicians in Ontario for the OHIP schedule of benefits and provides for the chairman of the negotiating committee to have the role of an independent fact-finder.

I am confident the new agreement will produce a level of remuneration for the services rendered by Ontario physicians that

will be accepted as fair by both the people of Ontario and the medical profession.

As I have indicated, the OMA supports the principle that the physician should inform the patient in advance of any charges above those provided for in the OHIP schedule of benefits. Further, the OMA endorses the principle that the patient should not have to pay rates above the OHIP schedule of benefits if the doctor has not given the patient prior notification.

The OMA executive feels strongly this is a matter for which it must assume full responsibility, as a self-regulating profession. Since they view it as a matter concerning the integrity of their profession, they have undertaken to communicate this information to their members and, through existing mechanisms such as tariff committees, to help in the resolution of any difficulties that may arise between doctor and patient.

The OMA also recognizes that should difficulties persist with this issue, the government will have little choice but to consider some form of consumer protection legislation to address the problem.

It is worth reiterating that our health-care system in Ontario remains one of the finest in the world. It is based on co-operative, rather than master-servant, relationships. Reasonable people can always resolve their difficulties amicably, given a rational environment in which to consider them.

The actions I have outlined today, I believe, will help maintain that spirit of co-operation and the high standard of health care which we enjoy in Ontario today.

OMERS LEGISLATION

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, today I intend to introduce three acts for amendment. The first is the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement Systems Act. I have two amendments to introduce in connection with the OMERS act. One is intended to give the OMERS board more leeway in investing surplus pension funds. According to the present act, OMERS may invest only a portion of its surplus moneys in the private sector; the remainder is to be paid over to the Treasurer of Ontario in return for a province of Ontario debenture. The new provisions will permit the board to invest all its surplus funds in the private sector.

The second amendment is to do away with an inconsistency between the OMERS act and the year-old Family Law Reform Act. The OMERS act now prohibits any attachment of pension funds, but the Family Law Reform Act permits such attachment in the case of support orders. The new provision will allow

exception to the general rule, making attachment of OMERS' pension funds possible in the case of support orders.

BUDGET DATE

Hon. F. S. Miller: The second statement I would like to make is that on April 10 at 8 p.m. I will be presenting my budget to this Legislature.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONFEDERATION

Hon. Mr. Wells: In the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis), I would like to make a statement today and table in the Legislature the second report of the Advisory Committee on Confederation. This report deals with the subject of the federal-provincial distribution of powers. It is available in the two official languages of Canada.

Members will recall that this advisory committee was appointed in April 1977 under the chairmanship of Mr. Ian Macdonald. Its mandate has been to advise this government on questions pertaining to the future of our country.

The recommendations in the committee's second report cover the major issues pertaining to the distribution of powers, including many of the areas currently being discussed among the federal and provincial governments. The report is the culmination of a year of hard work and consultation by the committee.

Last April the Premier had the honour of tabling the first report of the committee. In that report, the committee made suggestions for constitutional changes in such areas as a new second chamber, the Supreme Court, fundamental and language rights, and an amending formula.

At that time the chairman of the advisory committee was asked to convene a small conference of Ontarians, both experts and non-experts, to analyse and evaluate the report. The result was Confederation '78, a most constructive conference held last June at Glendon College. This was organized with the co-operation of the Ontario section of the Council for Canadian Unity. The committee supplemented the consultative process by meeting privately with several people well versed in the field of constitutional reform to elicit their reactions to the proposals in the first report.

Following this consultation the committee prepared a followup to its first report, which clarified some of the proposals and modified others. The first report and its followup provided the basis for a presentation that the

advisory committee made before the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Constitution. This presentation was made last August.

Through the fall and winter, the committee has undertaken a heavy schedule of meetings, not only to provide counsel to the government on the ongoing constitutional discussions which have been carried on, but also in order to refine its recommendations on the distribution of powers.

I think this second report comes at a particularly important time. I hope its release and wide distribution will provide a valuable contribution to the debate on the future of our country. The recommendations, like those of the recently released report of the Task Force on Canadian Unity, are thoughtful and very worthy of careful consideration.

As was indicated in the Speech from the Throne, this government is strongly committed to contributing actively and constructively to the urgent business of renewing the Canadian constitution. We maintain the positive conviction that with the co-operation of all the provinces and the federal government a new constitutional agreement can be achieved. Such an agreement would recognize the importance of a strong role for the central government in maintaining an effective national economy for the benefit of all Canadians. It would also recognize the necessity for the provincial governments to retain the tools necessary to reflect their regional interests.

I would repeat what has been said often before, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible for changes to be made in the Canadian federal system that we think will meet the basic concerns of the people of Quebec as well as those of Canadians in all provinces.

I am also sending copies of the advisory committee's second report to the Prime Minister and to the Premiers of the other provinces as we table them here today. I am also tabling copies of the letters that the Premier is sending to these other people accompanying the copies of the report.

On behalf of the Premier and the government, I would like to thank the chairman of our advisory committee, Mr. Ian Macdonald, the very busy President of York University, and the other members of the committee, past and present, for the time and energy they have given in order to provide guidance to this government and to produce this second report.

I look forward to being able to continue to call upon them, as this government does, for counsel on all matters concerning Confedera-

tion over these next very crucial months ahead.

KENORA PLANE CRASH

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in this statement and I am confident that all members of this House will share this feeling with me.

Mr. McClellan: The Thursday filibuster.

Mr. Peterson: If the minister would speak up maybe we could hear it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will send it over to the member.

Mr. Conway: What's that?

Mr. Peterson: Don't give away your hearing aid, Jimmy.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I asked for that.

Yesterday in the Kenora area, acts of bravery and determination were performed by two men, one of whom is a member of the staff of the Ministry of Natural Resources. The two men, one a pilot on our staff, the other a young helicopter pilot from a commercial company, rescued three people whose airplane had crashed in the Lake of the Woods. Unfortunately, a fourth person, a woman who was strapped in a stretcher and being flown to Winnipeg for medical attention, could not be rescued.

I would like to recount this incident in detail, from reports we have received during the last few hours from our ministry office in the northwestern region.

Yesterday afternoon, a twin-engine Piper Aztec with three women and the pilot aboard crashed near Kenora in the Lake of the Woods. Just before it went down, the pilot was in touch with Ministry of Transport officials who called our small airfield in Kenora to alert us that an emergency was in progress. One of our ministry pilots by the name of Bob Grant was on hand at the time. Outside the office was a helicopter belonging to Heli-Voyageur. Its pilot apparently was heading home from Edmonton to Quebec for a break.

Ministry of Transport informed Mr. Grant that a plane with both engines gone had crashed and appealed for help. Bob Grant immediately enlisted the aid of the helicopter pilot, a young 23-year-old gentleman named Brian Clegg. They took off from the ministry airstrip and began searching the area where MOT last had radar contact with the troubled plane.

To give the House an idea of the flying conditions, earlier that day Mr. Grant had cancelled a flight because the weather was too bad. It was snowing and gusty.

According to Mr. Grant, they searched the area for about 10 minutes until one of them noticed skid marks on the ice below leading into the water. The helicopter was flying at treetop level at this point.

Pilot Clegg dropped down and they immediately saw a man and woman on shore waving. It was the pilot and a woman on board who had managed to swim to shore through the icy water. The downed plane was nowhere to be seen. As they were turning toward shore, Mr. Grant noticed what looked like a coat floating in the water. He took a closer look and realized it was a woman just barely afloat. At this point she had apparently been in the water almost 10 minutes. Both men decided to try to rescue from the air rather than wait any longer.

[2:30]

Mr. Clegg brought the helicopter to within a few inches of the surface of the open water and held it steady in the gusts of wind. Mr. Grant then unbuckled himself and climbed out of the cockpit on to the skid, which he straddled. At this point he was in icy water up to his mid-section. Bob Grant grabbed the floating woman and yelled to the pilot to lift off slowly. About 10 feet in the air, he was apparently unable to hold on because of the cold, his precarious position and the weight of the woman whose winter clothes were soaked with water. She fell back into the water.

Mr. Grant and the pilot decided to try again. At this point the unfortunate woman was stiff but still conscious. Mr. Grant grabbed her again and ordered the pilot of the small helicopter up again. Once again, he couldn't maintain his grip.

Mrs. Campbell: This is unreal.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It seems almost unbelievable that they could continue to do this, given the weather conditions and the skill that it takes to control a helicopter under these circumstances, but they tried twice more and the results were the same.

Then Mr. Grant asked the pilot to fly sideways across the water and backward to the sheet of ice approximately 100 feet away. Mr. Grant all the while clung to the helicopter skid and dragged the woman through the water. He pulled the survivor onto the ice and the helicopter backed up again.

Mr. Grant, on surer footing now, climbed out and pushed the woman into the passenger seat of the helicopter. She was barely conscious, but apparently—and these are Mr. Grant's words—"as stiff as a board" from the cold. Then, with Mr. Grant standing on the skid, half in and half out of the heli-

copter and with a grip on the woman survivor and the machine, they took off for Kenora.

Within a few minutes they were setting down in the main drive of the Kenora hospital. They delivered the woman survivor and then returned to pick up the others.

Mr. Riddell: It's a good thing there were hospital beds.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's an excellent hospital.

Hon. Mr. Auld: These are the details of the rescue yesterday that were relayed to me by staff in Kenora. This report was done in a rush, but we believe the facts are accurate.

I'm sad to report the other passenger aboard the aircraft, who was being flown to Winnipeg, did not survive. I'm glad, however, to say the pilot and the two other women passengers, including the woman rescued from the water by Mr. Clegg and Mr. Grant, were released from the Kenora hospital this morning after being treated for exposure. All of them were understandably glad to be alive and anxious to get home.

I will be personally commending the actions of our staff pilot, Mr. Grant, and the pilot of the helicopter, Mr. Clegg, but I'm particularly proud to report that Mr. Grant, although he has only been flying with my ministry for two years, has demonstrated how he fits into the tradition of the Ontario air service that was begun in the early 1920s.

Once again, I am sure all members will join me in thanking those two gentlemen for doing a remarkable job under almost impossible circumstances.

Mr. Peterson: Even you made that sound exciting.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Premier (Mr. Davis), who I thought was going to be here today. The House leader believes he will be here? Perhaps I will save that question.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. S. Smith: I will ask my first question of the Minister of Health. I note in the minister's statement, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Medical Association, the Ontario Hospital Association, and the ministry I presume, will be meeting to discuss how to guarantee that in every public hospital patients will have a choice of access to physicians' services at OHIP rates. In the meantime, however, can the minister clarify what the situation is in those hospitals where all the members of

one speciality, such as anaesthetists, have opted out? Is it within the ability of the patient now simply to choose whether or not the patient is to pay the OHIP rate or to pay the additional rate? Would the minister be very clear? I'm speaking, of course, of the conscious patient.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to give a conscious answer.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's a change.

Mr. Ashe: Too bad we don't have a conscious opposition leader.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In individual instances that come to our attention, either through our own surveys or through the efforts of members opposite or through the media, we will contact individual hospitals in the interim period between now and the finalization of the mechanism which the hospital association and the medical association are working on to assure that. Obviously, I don't want to prejudge what the ultimate mechanism they recommend will be, but we will deal with it hospital by hospital to give effect to that principle of the right to access to services on an opted-in basis.

Mr. S. Smith: I think I understood the minister's answer to be that in fact the patients can refuse to pay the opted-out rate. If I'm wrong in that understanding, I hope the minister will correct me.

I would like to ask by way of supplementary, stemming also from the statement the minister made earlier, how the minister proposes in those communities where the number of opted-out physicians is rather great to make sure that opted-in physicians are available. Is he now prepared to place health service organizations, or some other form of alternative inside-the-plan services, in those communities to make sure that access exists?

It is all very well for the OMA to say they are going to help people find these doctors, but what about communities where they are not in existence or are insufficient in numbers?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On several previous occasions I have indicated that we are indeed prepared to meet with and discuss with any potential sponsoring group in any community the possibility of the establishment of a financially viable health service organization. One community which has been very much in our minds recently is Peterborough.

Mr. Cassidy: You are starving the health service organizations. It is a hollow promise.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have been approached by two organizations there indicating an interest. One is a group of physicians, the other a group representing one of the major unions in the community. We

are quite prepared to sit down with either or both of them to transmit the information about the basis on which such an HSO would be formed, and take them through the various stages associated with that.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Since the statement by the minister in conjunction with the OMA states only that the patient will have a choice of access to physician services at OHIP rates in hospitals, can the minister tell the House and the public of Ontario what proportion of services by doctors or what proportion of doctors within a hospital must be making their services available at OHIP rates in order to be acceptable to this new standard? Is it the 95 per cent which is comparable to the standard laid down by Ottawa for the number of people enrolled in the plan provincially? Is it 75 per cent, is it 55 per cent, is it 25 per cent; or is the minister simply saying that as long as there is one doctor in a particular specialty who is prepared to work under OHIP he will be satisfied? If that is his view, how does he then say there is universal access to hospital medical care at insured rates in the province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would invite the honourable member to reread that portion of my statement, because what I talked about was access to services at opted-in rates. He will know that in every clinical department of every hospital in the province the regulations provide for the right to form a billing group within a specialty, and for each one to have a separate billing group so that accounts can be billed directly to the plan, that is on an opted-in basis.

The principle here is the right of access to services to be provided on an opted-in basis. So really, I don't envisage and I can't foresee as part of the development of this mechanism that the hospital association and the medical association have undertaken that it would be a particular percentage of doctors. The principle accepted by everyone is that you or I or anyone, if we insist, will have access to the service to be provided on an opted-in basis.

Mr. Cassidy: If we insist?

Mr. Swart: How can you ensure that?

Mr. Warner: That's your responsibility.

Mr. Conway: I have a supplementary with respect to the third action spoken of on the bottom of the third page of the minister's statement. Can the minister clarify for me and members of this House what exactly is this new procedure involving the OMA in its negotiation of the OHIP schedule of benefits; how it is their input is going to be new and perhaps different from what has existed in

previous years; and how it is he expects the chairman of this negotiating committee ultimately to act in some capacity as an independent fact finder?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We have not dotted all the i's and crossed all the t's of that agreement.

Mrs. Campbell: You sure haven't.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, don't be so cynical. You want to bludgeon the doctors into submission.

Mr. Van Horne: Your ministry should plan a little ahead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Smile.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The two key principles, as I indicated in the statement, are that we accept the Ontario Medical Association will be the sole bargaining agent with the government of Ontario for physicians' benefits under OHIP, that is the OHIP schedule of benefits. The second thing is perhaps even more important, because as we strive to ensure a system that will achieve fair results—

Mrs. Campbell: I can't believe it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the chairman of this agency, as it were, will have the authority, on the motion of one of the parties, to examine the arguments and seek out information independently and make a recommendation. It is not unlike, I would suggest, what we have in the role of the chairman of the educational relations commission.

Mr. Breagh: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In choosing this route, is the minister now saying that in the next set of negotiations he will move to one approved rate of services for doctors? Will the same rules apply in that instance—since we're using trade union and normal negotiating terminology here—will the same rules apply to the medical association as apply to other people who bargain and negotiate a salary rate, like teachers, like trade unionists; that is if you move to negotiate one approved rate for your services, then you must abide by that and you cannot opt out?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, we will maintain the health insurance plan in Ontario as presently structured, which gives options to the patients and to the doctors. I'm still trying to figure out what the policy of that group over there is. Last week their leader said he would opt all the doctors in; yesterday their leader said that he would avoid draconian measures. Last night he was speaking in Hamilton and was going to tell the world the solutions of the New Democratic Party for health care. Apparently he said nothing.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I understand—

Mr. Swart: You don't even understand your problems.

Interjections.

An hon. member: I think you struck a nerve there.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I quite understand the policies of that party. I quite understand the policies—

Mr. Cassidy: If you don't understand the principles of health insurance in Ontario, then you shouldn't be the Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —because I've seen the national health service, I've seen the disaster which their philosophy has wreaked on the United Kingdom; and they are not going to do it here.

An hon. member: Is the campaign still on, Dennis?

Mr. Makarchuk: Have you checked out the health services in Ethiopia?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

FORMER MINISTER'S SPEECH

Mr. S. Smith: A question of the Premier: Now that the honourable member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) is no longer bound by cabinet solidarity and appears prepared to speak out on his experience as a minister in the Premier's government, has the Premier, as a matter of priority, today discussed with him the important and relevant remarks which he made last night to the North York Progressive Conservative Association? I might quote from his remarks: "Legislative overload and abdication of authority has contributed to the transfer of political power to the bureaucracy. Ministries are manipulated by deputies and clever marionette-like manoeuvres. They, in turn, are managed by the Premier's mandarins, with only the semblance of power at the elected level."

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question in all of this?

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, since deputy ministers are appointed essentially by the Premier, and in view of this reference to mandarins in the Premier's office who allegedly manage the deputy ministers, has the Premier asked his former Minister of Energy to provide him with information to substantiate these very serious charges being made about the conflict of democratic government in Ontario?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that very serious question, one of urgent public importance raised by the Leader of the Opposition, which has about as much relevancy as a number of questions he is prone to ask in the House—

Mr. Bolan: A heck of a lot more than the answers you are giving too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have never raised the question of the relevancy of my answers. They usually reflect the tenor of the questions that are asked, and this particular answer will be no different.

Mr. Bolan: Facetious.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, it will be a little bit facetious because the question was more than slightly facetious.

I would say to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker—and I am sure you will allow me the same latitude in reply as you allowed him in reading from the news report—that quite honestly I have not discussed the particular matter with the former Minister of Energy. He is a very able member of our caucus, one who represents, as we do in the whole caucus, a Conservative approach, unlike the caucus opposite which is ultimately divided into Liberal and Conservative philosophy.

He is one who has never been reluctant to campaign as a Conservative either federally or provincially and not as a representative of a party who, if he goes into Scarborough West, will be faced with election signs saying “Ontario Liberal, Canadian Liberal,” or any other variety of Liberal you may wish to choose in this particular period.

The Leader of the Opposition is quite correct. We do have the responsibility of the appointment of our deputy ministers within this government. I am not one to become too expansive on any of these things. I am always very modest in my praise of individuals, except I would say that I think we have an excellent—

Mr. McEwen: Your halo is slipping.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, there's a halo. To the hon. member opposite who is gesturing with his hand around his head, indicating some difficulty which we would understand on this side of the House, I would only say to him a halo he does not have.

I would also say I have great confidence in and great respect for the deputy ministers in the government of this province. Not only do I say that, but I am sure in a personal way I really reflect the views of the reasonable members opposite who on occasion do communicate with these deputies in order to get problems solved within their constituencies.

I am told they are always treated politely, cooperatively and in a way that does resolve problems for individual members opposite.

Mr. Makarchuk: You mean he is all wrong, in other words.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I happen to know that this takes place. While the hon. member in the speech apparently indicated some concern that all of us have expressed on occasion as to the role of the “bureaucracy” and that of the elected people, I can say, unlike the Liberal caucus, certainly we are a very independent group on this side of the House. I would say that I have the advice of some of the most able men and women in political life in this country who have never been reluctant either to differ with the deputy ministers or on occasion even to differ with the Premier in their approach to certain issues.

While I know the Leader of the Opposition had hoped in some small way, because of the by-elections, facetiously to embarrass this party, I can only say to him, unlike his party we do not discourage independent thinking. We do not discourage our private members from making observations, and at the same time, unlike his caucus, the ministers of the crown in this government do express their points of view. Their points of view are understood by the senior level of administration—

Mr. Sargent: You have made a hell of a mess of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in this province and they do accept the ultimate political decision that is made. If the Leader of the Opposition wants me to expand upon this further, I am quite prepared, hopefully, to answer a supplementary question, or perhaps he now feels he has had enough.

Mr. Makarchuk: Any more?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can go on. I can even be provoked into commenting on Hamilton-Wentworth.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I won't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I really think the Premier's answer has been expansive enough.

Mr. S. Smith: Since the Premier seems determined to take the question less seriously than it was intended—

Hon. Mr. Norton: You mean it didn't achieve the result you hoped it would achieve.

Mr. S. Smith: I would like, by way of a supplementary, to ask whether the Premier is aware that because cabinet solidarity no longer binds the member for Prince Edward-

Lennox the member is making some very serious charges about the conduct of government in the province of Ontario under the stewardship of the Premier. I want to know, therefore, whether the Premier intends, since he has obviously not already done so, to find out the specifics of the accusations being made by the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, whether he intends to share with the House any of the specifics that are involved, and exactly what the Premier's opinion is of a situation where a former minister, finally free to speak of his experience, tell us the elements of democracy have been undermined by the way in which the bureaucracy acts towards its ministers and the way in which the Premier's own appointees control the very top echelon of that bureaucracy. Does he intend to take this seriously and find out what it is the former Minister of Energy is complaining about and what it is in the system of government in Ontario that may require change?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I take all serious matters seriously and I have every respect for the views of the very distinguished member of this caucus and former minister of the crown. I am delighted the Leader of the Opposition, for the first time since I have been here, is now himself paying some attention to the former Minister of Energy. If memory serves me correctly, he was less than complimentary, less than supportive, and hypercritical of that same individual not too many months ago. It is interesting to see the change that has taken place.

I would further say to the Leader of the Opposition, who has yet to gain some measure of experience in these matters I guess—and I will just restate it, Mr. Speaker, because the supplementary really was the same as the original question—that while all of us from time to time are concerned about the balances between the administrative people and the people who labour so conscientiously for the public of this province and that of the elected person, I can only repeat what I say: that I have confidence in the deputy ministers in this government. They are extremely—

Mr. di Santo: Time, time, time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen. My answer hasn't taken as long as that rather rambling question.

Mr. Swart: Oh yes, it has.

Mr. McClellan: Spare us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you having trouble with your fingers this afternoon? I don't doubt it; you got burned earlier this afternoon. I would only repeat to the Leader of the Op-

position that in no way am I upset or concerned—

Mr. McClellan: We got burned? Your minister was on fire.

Mr. Wildman: He went up in smoke.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —by what the honourable member has said. I would only remind him if he has something of a specific nature, if he has some criticism to make of the senior deputies in this government, then he should do so. He should not do as he did in Hamilton, criticizing and in many respects going pretty far with respect to the employees of the Ministry of the Environment who can't defend themselves; and in this he has not yet been big enough to apologize or take back what he said.

If he is saying to me as head of government that the "senior public service" are incompetent and that they don't take political direction, then he should just say so and we can debate it here in the House. I would be delighted to do so. I have never been reluctant to defend the public service of this province and that includes the deputy ministers.

I don't want to go on too long on the subject. They are very able people, they take political direction, they take it from a very able group of ministers. I know that is frustrating the Leader of the Opposition; he only wishes he had in his caucus such ability to demonstrate to the people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary to the Premier: Since the usurpation of the legitimate rights and powers of the elected representatives by the growing bureaucracy in modern government is a well-known phenomenon that has been discussed ad nauseam in hundreds of political science classrooms, could the Premier inform us from which one of the thousands of texts his minister may have plagiarized those comments?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Knowing the honourable member who just asked the question is himself either an author or an editor, who in this House is a practising political scientist and in the academic community is a theoretical political scientist, who is one of those who does carry into theory some of the practicalities, as I read some of his material and as I have talked to some students to whom he has lectured, I might observe that perhaps the member for Prince Edward-Lennox borrowed some of his phraseology; I don't know.

I hope he too is expressing at long last some confidence in, and appreciation for, the efforts given to the public of this prov-

ince by the former Minister of Energy. He didn't show such great interest not too many months ago.

Mr. Swart: That is a perfect non-answer.

An hon. member: Find out what books he has read.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier something arising from the original question and his answer. Does it not concern him that the honourable member who made the speech was Minister of Energy at just the time when Ontario Hydro was making the decisions which are at this time costing the consumers so much money and are above and beyond what is required?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Not really.

Mr. McClellan: You should have asked that a half hour ago.

Mr. Nixon: Is he not concerned that the democratic control of Hydro, which was supposed to have been operating through the former Minister of Energy, was in fact usurped by the bureaucracy and directly by the mandarins, whoever those are, in the Premier's office?

Mr. Wildman: He certainly showed Smith how to ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the baseball season is upon us and when the leader strikes out the pinch-hitters come up to bat; I understand that. Only I have to tell the honourable member that really, historically he is not correct.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is making an absolute fool of himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member I want to recall for him some of the observations he has made recently when we get into more general debate after the fifth.

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary question was quite specific.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was quite specific. Well then, trying to deal with it specifically, Mr. Speaker, my recollection, and of course the memory of the honourable member who asked the question is far better than mine, is that the majority of decisions were made prior to this time.

Mr. Peterson: He is better looking too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly he is better looking. He is better looking than you are, in spite of your wardrobe, in spite of your in-laws.

Mr. Sargent: That is pretty shaggy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are they going to be on the campaign trail for Joe? Sure they are.

I would remind the member who asked the question, Mr. Speaker, that the majority

of the basic decisions which are now being debated, and the member for York South can correct me if I am wrong, really in essence were made by Ontario prior to the very former, at least the very distinguished former Minister of Energy having responsibility.

Mr. McClellan: He is very former.

Mr. Breaugh: He is very former.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No; the former, very distinguished, Minister of Energy. I think that is, from the standpoint of chronology, correct; so please don't try to bail your leader out by asking a question that really is not totally based on the history of the situation.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Health; but first to remind him of what he said on Tuesday: "There is no evidence whatsoever, none whatsoever, that people have in fact been deterred from necessary medical care by our system." He also said: "There is no evidence, there is no reason of any kind to believe that our health plan is any way at all being dismantled." Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the conversion the minister has reflected in a statement he gave in the House today.

I would like to ask the minister a very specific question which relates to this question and relates to the comments made on Tuesday. Since the minister was insisting on Tuesday that it would be a violation of the Health Insurance Act to publish names of physicians who were in or who were out of OHIP, can he explain why and how it was a violation of that act on Tuesday to publish the names, but yet on Thursday it is possible to announce an agreement with the Ontario Medical Association where they will publish the names in some way yet to be determined in order to let people know how to get access to an OHIP physician?

Mr. Breaugh: That is the difference between Tuesday and Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, it will be done in exactly the same way that the medical association has for years provided that service to the public when they are new in an area looking for a doctor of any kind. What I said was—and again I cannot remember my exact words—I said that I believed that under the provisions of the Health Insurance Act, specifically section 44, that could, in fact, be a violation. That is the section that deals with confidentiality. That is being checked out.

Mr. Conway: I wonder what Bert Lawrence would say if he were here today.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: But that is my understanding of it.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, supplementary: Will the minister not agree that if section 44 was in fact intended to protect confidentiality it would apply as much to the local medical associations or academies of medicine as it would apply to the Ministry of Health in publishing the kinds of lists that we wanted, for each community in the province, of doctors who are opted in and opted out?

[3:00]

Will he also not agree that section 44 of the act is intended to protect the patients, but that it is not intended to be a legal smoke-screen to allow the Ministry of Health to fail to inform the people of Ontario whether and how they can get service at insured rates?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the government, the Ontario Health Insurance Plan and the profession is dictated by the Health Insurance Act. We are all bound by that. The confidentiality of information, whether it is about physicians or patients, must be applied equally.

The relationship between the Ontario Medical Association and the doctors is bound by the constitution of the medical association. Under the terms of that document, they have in the past answered inquiries looking for new doctors. They can and will give some names to individuals who call asking for help in finding an opted-in physician in their area.

The member is talking about a complete list, and they are talking about giving some names to assist individuals in finding a doctor. They are really two quite different things; they are two different relationships: one to the association under the constitution of that association, and the other to the health insurance plan under the terms of the Health Insurance Act, which is binding on all of us.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Can the minister please explain what kind of choice—since this is what he keeps insisting on—an individual patient is going to have if he first has to phone up the Academy of Medicine, which is not listed in the phone books of the various cities and towns of the province and, in the second place, if all the individual gets from the academy is a list of two or three opted-in physicians who may or may not be convenient for the neighbourhood the person is phoning from?

Does it really constitute choice if there are other doctors in the area whom the person who is calling may know personally and whom he may wish to go to but he is not able to find out whether they are opted in or opted out?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, I understand the medical association will indicate in their announcement today the phone number for a Zenith line at their headquarters on St. George Street; so that information will be accessible throughout Ontario, through the Zenith line. That would in fact, ensure choice.

If the individual feels that on principle he wants to deal with an opted-in physician only, then he will be able to get this assistance, in addition to other normal inquiries one would make of fellow citizens in a particular community.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: On the question of opting out, since the percentage of opted-out physicians has clearly increased, could the minister indicate to this House either now or at an early opportunity what increased burdens this has placed on the OHIP administration? Obviously, a substantially increased number of cheques must be sent out to a much greater number of patients. Can he indicate of what order is that increase and what the additional costs of that are?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the House that I did put that question myself over the phone to the general manager of OHIP about three or four weeks ago. He indicated at that time that, as one would expect, there has been an increased volume of claims associated with patients being billed direct. He assured me that at that point they are able to look after that volume within the existing staff arrangements and that any additional cost would be associated with postage, in the main, and with paper-work, supplies and so forth.

Mr. Cassidy: I have another question, which I would direct to the Minister of Health, arising out of the statement he made in the Legislature today.

The minister states: "I am confident that the new agreement will produce a level of remuneration for the services rendered by Ontario physicians that will be accepted as fair by both the people of Ontario and the medical profession."

Can the minister explain why the government intends to continue to allow a substantial number of doctors in the province to opt out and to charge fees that are very much in excess of the OHIP rates, if, as the minister says, the rates negotiated with the Ontario Medical Association for OHIP will be fair both to patients and to the medical profession?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It bears repeating, I guess, time and time again. I really do not

think, Mr. Speaker, that member is going to believe it or understand it, let alone accept it. We believe in freedom of choice for the patients, for the doctors. In fact, in any jurisdiction in this country, all of them having health plans, there are choices that have to be made. Even in provinces run by socialist governments, even in that place called the UK, your Valhalla, your Nirvana, there are choices that are made.

In Ontario we have been extremely well served by our system, which is based on these options of the patients and of the doctors and will be maintained in that fashion.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is saying, in effect, that the rate negotiated with OHIP will in fact be a fair rate both to the patients and the doctors, but then he is also saying that it will be open to doctors to charge a rate which by definition will, therefore, be unfair. Can the minister then say, as far as the so-called freedom of choice of patients is concerned, why he will not insist that patients have access to care at the insured rate, why he insists on trying to have this House believe that it's a quirk of a few people in the province who insist on the principle of having services at the insured rate? Why will he not understand that for most of the people in the province of Ontario getting service at the insured rate is not a quirk, not some kind of eccentricity, but in fact it is a matter of dire necessity? Why, therefore, will not the ministry, having accepted the principle that some doctors' names in OHIP can be published, publish all of the names for each community across the province of those doctors who are in the plan and those doctors who are out of the plan, so if the ministry insists on people having a choice there is a fair choice both for patients as well as for doctors?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if there are any quirks around here, if there are any eccentricities around here, they all come from Ottawa Centre.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the track record of this health plan, if you will look at the reality rather than the distorted perception the member is trying to sell, the people have the right of access, the people have the option. They have been well served by this plan.

It amazes me that for all his talk of this the people still support the plan; the people know that they have a health plan that does look after them.

HYDRO URANIUM CONTRACTS

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I had thought the Premier would have had a statement to

the House today regarding the nuclear spill in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and that his power officials would be down there finding out what is going on. I have been in touch with that office now—

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Sargent: I am leading into what I am talking about; and don't start giving me the gears about a question after what has been going on here the last few months.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Sargent: You will hear my question now.

Mr. Speaker: Please put it immediately. Please put it right now, immediately.

Mr. Makarchuk: Tout de suite. That's in the other official language.

Mr. Sargent: To the Premier, with regard to the \$7 billion uranium contract, about which a lot of people are considering a class action verging on public fraud, and wherein he has given them a \$2 billion profit before they have even started on the \$40 to \$60 a pound price, in view of the fact that the Wall Street Journal has said it can be bought at the mine for \$1 a pound—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the hon. member take his seat? Will the hon. member please take his seat?

Mr. Sargent: I will stand here all day to get this question.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member please take his seat?

Mr. Sargent: I will not. I want to get this question in.

Mr. Speaker: I have no alternative but to name the honourable member and ask him to withdraw from the balance of this sitting.

Mr. Sargent: You are impossible.

Mr. Makarchuk: Do you want me to show him out?

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about a \$7 billion deal and we can't get a question across. Who do you think you are?

Mr. Sargent was escorted from the chamber by the Sergeant at Arms.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr. Cunningham: I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. I would like to ask the minister if he is aware that the proposed equalization of assessment in the city of Hamilton has caused increases in both commercial and residential property, anywhere from 42 per cent to over 500 per cent. I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to take any action, as provided in the

Municipal Act, to provide some relief for those people who will be facing very severe and radical tax increases?

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I am aware that there are some increases in taxes and also some decreases. There is a balance there: those whose taxes will go up and those whose taxes have gone down. One has, really, to consider both sides of that coin.

Section 505 of the Municipal Act comes under the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs; however the municipality has the right, at any time, to make the request of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs if they want to use section 505 to phase in any part of the tax hike that might result from the reassessment.

Mr. Cunningham: The increases on some of these businesses will be upwards of 400 per cent and 500 per cent, especially on some small businesses. A similar effect may be imposed somewhat radically on individual home owners who are already facing the burdens of regional government in that particular area. I'm wondering if the minister would take it upon himself to meet, as soon as possible, with officials from the city of Hamilton to see that if any increases are going to be imposed on these people, that in fact the provisions of section 505 might apply and that those increases be very marginal at best and phased in over a period of time.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I might advise the honourable member that we did meet with the mayor of Hamilton yesterday in this regard. He has been advised of section 505. There is also another section of the Municipal Act, section 636, that could be applied as well. That action has already taken place.

Mr. Charlton: Would the minister inform us of what, specifically, he is prepared to do in terms of phasing in the increases in Hamilton? What form will the financial assistance take, and how much?

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I have not made any commitment that there will be any financial assistance from the province whatsoever. Section 505 deals with allowing the municipality to make adjustments. Section 636 does the same thing in a different way, as I'm sure the member is aware. There have been no commitments from this government, at this point in time, for any financial assistance to Hamilton or any other municipality.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, that's not what the Premier was reported as saying today.

PHYSICIANS' SALARIES

Mr. Breaugh: I have a question of the Minister of Health: Will he explain to the

House why his ministry decided to freeze the salaries of those general practitioners who are generally considered to be the lowest paid practitioners in general medicine in Ontario, those working in community health service organizations?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: My understanding is that in each case the salaries are negotiated with the individual boards. If the member has a particular case in mind of a doctor's income being frozen in the health service organization in which he works, let me know and we'll look into it.

Mr. Breaugh: If I could clarify it: We have some indication here that the ministry staff has indicated that because the ministry doesn't have a contractual agreement to provide the increase approved in the OMA schedule, it is not, therefore, going to increase the doctors' salaries in the community health service organizations. Is that the policy of the ministry's program development branch? [3:15]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, I think that of the 28 or 29 individual contracts that we have, a number do have escalation clauses that relate to the changes in the OHIP schedule. A number do not. I believe, in fact, there was a presentation made to the select committee on that by Mr. Ray Berry, the branch director, around the first week of August, at which time the whole system of the HSOs was explained to the committee. If the member has a particular one in mind I'd be glad to look into it for him.

RAPE CASE

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on March 9, the member for York Centre, in a question addressed to the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Welch), asked whether or not my ministry would review the possibility of appealing the acquittal of an accused on a recent rape charge.

The member for York Centre referred to a story in a Toronto newspaper which purported to quote the assistant crown attorney as referring to a prostitute as an unrapable woman.

Senior officials of my ministry have reviewed this matter with the crown counsel in charge of the case and, as a result, is of the opinion that there are no legal grounds upon which any appeal may be based.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that at no time did the crown counsel who prosecuted the case use the term, "a prostitute becomes an unrapable person." I'm sure that the member for York Centre was quoting from a March 8 edition of a newspaper which

apparently used this phrase. The reporter responsible for this article subsequently apologized to crown counsel for the fact that someone had rewritten his original story.

In the view of crown counsel, the jury in question was properly charged by the trial judge, and it is apparent that this case is one where the jury felt that the case simply had not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

TOURISM

Mr. Eakins: I have a question of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, Mr. Speaker. In line with his efforts to reduce the province's \$660 million travel deficit, will his new director of tourism be investigating such practices as a tour operated by Gray Coach Lines, one of our publicly-controlled companies, to transport residents to Niagara Falls every day of the year and which offers accommodation on the American side of the falls only?

Mr. Kerrio: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course we will. I think we have some great facilities on our side of the border and we'll speak to Gray Coach about that—

Mr. Kerrio: The best, the very best.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and see why it's doing it and if it can't do it on our side.

Mr. Eakins: A supplementary: While the minister is looking into this, will his director of tourism look into why they rejected a submission from the Canadian operators in Niagara Falls? I believe the operators were asked for a submission, they prepared it and they were turned down. At least, we ask for the opportunity for tourists to stay on the Canadian side if they wish. At the present time, they have no alternative.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I would. I would be very interested to learn the circumstances surrounding that since it would seem to me, in view of the dollar exchange, it would more than likely be cheaper to stay in any of the fine facilities in the great city of Niagara Falls on our side of the border than in the United States. I would be very interested to find out what happened in that situation and I'll report to the House.

Mr. J. Reed: The minister doesn't know anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I may go out there myself.

DRIVER EDUCATION

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Com-

munications, of which he's had notice, I believe, for some time.

In view of the increasing surplus of teachers in Ontario and in view of the discussions now under way in the ministry toward upgrading of driving education and the professionalization of driver instruction in the province, what progress has now been made in utilizing the skill of our surplus teachers to improve driving education in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the member did advise me some time before the recess that he was going to ask that question, but I must admit that I had almost forgotten.

I can't tell the honourable member what specific action is being taken, if any, for the use of surplus teachers in the role of driver education. Certainly no action is being taken at this moment by my ministry in that area. It may be that through the boards of education and the secondary school system some role is being played in this area for more intensive utilization of secondary school teachers in driver education.

As I'm sure the honourable member is aware, last fall we published a discussion paper on driver education which was distributed rather widely. I believe 3,000 to 4,000 copies were distributed throughout the province. We have had a fairly good response, but not as great a response as I would like to have had. We have had response from education officials, boards of education, driving instructors, commercial driving school operators and safety associations. These replies to our discussion paper are being tabulated right now, or have been.

I don't intend to proceed with legislation on anything this spring session but, perhaps before the summer recess I hope to be able to either distribute draft legislation or table for first reading legislation for discussion purposes outlining what I will be proposing for dealing with the whole matter of driver education in Ontario. Then, during the summer months, I hope to have meetings and discuss this and perhaps proceed with something further in the fall to bring a more formal solution to the whole driver education system of the province.

Mr. Young: Supplementary: I would like to thank the minister very much for his reply. Certainly the urgency of this situation is underlined by the dilemma in which the Minister of Health now finds himself.

I wonder whether or not the minister is planning anything in the way of stepped-up driving instruction over this summer, or whether his program—and I understand the difficulties here—has advanced far enough

that driving instruction can be stepped up during the summer months instead of being cut back as it was last year.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't expect that I will be able, in any way, directly through the ministry, to step up driver education. I certainly recognize the need. One of the things I have been very interested in over the past couple of years—three years, as a matter of fact—is bringing a more formal curriculum type of program to the whole driver education system. As the honourable member well knows through his committee on safety there were some valuable comments and recommendations made.

I am not completely happy with the driver education system we have in the province today. It's fragmented; it's not a uniform system. But the ministry directly is not in the business of supplying driver education; the boards of education are and the commercial driving schools are and a great many private individuals are. I will tell the honourable member right now it is not my intention to make a course of driver education, whether it be by a board of education or by a private driving school, mandatory to obtaining a licence, advisable as it may be. Ontario is a very large and diverse area of land with a lot of people—

Mr. Kerrio: We give up, we give up.

Mr. Speaker: Will the honourable minister be a little bit more crisp in his answer?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the area of the province to which I am referring now happens to be that great area which you represent a major part of.

Mr. Speaker: It has been crisp up there.

Mr. Breagh: You're right, Mr. Speaker; I was just there.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I recognize the honourable member's keen interest in this; he has been very helpful. I look forward to being crisp and, by June, having draft legislation for us to consider.

MEMBERSHIP OF POLICE COMMISSIONS

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the member for Eglinton—and I address him that way because I think the question concerns both of his portfolios.

In view of Kent county Judge G. Brian Clement's refusal, because he finds he does not have the time, to act on the police commissions in four municipalities, would the minister either direct the judge to act in this capacity or, probably more preferable, appoint someone else to act in that capacity?

At the present time there are only two members acting on these police commissions; negotiations currently are under way regarding salaries and so on, and they feel a great deficiency in having only two people.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I cannot direct any judge to sit on any board or commission, and I was not aware of the particular problem involving this judge.

Part of the problem in some areas is caused by legislation which requires that the commission include a judge as a member. In my view, this should be changed, not to exclude judges as members, but to leave it up to the individual municipality to determine whether a judge is the appropriate member. I hope an amendment to the Police Act in this respect will be brought forward, certainly before the end of spring. In the meantime I will look into that particular situation.

Mr. Worton: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has had correspondence from myself and from the mayor of Guelph in regard to additional members other than the three members in the municipalities, such as the regional governments have. Is the minister going to give consideration to that when he brings in this amendment to the Police Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker.

LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, my perennial question is for the Minister of Health. While the minister was away—it is perfectly all right to go away; I am not saying much about that—a goofy decision was made by some member of the ministry staff to close the special observation unit at Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital.

Is the minister aware of the case of a young woman, Theresa Bonnici—we have permission to use her name—22 years of age, who had been in the hospital, involuntarily, whose condition was such that she had to be taken to the special observation ward? She was forced out last week because of the closing of the ward and is not locatable at the present time, and her parents are profoundly worried about her. Is the minister aware of this case?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Not that particular case, Mr. Speaker. My understanding—I am looking for the note I had on that; I had asked a question about the special observation unit—is that all the patients in the special

observation unit are in secure wards at this time. I will check that out and confirm that.

Mr. Lawlor: Supplementary: Since there are many patients in these conditions, dangerous to themselves and even possibly to others, and many court referrals—the ministry will be getting a lot of complaints from the courts, judges and police very shortly if it has not got numerous complaints already—would the minister consider reconstituting the special observation ward at least until his further plans are developed?

[3:30]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'll be glad to talk with the staff in the psychiatric hospitals branch to assure myself the decision that's been taken is not causing any harm to the patients, because obviously the welfare of the patients is first and foremost.

The member's comment about the requirements of the courts and so forth relates more to Queen Street, inasmuch as that's where the METFORS forensic unit is located. Of course that is carrying on as presently constituted.

COMMUNITY SERVICE BOARDS

Mr. Bolan: I have a question of the Minister of Northern Affairs with respect to the community service boards which his ministry is proposing to establish in unorganized townships in northern Ontario. Is the minister aware his ministry officials who have been holding meetings in northern Ontario communities to explain to the people the proposed legislation of community service boards are very uninformed when it comes to answering questions, particularly in the area of funding? Could the minister also tell us what would happen to existing contractual arrangements which some of the unorganized townships already have with respect to providing services to these unorganized townships?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As the honourable member is well aware, we're moving around northern Ontario with the Northern Affairs staff to discuss a position paper—a white paper if you want to call it that—to get northern input, because something northerners really want is input into legislation before the legislation is written. There's nothing in that position paper that says that what is there will be in the legislation. That is our purpose in going around.

I regret the member wasn't at that meeting in his riding. He was invited; he did not see fit to attend.

I have to say to him I've had some discussions with my staff and I am confident they are fully aware, very much aware of

the proposals we have brought forward. They discuss it in a very open manner, and they get input from the people in the unorganized areas. I must say both the UCANO groups in the east and in the west have been very much involved in the preparation of this white paper that seems to be acceptable to most of the people in the unorganized areas.

There are certain areas we haven't really clarified. One of them is bequests to a municipality and another is the volunteer labour aspect which we're working on. We're getting their advice, and prior to any legislation being drafted of course, we will be back to those unorganized areas again to get their advice and their input to make sure that when the bill is introduced it will be acceptable to all parties on all sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Time for oral questions has expired.

PETITION

MENTAL HEALTH LEGISLATION

Mr. Lawlor: Pursuant to standing order 33 of the Legislative Assembly, we the undersigned members of the assembly hereby petition that sessional paper 19, compendium of background material on the Mental Health Act, Bill 19, tabled on March 2, 1978, be referred to the standing committee on social development for such consideration and report as the committee may determine.

There are in excess of 20 signatures from members.

REPORT

STANDING PROCEDURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. Breagh from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the following report and moved its adoption.

Your committee has considered its order of reference dated October 24, 1978, and recommends as follows:

Once the order in which estimates are to be considered is determined under the provisions of standing order 47, that order may be changed either by substantive motion upon notice or by unanimous consent.

Mr. Breagh: This recommendation from the committee deals with the matter that was referred to the procedural affairs committee by the House. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate circumstances in our last session when we ran into an occasion when the estimates had to be reordered due to the untimely death of one of the ministers.

It provides a suggestion by the committee of a way to handle it which offers the House two options. One is, if there is some emergency, to do so by unanimous consent. The other option, if that unanimous consent cannot be received, is by simple notice to put a motion before the House.

On motion by Mr. Breaugh, the debate was adjourned.

MOTIONS

DISCHARGE OF BILLS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Bill 2, An Act respecting the County of Middlesex, and Bill 7, An Act to amend the Milk Act, be discharged from the committee of the whole House and ordered for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that on Thursday, April 5, private members' public business be set aside in order to resume the debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that this House endorses the following schedule for committee meetings during this session: The social development committee may meet on the afternoons of Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays. The resources development committee may meet on the evenings of Tuesday and Thursday. The general government committee may meet Tuesday afternoons and evenings, for the sole purpose of completing Bill 163, and regularly on Wednesday afternoons. The administration of justice committee may meet Thursday afternoons and Friday mornings. On Wednesday mornings no more than two of the following committees may meet unless authorized by the House: general government, resources development or administration of justice. The following committees may meet on Thursday mornings: public accounts, members' services, procedural affairs and statutory instruments.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MUNICIPAL NIAGARA HYDRO-ELECTRIC SERVICE ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved first reading of Bill 29, An Act to provide for Municipal Hydro-Electric Service in the Regional Municipality of Niagara.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, this bill received first reading last fall as Bill 180. It establishes a new municipal hydro-electric commission for 10 of the area municipalities in the regional municipality of Niagara. The principal difference between this bill and Bill 180 is that the service area boundaries of the Grimsby Hydro-Electric Commission will remain unchanged until the Grimsby council directs its expansion to the municipal boundaries. In Bill 180, the Grimsby Hydro-Electric Commission was required to serve the entire municipality of Grimsby by January 1, 1980.

In addition, there have been some minor changes. First, the implementation date on which the new commissions must commence operations have been deferred to January 1, 1980, and other dates have been adjusted accordingly. There is provision, however, for earlier implementation as a result of agreement between a new commission and Ontario Hydro.

Second, under this bill, each municipal council will decide whether the transitional commission in that municipality will have three or five members. However, where there are two or more existing commissions in a municipality, the transitional commission must have five members, including one from each of the former commissions.

Third, the bill has a new provision retroactively deeming the trustees of the former police village of Queenston to have been created as a hydro-electric commission when the Regional Municipality of Niagara Act came into force in 1970.

All other provisions of the bill are the same as those in Bill 180.

YORK MUNICIPAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC SERVICE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved first reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend the York Municipal Hydro-Electric Service Act, 1978.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This is a minor housekeeping amendment to clarify that municipal councillors can sit on the hydro-electric commission.

ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 31, An Act to amend the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act.

Motion agreed to.

AUDIT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Audit Act, 1977.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
REPEAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 33, An Act to amend the Agricultural Development Repeal Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS
AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Drea moved first reading of Bill 34, An Act to amend the Business Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Before the orders of the day I wish to table the answers to questions 93 and 94 standing on the Notice Paper; and, Mr. Speaker, may I have the unanimous consent of the House to call Bills 2 and 7 for third reading at this time? (See appendix A, page 406.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading on motion:

Bill 2, An Act respecting the County of Middlesex;

Bill 7, An Act to amend the Milk Act.
[3:45]

PRIVATE MEMBERS'
PUBLIC BUSINESS

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

Mr. Grande moved resolution 2:

That in the opinion of this House the government should: (a) provide financial assistance to every school board that establishes or operates a full-day senior kindergarten program on the basis that each pupil enrolled in the full-day senior kindergarten program is a full-time pupil for the purpose of determining the amount of legislative grant; (b) establish prior to September 1, 1981, a maximum enrolment of 20 pupils for each class in grades one, two and three of the elementary school program.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I will reserve any portion of my 20 minutes that is left for

the end. Before I begin I would like to express regret that the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) is not in the House to debate this very important issue. It is an issue with which the Minister of Education has certainly concerned herself, but going in the opposite direction. It is an issue on which the Minister of Education has said that what we need to do in this province is to increase the class size, instead of reducing the class size.

The Ministry of Education as a whole is making a mockery of the International Year of the Child. Their suggestions are laudable but their actions are at best superficial. The resolution I am presenting to the Legislature today speaks to a fundamental aspect of the education of young children in Ontario. The first four years of education from kindergarten to grade three are the foundation upon which a child's educational future is built. All of us in this House must ensure that the foundations are built on solid rock and not on shifting sand. The future of our children depends upon the decision we make today. We must not let them down.

The NDP for a very long time has been committed to improving the quality of services in the primary years of the elementary school program. This resolution is important, particularly for those children whom the school system so frustrates that the only solution open to them is to drop out before graduation. We know that over 50 per cent of Ontario students never complete their course of studies. The government should be ashamed to allow this state of affairs to happen. Even although the resolution today is directed at improving the learning conditions in the first four years, it is also aimed at providing opportunities for those 50 per cent of the students who drop out, by providing them with the necessary skills and attitudes to succeed.

The resolution does two things. It allows local boards to receive funding for all-day senior kindergartens and it establishes a maximum class size of 20 children to one teacher in grades one to three. This resolution will give substance to the minister's recent letter to the chairman of school boards encouraging them to honour the International Year of the Child.

In that letter the minister wrote: "Here in Ontario children have always been regarded as our most precious resource. Consequently, their growth, physical, emotional and intellectual, is uppermost in any objectives set forth by the Ministry of Education."

Section (a) of the two-part resolution calls upon the government to provide, as I say, the

financial assistance. I will not read that part of the resolution again; it is already in the record. This part of the resolution does not force school boards—and this is important to point out at the very beginning—to institute full-day kindergartens. It does not force the parents to enrol their children in full-day kindergartens. It simply allows the boards to establish such classes if they perceive the need in their communities. However, it does force the ministry to provide funding where the programs are established by local boards.

The standing social development committee last year found out during the estimates of the Ministry of Education that 7,500 five-year-old children across this province did attend full-day kindergarten classes, and legislative grants were given to the boards concerned to set up the programs. The resolution today calls upon the government to encourage all boards of education in that direction.

The previous Minister of Education, the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), made a commitment in committee last year. He stated he would be willing to consider seriously proposals that boards might bring to him outlining special needs of five-year-olds. I think the previous minister said, "In some cases, that could be a viable program. If the city of Toronto were to come in with some proposals in that regard we could take a look at them and do it."

To my astonishment and disbelief, the ministry made a retrograde decision in this year's announcement of the general legislative grants in February which wiped out the 7,500 places for full-day kindergarten classes in the province. The decision flies in the face of the massive, incontrovertible evidence that reveals the extreme importance of the early childhood years in determining a child's linguistic and cognitive growth.

The decision to wipe out the 7,500 full-day kindergarten spaces by September 1980 flies in the face of the findings of the Windsor early identification project funded by this ministry. The project report produced in 1976 states: "When children identified as high risk or high performers were isolated statistically from the full sample, prediction to criterion reached very close to 100 per cent accuracy." What that means is that the Windsor early identification project was very successful.

Identifying children who are at risk in the system is not enough. As a matter of fact, some people believe it can be harmful and detrimental, because it might lead to labelling children as slow learners, brain-damaged, dis-

advantaged and a myriad of other terms that have pejorative meaning to the layman.

The Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario in its brief to the commission of inquiry into the education of a young child put it in this way: "There is no point in early identification that merely identifies; such identification can be used to predict future levels of achievement or to label children. These uses, because they are not in the best interests of a child, are totally unacceptable. The only purpose for early identification is to uncover the child's needs and to structure the learning system to meet those needs."

In other words, providing the funding necessary to establish full-day kindergartens allows parents and teachers the means to develop programs that will meet the physical, emotional and intellectual needs of five-year-olds. This is the way of realizing the commitment the minister demonstrated in her letter to the chairmen of boards of education.

I mentioned a few moments ago the mass of incontrovertible evidence that exists to support the value of full-day kindergartens. Let me point to some of it.

Dr. Burton Wright, of Harvard University, who is recognized all over the world for the work he has done with young children, said in a paper entitled *Reassessing our Educational Priorities*, "Failures in the fundamental learnings of language development, curiosity, social development and intelligence in the first years lead directly to underachievement in the elementary grades and beyond."

Recent findings of Project Head Start programs in the United States point to gains in areas such as reading and the development of language. Those children in Head Start proved less likely in the long term to be held back in school and less likely to be assigned to special education programs than comparable groups that have not experienced such intervention.

Ken Fogelman and Peter Gorbach of the National Children's Bureau in London, England, in a paper entitled *The Relationship between Age of Starting School and Attainment at Age 11* conclude, "Our results provide as strong evidence as could be obtained that at the age of 11 children who started school before their fifth birthday are ahead on average of those who started school after their fifth birthday in terms of general ability, reading comprehension and mathematics attainment."

The Minister of Education commissioned Dr. Bienmiller of the Institute of Child Study to find out the effects of half-day, alternate full-day and full-day junior and

senior kindergarten programs on children's constitutional skill, emotional and behavioural development. The study included 340 children from urban and rural schools in Ontario. The children were selected on the basis of "thriving" "not thriving" or being "average." The study suggests some tentative conclusions.

Conclusion one: "Thrivers tend to benefit more from school than non-thrivers." I wonder if we needed this study to point out the obvious.

Conclusion two: "The lengthened school day provides no discernible short-term"—and I underline the words short-term—"benefits; neither does it prove harmful to students." Of course we already knew prior to the study that the short-term effects cannot be readily measured. Studies that were done to find out whether Head Start programs were successful in the United States only began to report positive results after approximately 10 years of the program.

To be fair to Dr. Bienmiller, another of the tentative conclusions was, "The long-term effects of the program must be examined." Precisely. Given the last conclusion one may be tempted to demand from the minister why no study was commissioned to find out the long-term effects of the full-day kindergarten since these classes have been in operation for at least the last five years in this province. One may be further tempted to suspect that the ministry did not want to find out the long-term positive effects that a full-day kindergarten experience would have on the five-year-olds of this province because, once the results were in, pressure will mount upon the ministry from every nook and corner of this province to establish full-day kindergarten programs.

In conclusion, the research is positive. It shows beyond a doubt that it is beneficial to five-year-olds in this province to have a full-day kindergarten experience. The research evidence reveals the extreme importance of the early childhood years in determining a child's linguistic and cognitive growth. It shows that the Ministry of Education itself had thought that five-year-olds benefit from a full-day kindergarten experience because the ministry allowed boards of education and gave funds to those boards across Ontario to set up full-day kindergarten programs.

The former Minister of Education made a commitment to this Legislature that he would be willing seriously to consider proposals for full-day kindergartens on a special needs basis. The Windsor early identification project developed by the ministry would be useless if the only thing we do with the children that are identified is to label them. What we need

to do is permit local school boards to lengthen the school day for kindergarten children so that programs can be developed early on in the child's educational experience to short-circuit, so to speak, definite stumbling blocks in the learning process..

[This is what prevention is all about. If the Minister of Education and her ministry want to pay the costs for the pound of cure tomorrow instead of paying the cost for the ounce of prevention today, then let the party opposite vote against this resolution. If they want to do something worthwhile in the education of our children and our future working force, as I hope they would, then let's get the teachers, parents and ministry together and develop viable and vibrant programs for our five-year-olds in this province.]

[4:00]

I have talked so far about the kindergarten year and the life of the young children. The three years following—grades one, two and three—are every bit as important, every bit as critical as the first full year of schooling. The second part of this resolution requires some planning. That is why I did not call for immediate implementation but rather am prepared to give the ministry close to three years to see that a smooth transition occurs.

In the past there was no consensus in the research literature as to which is the most suitable class size for optimum learning to occur. However, all the literature I have read to date has never researched the primary grades—grades one, two and three—and come up with even a modicum of proof to suggest that a small class size is not beneficial to the children.

The class-size report produced in 1977 and commissioned by this ministry, by Wright, Shapson, Eason and Fitzgerald, only refers to the effects of class size in junior grades—grades four and up—and makes no mention of primary grades. As a matter of fact, the researchers were careful to point out, "Caution must be exercised in generalizing the results of the study. They cannot be safely generalized to primary grades."

Recent research done by the Educational Research Service in the United States, and reported in May 1978 by Education USA, a weekly education newspaper, showed, "Where smaller classes do have an impact is in reading and math achievement in the early primary grades, when primary-grade pupils stay in small classes for two or more consecutive years." Further, the research showed: "Where smaller classes do have an impact is with students of lower academic ability or socio-economically disadvantaged pupils."

Another important finding of the Educational Research Service is, "Smaller classes have a positive effect on pupil behaviour in elementary grades."

The study done by Gene V. Glass, co-director of the University of Colorado Laboratory of Educational Research, whose evidence is based on nearly 900,000 students, concludes that, "A clear and strong relationship between class size and achievement has emerged. The relationship seems slightly stronger at the secondary grades than elementary, but it does not differ appreciably across different school subjects, levels of pupils' IQ's, or across several other obvious demographic features of classrooms."

Here is the startling, sobering fact: "A pupil who would score about the 83rd percentile on a national test, when taught individually, would score at about the 50th percentile when taught in a classroom of 40 pupils." To appreciate the significance of this quote, this Legislature should realize school boards in Ontario in 1977 that had 30,000 pupils or more enrolled in elementary schools have, in 30 per cent of the classes, 31 to 41 children to one teacher. In 10.4 per cent of those classes we find more than 41 pupils to one teacher.

I ask you this, how on earth can a child of six or seven years of age learn how to read in a class of more than 41 students? Where would a teacher find the time with a class of 41 children to assess a child's needs and develop a strategy to look after those needs? The Minister of Education, who is a medical doctor, should appreciate this, should appreciate these facts. Would she not provide a better service to her patients if she diagnosed 20 patients in a day as opposed to 41 patients in a day?

These recent research findings I have quoted do not surprise the public at large, nor the parents of the children in the schools and, least of all, the teachers.

In February 1972, a report entitled *Quality of Education in Ontario—Survey of the Parents' Perspective*, conducted by Adams, Buckland and Tribbling for the Ontario Department of Education as it was known at that time, was published. This study asked two very important questions. The first was: What do you consider to be the most important thing that should take place in the schools? A tremendous percentage of those people insisted the most important thing for the children—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'm sorry, the honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Grande: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope the ministry, or whoever

will talk on behalf of the ministry, will respond to this crucial question in kind.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I wish to debate the resolution introduced by the member for Oakwood. Before doing so, I would just like to clarify a point for him. He referred to the absence of the Minister of Education and I would note that she is out of province today on government business. Indeed, she is very much aware of the resolution, so it is not a lack of interest on her part but of necessity. She is not able to be in the Legislature today.

Mr. Warner: That's probably why she left.

Ms. Gigantes: It's a habit of hers to miss important things.

Mr. Jones: This is a private members' hour, I believe, and while he was directing some of his comments to the ministry, no doubt they are being recorded as we submit them to Hansard today. I can reassure him that the minister has very much awareness of the debate taking place and the subject.

Mr. Warner: She is big on red schoolhouses.

Mr. Jones: As a member of the Legislature, I, as the mover of the resolution readily acknowledged, find the resolution is almost two in one. I could find myself being sympathetic with one side of it—and I'll touch on that in a moment—but at the outset I have some very real curiosity because I find parts of the resolution to be ambiguous in many respects.

I'd like to just read it quickly again: "In the opinion of this House the government should provide financial assistance to every school board that establishes or operates a full-day senior kindergarten program on the basis that each pupil enrolled in the full-day senior kindergarten program is a full-time pupil for the purpose of determining the amount of legislative grant."

It seems to me it behooves us to look at what this means in practical terms. I suggest it means that all school boards in Ontario are being enticed with the taxpayers' money to establish full-day kindergarten programs whether or not there is a community demand for these services.

Mr. Grande: How do you translate that?

Mr. Jones: I know the mover of this resolution went to considerable pains to say it does not force the school board, it does not force parents. But it does force the ministry.

Mr. Warner: Here it comes.

Mr. Jones: To do that—I'm coming back to practical terms—human nature being what it is, dollars and cents and constraints as they relate to the different levels of the ministry and school boards, being what they

are, I do say it is an enticement that is being suggested to those school boards.

Mr. Grande: It is providing programs for kids.

Ms. Gigantes: Are you offering 100 per cent funding?

Mr. Jones: We'd be pretty naive if we didn't recognize that, under this resolution, school boards would be encouraged to canvass the neighbourhood for students, to fill their classrooms with pre-schoolers, as a fund-raising venture. There's no other description for it.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, come on. Are you offering 100 per cent funding? Is that what you're talking about?

Mr. Warner: Is that the way you run things over there?

Mr. Jones: The honourable member proposes that the number of enrolled, full-time pupils would be the basis for determining grants. In other words, the more tiny tots the board can gather up and bring into the regular school system for a full day, the more tax money it would receive from provincial revenues.

Ms. Gigantes: And the more they have to raise locally too.

Mr. Grande: That's the way it works.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, boy. You need some elementary math.

Mr. Jones: If the members would just let me proceed, I would suggest one has to take into account that we already have—and I believe it was acknowledged a moment ago—I guess two points that we should touch on here. The way I see this is that I would question whether this is a responsible way of dealing with school boards. I'm uncomfortable with a proposal that dangles money before the eyes of trustees. Again, the fact is, it's human nature. I don't think trustees would want to be part of any such scheme.

Ms. Gigantes: What nonsense.

Mr. Makarchuk: As a matter of fact, all you can see is money. You can't see the kids at the bottom of the thing.

Mr. Jones: They are urged to use those little toddlers as pawns, I suppose, in a fight for a bigger share of limited taxpayers' dollars.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, my heavens, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Warner: What a view of education. A warped view.

Mr. Jones: Just be quiet. The member, as he moved the resolution, talked about this government making a mockery of the Inter-

national Year of the Child and all that nonsense.

Mr. Warner: No wonder you were good at selling insurance. Spoken like a true insurance salesman.

Mr. Jones: I'd just like to explain this as it reads, not as pie-in-the-sky philosophy but the way it would actually be applied.

Mr. Warner: You don't care a whit about the system.

Mr. Jones: In my mind, this resolution fails to deal with many basic questions. Let's look at one: What would be the cost of full-day kindergarten programs created by school boards?

Mr. Makarchuk: What is the cost of the reform schools you have to build afterwards?

Mr. Jones: The honourable member didn't mention it. He didn't allude to any of those estimates of cost. We're responsible legislators. We have to deal with dollars and cents.

Mr. Makarchuk: Of course you're responsible.

Ms. Gigantes: Just say your piece and sit down.

Mr. Jones: The members opposite raise it in question period. We can't ignore it; it won't go away. It's a practical world. The member doesn't know how many school boards might participate—I didn't hear any reference to that—so I'm working from this financial void, as it were, because I didn't hear the figures mentioned.

Mr. Grande: This is discussing principle.

Mr. Jones: The member is suggesting, I would have to think, that we should offer the school boards an open-ended funding scheme without any thought as to whether the taxpayer can afford it, and this hardly sounds responsible to me.

Ms. Gigantes: You are so mean you squeak.

Mr. Jones: Secondly, what effect would this scheme have on the existing day-care services that are already offered to pre-schoolers?

Ms. Gigantes: The what? The what?

Mr. Jones: The answer would have to be that it would drive a lot of them, if not all of them, out of business.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, now we get it.

Mr. Jones: At the present time there are 618—

Ms. Gigantes: Now we get the real story: competition of the private day-care services.

Mr. Jones: Just a moment. There are various kinds of those services. There are 618 licensed day-care centres in Ontario right now offering full-day programs to some

50,000 children, and more than half of these licensed centres, some 321, are operated by volunteer parent co-operative boards. I have a youngster, three years old, who is in one of those very same programs.

Mr. Warner: Why don't you sell them a policy against the threat?

Mr. Jones: The family involvement is very real, very vital, contributing to the proper upbringing of tiny children.

Mr. Makarchuk: Have you ever looked at the records of the kids in the reform schools?

Mr. Jones: I was polite to the member for Oakwood as he put his case—

Mr. Makarchuk: Have you ever looked at their backgrounds?

Mr. Jones: —so could the member for Brantford just contain himself for a moment and listen to a couple of facts—

Mr. Makarchuk: You stand up and come across with absolute baloney about conditions that are totally different from conditions in our society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Jones: —that were not contained in the member for Oakwood's proposal.

Mr. Warner: He made more sense.
[4:15]

Mr. Jones: Most of these licensed centres do not receive direct funding at present. In fact, only 212 centres operated by municipalities, Indian bands and charitable organizations receive subsidies totalling close to some \$35 million a year. These are funds provided on an equal basis by the Ontario and federal governments. In addition, the Ontario government provides a further \$5.5 million a year program for mentally retarded children.

Mr. Makarchuk: And when you don't do it, you give it to the minister sitting next to you.

Mr. Jones: Clearly, we already have an existing, extensive, excellently run network of licensed centres with strong parental and community involvement.

Ms. Gigantes: You guys are not for real.

Mr. Jones: Significantly, the people who work with these little children have taken special training under the early childhood education courses offered at most community colleges in Ontario.

Ms. Gigantes: Reuben, isn't this making you nauseous?

Mr. Jones: If the school boards were to opt for the tax-paid, state-run scheme the honourable member proposes, then the competition between these qualified, experienced, community-rooted centres would be intense.

Mr. Grande: Talk about education, you don't know anything about it.

Mr. Jones: In the end they would be driven out of business as tiny tots are transferred to what appears to be a free service in the school system, and we all know that isn't true. A third question that I suggest this resolution has failed to face focuses on demand. Who is demanding this elaborate state scheme? The school boards?

Ms. Gigantes: All the people who don't have day care.

Mr. Jones: I am not aware of one singular proposal by school boards or petitions to extend the school system back towards the cradle, as the member talked about the studies that dealt with the first four years of a young person's total age.

What about the parents? Are they clamouring for a province-wide program to sweep their children into the system before they are hardly out of diapers?

Ms. Gigantes: They want it in their own area.

Mr. Jones: I haven't heard that either. Perhaps the honourable member believes that this plan would benefit single parents. If so, I would like to examine that. We all agree that single-parent children face a special plight these days. That is why we can now utilize subsidized day-care facilities that we have and that is why we have an Income Tax Act that permits them to deduct up to \$500 per child from their taxable income for child care expenses, and that is why we have family financial assistance programs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Jones: I cannot support this resolution that attempts to place little children in auction in a battle between different levels of government.

Mr. Sweeney: I would like to begin by complimenting the member for Oakwood for introducing this resolution. I have already spoken to him about it. He knows, and I would so advise this House, that I concur completely with the spirit and the thrust of this resolution.

I have some concerns with some of the specifics but the general thrust of the resolution is one which I support wholeheartedly. That thrust, as I understand it, both from reading the resolution and from speaking to the member, is that it is far better for us to assure ourselves that the young children in their early days in school get the best possible education.

We have learned, not only from research but also from practical experience, and I can say this personally, that allowing our primary grade children to be in smaller classes does pay off in the long run and it pays off in two ways. It pays off in terms of the ability of the student himself or herself to be able to benefit from the subsequent range of education. It also pays off, I suggest, in terms of the later costs if we don't do it at the early age.

I know from experience, and the research once again has shown clearly, that those children in the primary grades who do not get the individual attention they require, and this is only possible in smaller classrooms—now whether or not the figure of 20 is the magic figure I am not prepared to argue; it is as good a figure as any to start with—if they don't get that kind of individual attention in the primary grade, then we know—there is no dispute about this, it is a confirmed fact—that those youngsters are going to have serious learning problems in the junior grades, in the intermediate grades and in the senior grades.

One of two things happens: Either we spend a great deal of money and time, in terms of both human and financial resources, to try to remediate the problem we should have caught earlier, or we allow those young people to fall by the wayside. I would point out to the government members that the number of students falling by the wayside is becoming scandalous in this province.

A very recent study, of which I am sure the member for Mississauga North is aware, has just been finished by the director of the school board in the Mississauga-Peel area. The study clearly identifies that even in that area—it is not what I would call a down-trodden area of the province; it is a very affluent area of the province—52 per cent of the young people who start in grade nine do not successfully complete grade 12. The director, as part of his open, public discussion with his school board, clearly identified as one of the reasons—not the only one, but one of the reasons—inadequate educational attention in the younger grades.

One of the things that I have seen happen myself is that those children who do not in their primary grades get a sense of success of accomplishment, a sense of being able to deal with school work or educational matters, continue to have problems in subsequent grades.

If for no other reason, we would support this kind of resolution to be sure that the young people, particularly in the primary grades—I know there is some dispute about

class size once you get beyond the primary grades but I do not think there is any dispute with respect to the primary grades—are given that sense of accomplishment or success at school work, at school types of things, because it is going to pay off in the long run. It is going to pay off in human terms and it is going to pay off in financial terms.

It is strange that one of the reasons—as a matter of fact, from my talking to people, one of the main reasons—that many parents pull their children out of the publicly supported school system and put them in the private school system, where in many cases they have to pay very high tuition fees, is the smaller classes. There are other reasons too, but for this reason as well they prove there that it does pay off.

What we have in this province, then, is that double standard: Those people who can afford it are able to get their young children in privately funded schools, in smaller classes, and to get them a better education. I do not think that was ever the intent of education in this province.

With respect to kindergarten, the evidence coming out of the Ottawa-Carleton area is pretty clear now that if you want to get children in French immersion programs—this is referring mainly to English-speaking children now—they do better starting at the kindergarten level. There doesn't seem to be too much dispute about that for most children.

We know, as has already been suggested, that the former Minister of Education accepted the premise that even in an area like Metro Toronto there are children from immigrant families, where for all practical purposes there is no English spoken in the home, who could benefit from that same kind of English-language immersion program, if you want to call it that. That is a second place where there would seem to be that kind of need.

If I can go back to the comments made by the mover of this resolution, that he was primarily concerned with defining a need, I do not really believe that the member was advocating, as the member for Mississauga North suggested, that it be spread throughout all the province, whether there was a need or not.

Where there can be a clearly identified need and where we can find some mechanism—and here I pause, because I know it's difficult; we have had problems with this before—where we can find some mechanism to limit it to those areas and boards—and those parts of boards, if necessary—where there is a defined need, then I could support that

part of this resolution. I cannot support it if it means we are going to go out on a selling job and encourage school boards all across the province to start full-day kindergartens where there really is not a serious need.

As a matter of fact, speaking very personally, I have some reservations as to whether it is desirable in all cases. I know the research is divided on this. My own personal opinion is that I am not sure it is desirable in all cases for five-year-olds to be in school all day long. I think there is some question about that. If we can't define a clear need that, hopefully, can be met in this way, then I don't think we should encourage it, but where we can define the need, then I think we should encourage it.

I would point out to the member for Mississauga North who spoke on behalf of the government that one of the observations the Minister of Education made about a year ago was that any of those boards that wanted to do it on their own could do it from the local tax base. There is one little catch in that and that is it is probably possible for public school boards to do this, but it is not possible for separate school boards to do it, as I am sure the member quite well appreciates. The separate school board simply doesn't have the local property tax base from which to draw sufficient funds to support these kinds of programs.

I would hope if there's any way the government can see its way clear to do it in those places where the need exists, they would continue to recognize that differentiation that is necessary between public school boards and separate school boards. I will recognize they have done that in all other areas of public versus separate school education in this province.

The question of costs came up. I don't want to get involved in a discussion of costs because I don't think that is the central issue but nevertheless, it is part of the question. The difficulty, and what we would like government members to come back with, is what cost are we talking about? We heard figures last year from the former Minister of Education that it would cost \$65 million, ranging all the way to a figure that in Metro Toronto alone, it would only cost \$2 million. That's a very significant difference. I think if the government members are going to speak about the cost factor here, and I recognize it is a legitimate aspect of this question—it can't be ignored—it is incumbent upon them to bring forward some realistic cost figures so we can end up with something other than a potential spread from \$2 million to \$65

million. We just can't handle those kind of figures.

Mr. Bounsall: I have many comments I would like to make on this excellent resolution presented by my colleague from Oakwood. I will try and limit myself to five minutes however, so as many speakers as wish to do so can get in on this debate. I support fully this resolution, which is a very simple one and whose intent should not have been muddled by the member for Mississauga North in his comments.

Hon. Mr. Walker: It was clarified by the member for Mississauga North. You should compliment him for keeping the record straight.

Mr. Bounsall: This does relate to the kindergarten grade only, when children are five years old. It was sort of interesting, however. I always wondered what the problem was but the member for Mississauga North indicated to the House this afternoon that he didn't get out of his diapers until close to age five.

Mr. Jones: I don't remember.

Mr. Makarchuk: After that speech, we even questioned that.

Mr. Grande: You still are in diapers, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Bounsall: This would establish a full-time pupil funding for those boards which in their wisdom decided there should be full-day kindergartens in their jurisdiction in whatever board area they are in the province.

Secondly, it has been very well studied and very obvious and clear conclusions have come from those studies, of which there have been more than one, in North America and in other jurisdictions. They show the smaller the class size one can get in grades one, two and three, the more efficient is the learning and a greater degree of learning can occur. We are talking in that case about the normal child who would have learning increased tremendously, not just that problem child who has a problem in learning, who, if you don't have numbers of fewer than 20, does not have that much of a chance to have their particular learning difficulty identified—nor, even if it is identified, is time spent on that child to alleviate that learning difficulty.

[4:30]

The closer we get to 1984, dismayingly, the more Orwellian become this government's behaviour and attitude towards education in this province. On the one hand, you have the Ministry of Education sending out a letter to the school boards across the province reminding them, as if they weren't aware,

that this was the International Year of the Child, and urging them to do something about it. Yet, on the other hand, through the completely regressive ideas contained in her trial balloons, in her policies, and in her lack of provision of sufficient funds for education—

Ms. Gigantes: Come on in, Tom, we need you.

Mr. Bounsall: —this minister is engaged in nothing short of child-bashing in this International Year of the Child.

We have in this government a minister for social development who doesn't, in principle, believe in child care. We have, in the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), a minister who believes in the daycare system, but he does not believe that there should be education in that daycare system. He has consistently refused to deal in any positive manner with any briefs presented by the early childhood education specialists around this province; briefs asking that a decent education program be made available in those daycare centres for the pre-five-year-olds in Ontario.

The Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) is engaged in dismantling, through financial starvation, the education system in Ontario, just as surely as the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) is dismantling the health system in Ontario.

I have been Education critic now for only some five weeks, but I am dismayed at what I see happening to the education system in Ontario and the exceedingly short-sighted view of this government; a government which used to—I think with some validity—be able to say that the education system in Ontario was second to none. It was not perhaps the best, but it was hard to find one that you could clearly identify as being better.

Ms. Gigantes: That was with Robarts.

Mr. Bounsall: In the last year, with their funding the way it has been—and it was interesting to note that the member for Mississauga North dwells almost solely on the funding aspect—

Mr. Jones: He didn't deal with it at all.

Mr. Bounsall: —in its funding they are ensuring that our system will be second and third and fourth and if this continues any longer than a year or two, probably tenth in Canada in terms of education available to the children of Ontario.

This resolution from my colleague from Oakwood would try and reverse some of that trend. It would require some additional expenditures, without doubt, by this government in the area of child education; an area

in which it should be placed and in which it could be most beneficial.

This government—which had a reputation and an interest in education in Ontario; which had programs and studies indicating that it did take a long-term view in education; and which may be looking for solutions for the best education of this province's children—is now turning its back thoroughly and completely upon that whole concept. Its financial restraints starve and restrict virtually every school board and every activity in which the boards can engage in Ontario. That must and should be reversed. This is the prime area in which a reversal of that attitude should take place.

Mr. Speaker, I will end by saying this. In addition, I just wish to point out that this ministry and this government is engaged in bashing all property taxpayers in this province. It is doing this through a steady and progressive shift to the property tax base from the provincial tax base for education costs. Now the province picks up only 53 per cent—

Ms. Gigantes: It is 51.5.

Mr. Bounsall: It is 51.5 per cent, I am corrected—of the costs to local school boards in the area, as opposed to 61 per cent just a few short two years ago.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a few remarks to this debate.

The decision of the Ministry of Education to limit the funding of kindergarten to one half day per pupil enrolled is predicated on the fact that there are limited financial resources available to support elementary and secondary education.

At the present time there are approximately 165,000 pupils attending junior and senior kindergarten of which approximately 8,000 pupils attend school on a full-time basis. If a significant number of these students were encouraged by school boards seeking grants to attend school on a full-time basis the additional cost would be tremendous.

Mr. Grande: What are they?

Ms. Gigantes: What are the alternative costs?

Mr. Watson: The provincial government does not have the revenue to increase its grants to school boards. An increase in local property taxes for this purpose I think would be asking just too much of the Ontario taxpayers at this time.

If there is no restriction placed on enrolment of kindergarten pupils eligible for grant and if all the senior kindergarten pupils were to enrol in classes on a full-time basis,

the additional total operating costs have been estimated at \$85 million per year.

Mr. Grande: You know that is mythical.

Ms. Gigantes: Wow, a new figure.

Mr. Watson: This is based on additional full-time equivalent enrolment of 56,000 pupils multiplied by an average of \$1,500 per pupil. It is estimated that the increased enrolments would create the need for approximately 2,000 additional classrooms. This could be achieved in part through the use of existing surplus rooms, but in many cases it would require the building of additional facilities or the conversion of existing facilities. Regular classrooms are generally not well suited for kindergarten classes with washrooms, coatrooms, smaller desks and that type of thing.

Assuming that existing surplus rooms could accommodate 50 per cent of the increased enrolment, the additional capital cost would be approximately \$50 million. That comes from 1,000 classrooms at about \$50,000 per classroom at today's cost.

Ms. Gigantes: Did you write this speech yourself?

Mr. Watson: Money is not the only question although I think it is the most important one to be addressed here today.

Ms. Gigantes: Who wrote this speech?

Mr. Watson: To be fair however, there are social combined with educational reasons for involving some of the four- or five-year-olds on a full-day every-day educational program.

Ms. Gigantes: This is the front line of educational thinking.

Mr. Watson: Any assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the full-day versus the half-day programs for senior kindergarten children must take into account the variables arising from the fact that the quality of the experiences available in the home environment varies more widely than the quality of opportunities provided for young children in school.

No doubt there are some five-year-olds who will profit from an extension of the time spent at home; others would gain significantly from an earlier and continuous exposure to the rich variety of opportunities and care provided by a good primary teacher.

Mr. Grande: You don't think the boards can make those decisions?

Mr. Watson: Generalizations based on evidence taken from either extreme would be faulty and consequently dangerous. The fact that parents may choose not to enrol their four- and five-year-olds in school is a safe-

guard that should be maintained. It is also one which I fear may be endangered by legislation being proposed here today.

Ms. Gigantes: What?

Mr. Watson: I would like to discuss the second half of the resolution in a little more detail than did my colleague on this side of the House.

Questions relating to the size of the class have been thoroughly researched both in Canada and internationally. However, there are no defensible data to support the belief that the simple lowering of numbers of children in a classroom would improve the quality of learning or life in the school.

Ms. Gigantes: Nobody has asked.

Mr. Watson: I think it is obvious that there are many variables which may be taken into account. They are important contributing factors to the quality of a child's learning experiences and they are just as important as the class size. The perception by a teacher of what is a small or what is a large class; the teaching style of the teacher; the methods used in being taught; the student learning styles preferred; the subject matter to be presented; and so on.

I question also whether the Legislature should consider the determination of class size when this has been traditionally a local school board prerogative. The government may be seen as interfering with local autonomy by legislating the class size without providing appropriate funding. The resolution does not mention—

Ms. Gigantes: Well, provide the appropriate funding.

Mr. Watson: —financial assistance in lowering the class size of grades one, two and three. It also makes no mention of the kindergarten class size.

I understand too that in some jurisdictions where primary division class numbers have been kept low, financial constraints have made it necessary to inflate the junior division class numbers, adding pressures there. There would be some basis therefore for school boards to argue that since primary division class size is subject to legislation, so should junior division class size be predetermined, and the questions of funding are consequently of the utmost importance.

The enrolment in grades one, two and three as of September 30, 1978 is approximately 400,000 pupils at an average class size of 28.5. The number of classroom teachers in grades one, two and three is approximately 14,000. If the enrolment for each class in grades one, two and three was limited to

a maximum of 20 pupils, the number of classroom teachers required would be 22,222, an increase of 8,222 teachers over the current levels. The direct instructional cost of that additional 8,222 teachers, including salaries and fringe benefits, would be approximately \$180 million.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, no. Another figure.

Mr. Watson: That is 8,222 times about \$22,000. Is that arithmetic wrong?

Ms. Gigantes: I just love your math.

Mr. Watson: Of course, there would be additional operating costs, administration and that sort of thing.

Mr. Grande: So why spend \$2 billion in education if you are worried about it?

Mr. Watson: The capital cost for the additional 8,222 classrooms is difficult to estimate. These classrooms represent more than 10 per cent of the existing number of classrooms and represent approximately two classrooms in each school offering grades one, two and three.

In many cases, surplus space as a result of declining enrolments could be used. But these spaces are already being used by smaller class sizes, additional special education rooms, French rooms and things like that.

Ms. Gigantes: Are they really?

Mr. Watson: For example, it is estimated that the decline in elementary school enrolment has resulted in approximately 4,000 surplus classrooms; however, approximately 3,000 of these have been equipped as French-language teaching centres.

I think a lot of us have come up through schools that had no kindergarten pupils, where we were in classrooms with 30 and 40 students. Maybe we haven't succeeded very well in life, but there are a lot of advantages in having been in a school where you had to learn to work on your own.

I have a certain amount of sympathy for the resolution as proposed by the member this afternoon. It would be nice if we could afford to have a tutor for every single pupil in the province, but we have to saw off some place. What we are discussing here this afternoon is something which involves an enormous amount of expenditure and which, considering our restraint policies, would be impossible to justify. Philosophical questions aside, I think the financial burdens attendant on these two proposals make both limiting of class size and extending the kindergarten programs quite impractical at the present time.

Ms. Gigantes: It is your government that makes it impractical.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk until 4:47 p.m.

Mr. Nixon: I have no hesitation in supporting the resolution with the greatest enthusiasm. I trust it will be allowed to go to a vote later this afternoon. I intend to stand in its support.

Coming from a rural area, I can recall the times when kindergarten was not available, for the same reason that the member for Chatham-Kent has just explained; that is, there did not seem to be much money available for it. When money was made available, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it has been to the advantage of the young people and the whole of the community concerned. I would very much like to see full-day kindergarten made available right across the province with the appropriate grants.

I can think of no more effective way for us to spend the money than to see that the young people in the province have an opportunity to begin the more formal aspects of their education even sooner. I would add as a rider which is not found in this resolution, that I would trust such education would mean the children would begin second-language education at those early ages before they become self-conscious about practising a language and when their brains are of a receptivity which is not equalled at any other time in their whole lives.

I am very much concerned also at the honourable member's comments about class size. Many years ago I used to teach and I may have that opportunity again. It is true that in the senior grades a good teacher can, I suppose, stand a class of 40 or maybe even 50. I am modest enough to say I was able to teach some of the laws of thermodynamics under those circumstances. But when you are dealing with young kids aged five, six and seven, that is where there is without doubt value in reducing class size.

I reject out of hand honourable members saying that this is outside our jurisdiction. We have the total responsibility for the quality and the costs of education right in this House, nowhere else. It is given to us by the constitution of the country and when we fob it off elsewhere then we are shirking those responsibilities.

[4:45]

Since time is limited I want to say something about these very costs. The member in his comments indicated that if we were to establish this the administrative costs themselves would be great, and this is probably one of the greatest detriments in our education system. These very administrative costs have

simply become so top heavy that we can't even contemplate improving the situation because of the inertia and the costs of the administration that has been set up by our very statutes and regulations and under the leadership of the various Ministers of Education over the last 15 years.

There is no doubt in my view that if we were to rationalize—a word that the Ministry of Health uses frequently—the costs of administration in education in this province we would be able to have all-day kindergarten without any problem at all. The positions of the directors of education and the very salaries they were paid were dictated by the government, led through the Minister of Education at that time, who is now the Premier (Mr. Davis). We were the authors of this top heavy administration which has seen the multiplication, the addition, the duplication with no subtraction, of all of these administrative personnel.

For one thing, they have been good teachers taken out of the classroom to the detriment of the value of the system as a whole. We have turned them into small-p politicians, all of them vying for advantage in crawling up the administrative ladder or more of this funny ersatz authority that seems to be so important to them, and appointing those people under them as special subject consultants and assistants to special subject consultants, and seeing that people in the classrooms themselves are given every advantage, surely for more pay—and I'm not prepared to object to that at this time—heads of departments who teach half days, assistant heads of departments who will teach two or three periods a day, people getting lots of money having less responsibility and, in fact, a very, very soft approach to the job of education which should be one of the toughest ones anywhere in the province.

I think the resolution is a good one and it contains within it the requirement for a total reorganization of the administration, which I think is about to sink the ship of education in this province. I have asked the Premier, and he made a good response just a few months ago, if the Minister of Education was going to reduce the costs of administration at the same time that the student enrolment was going down, and he said he felt that was reasonable. The Minister of Education got up the next day and said: "Well, we must realize that the threshold for reduction is very difficult to achieve."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Nixon: I was particularly offended when I got a letter from one of the adminis-

trators indicating that he had selected my words and the words of the Minister of Education to send out to his colleagues, this little cabal around the province, whereas they didn't send out the words of the Premier indicating that there should have been a reduction. Anyway, I am going to support the resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That completes the allotted time for discussion of this resolution and it will be dealt with further at 5:50.

REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS

Mr. Rotenberg moved resolution 4:

That in the opinion of this House, the government should give immediate consideration to legislation which would require the registration of lobbyists and a declaration by them stating in whose interests they are working.

Mr. Rotenberg: Before getting into the discussion of this resolution I would like to thank Mr. Dave Stewart of our caucus office, who has prepared the research for me on this and has been of great assistance by getting the details for me.

I want to make it very clear at the outset that what this resolution is asking for is registration of lobbyists, not regulation of lobbyists. I want to make it very clear that there is no thought in my resolution of limiting the access of anyone to government, or its committees, or its boards. There is no thought of restricting lobbyists. We just want to know who they are. If someone has a hired gun we want to know who he is and for whom he is working.

Sometimes the terms pressure groups, interest groups and special interest groups are considered to be somewhat sinister. Sometimes members of the media and the general public seem to think there is something wrong. They conjure up views of self-seeking, vested interest and manipulation. Sometimes there's even a charge of robbing politicians and public officials. But I think this stereotype is quite false. It fails to recognize the realities of today's political process; that is that in our increasingly complex society for groups with limited financial resources governments have become legitimate arbitrators between competing interest groups and the general public.

Lobbying is really simply the presentation of an interest group's views to the government, to politicians, to civil servants, and indeed to other members of the general public in the hope of making some change which this group feels is beneficial—a change in legislation, a change in government policy or

a change in programs administered by the civil service. I feel that lobbying is necessary, and that lobbying operating in full public view is a natural and important part of this legislative process. As I say, my resolution would not regulate lobbying, but simply bring the practice out into the open.

Interest groups, in my opinion, are necessary for good government, and society must occasionally admit that government can act against the best interests of society. But the problem is: is public opinion being properly gauged? An organized interest group represents a concentration of power and a means by which certain individuals, or individuals combined as groups—whether it be business groups, agricultural groups, labour groups, ratepayer groups, consumer advocates or on and on and on—a means by which these groups are seeking to have and to gain a greater impact upon the public and public affairs; and these groups have a tremendous advantage over the individual private citizen.

A well-organized lobby may solicit great numbers of people and do so in a short time, but that does not necessarily reflect a true opinion of the general public. Some of these groups are often large. They give free membership and from time to time they beef up their membership through promotional organizations. They add members to their membership lists of, say magazine subscribers, and in this way they say they represent a great number of people.

Probably the best, or the worst example I've come across of this kind of well-organized, one-issue lobby, is the gun lobby in the United States. They are so well organized that as soon as some congressman proposes any form of gun control, someone in Washington or Denver—I'm not sure where—pushes a button on the computer and some several million people get a letter or phone call from the local gun lobby representative.

Mr. Nixon: That's the way your fund-raisers work.

Mr. Ruston: Yeah, we are getting them every day.

Mr. Worton: They don't miss anybody.

Mr. Rotenberg: Within several days a member of the US congress will receive hundreds and thousands of letters from his community against this legislation.

Mr. Nixon: They push a button and it goes to all the Conservatives. I got one.

Mr. Rotenberg: This is all being done by one lobby and one organization.

Mr. Ruston: The trouble is I didn't send them a cheque.

Mr. Rotenberg: The impression is given that a whole bunch of people out there, all by themselves, suddenly wrote letters to their congressmen; when really there's one, very well-organized and very well-financed lobby.

I'm not saying this lobby shouldn't happen. What I'm saying is that the legislators should know how this was organized and what happens so that they can properly assess public opinion. What is really happening is what I think is very necessary gun-control legislation in the States is being blocked by this very well-heeled, well-organized, well-financed and well-staffed lobby.

I think paid staff of any of these interest groups should be registered as lobbyists, just like private interest lobbies or business lobbies should be registered. Just because a group says it is a non-profit group acting in the public interest—

Mr. Ruston: Colin Brown.

Mr. Rotenberg: —if it has paid staff, I think we should know who those people are and what they are doing. Registration of this kind won't hinder their activities. It will allow our legislators to better assess who they are, and whether they are properly representing public opinion or whether it's simply a well-organized group putting pressure on the legislators.

The same should apply when we have so-called expert witnesses coming before various committees or commissions or agencies in this House. We should know who the expert witnesses are, whether they are paid or are they simply part of a voluntary group. Again, I wouldn't want to restrict expert witnesses from coming before us. I simply want to know who they are and where they come from.

I would say registration of lobbyists, far from being undemocratic, would help enhance our democratic procedures, although it has sometimes been charged that pressure exerted by interest groups on policy may make legislators take illegitimate or even illegal stands and may have some unfortunate consequences. There are charges from time to time that there is a possibility of bribery, blackmail, questionable practices and so on being carried on by lobbyists. But I feel that if the lobbyists are out in the open and we know who they are, if they are registered, it is far less possible—although maybe it is still somewhat possible—for these people to carry on any questionable practices. In my opinion, there is far greater danger of questionable practices being carried on if the lobbyists operate in secret and we do not know who they are.

In short, the purpose of my resolution today on lobbying is to ensure that all this activity is conducted in the open so that people know who is trying to influence whom, and knowing this can respond properly. Lobbying done in the open, and without improper practices, will help everyone concerned, and I think the decisions made by committees will become more acceptable.

There is one other important aspect to this registration. Lobbyists deal, as I said, with the legislators; but they often deal with our civil servants, who also have a responsibility to the public. A civil servant has equal responsibility, I think, in knowing with whom he is dealing. A civil servant does not have the same free-wheeling ability as we as politicians do. In assessing who comes at them and who makes the presentations to them, I think they would appreciate knowing if a person is acting for himself, for a group of which he is a legitimate member, if he is a paid advocate of this group, if he is a hired gun for this group, or if he is a professional lobbyist who simply has been hired to bring this before the civil servant.

There is a positive aspect to the activities of professional lobbyists. Sometimes there are citizens' groups—legitimate citizens' groups, interest groups and so on—who want to come to this Legislature, or a body of it, to make a presentation, but they do not know how to go about it; they do not know where to start, where to go and so on. They are not as sophisticated as some of the others. They do not know the rules of the game.

If there were registered professional lobbyists, if people knew who they were and what their area of expertise was, an interest group could go to such a person and hire him for a fee—

Mr. Nixon: That could be a nice, new legal specialty.

Mr. Rotenberg: It already is a legal specialty. But, if they were registered, people could go to them. It does not necessarily have to be a lawyer. People can hire someone to come and make their case for them and to help them through the system. If it were the choice of a citizens' group, in my opinion, it would be an advantage of a citizens' group to do this sort of thing.

In summary, this kind of legislation does not originate from any distrust on my part of interest groups. The registration, in my opinion, does not cast a slur on the term "lobbyists" or impede any free expression. Registration, in my opinion, does not translate into regulation. The intention is to not put obstacles in the way of any volunteer group.

The matter of registering lobbyists alone will let us know what a lobbyist can or can't do.

Who are lobbyists? We know that a person who comes on his own as a citizen is certainly not a lobbyist. A professional who is hired is a lobbyist. There are some in-betweens. If we proceed with this and try to draft legislation which will require the registration of lobbyists, there will be some gray areas between who is a total volunteer and who is a totally paid lobbyist. There may be some difficult questions in drawing some legislation.

I am not asking today to get into the nitty-gritty details. I am simply asking this Legislature to adopt a principle which states that we feel—as I feel and I hope as the members will feel—that those who are paid to appear before our committees, those who are hired to appear before our committees, those who are paid to make representations on behalf of someone else, should be registered so that everyone knows who they are and what they are about. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the support of the members of this Legislature for my resolution.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Nixon.

[5:00]

Mr. Nixon: I'll second the motion, Mr. Speaker.

I used to read Time magazine every week, as a lot of precocious teenagers used to, and perhaps still do, and I was very much interested in the work of the lobbyists in Washington. I remember reading about the debates back in the 1940s, when the statute went through to register them; there was a feeling that, once everything was out in the open, then the approach of lobbyists to government would be in no way injurious, or against the public interest.

I understand the bill is not up for review in Congress. The view expressed there is that, if anything, the bill has been misleading and gives a false sense of security. The public lobbyists and those guys who are sort of guns for hire, in case you have a special lobby you want to put forward, are well known and some of them may or may not be affected.

I suppose it is the same thing as happens here in Ontario. The real lobbies will in no way be revealed by the bill the honourable member is suggesting, or in any of its ramifications. He says, "We don't want to deal in detail." But I can think of no bill that would reveal the functions, such as they are, of people like Bill Kelly, Colin Brown, Gerry Moog, Eddie Goodman—just to start a short list that may be lengthened by others who

search their memories. The real lobbyists are the ones who go to breakfast on Tuesday morning with the Premier and a select handful of favoured, upwardly-mobile ministers, like the Minister of Revenue, who is slated for great things, he tells me.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I was there once.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. They are the people, really who decide how the public moneys are going to be spent; surely, number one, for the public good, and secondly, to reap the largest harvest of votes and influence.

Hon. Mr. Walker: They just want a good breakfast.

Mr. Nixon: But the soon-to-be minister, as I said, the honourable parliamentary assistant, has suggested that such a bill would enable a person who may in fact be a lobbyist to have a card printed. He can hand it out to anybody who might want to approach the Legislature or its various emanations, such as the public accounts committee, or the government, and he would be able to indicate his track record. Imagine the elaborate résumé Bill Kelly himself could put on his card: "Satisfaction guaranteed. Rates negotiable," for example. That's the sort of thing I think really leads us to regard the resolution as something that is, well, unsupportable.

I really can recall, over the years, very strong approaches from the community on a number of subjects; for example, the famous "cats and dogs" bill. A number of members here recall when the poor, innocent, then Minister of Agriculture, who is now a senior member of the board of Ontario Hydro, was going to make it easier for dogs to be utilized for research. The spontaneous outpouring from around the world that came in here in letters and petitions and lobbies has been unequalled, I think. It took almost all our time. The thought that anybody there, such as the person hired by the humane society, should be registered—it just sets up another needless bureaucracy.

It may be that the honourable member who is proposing this is thinking that if his career does not mature the way he hopes he could be chairman of the registration board and I could be chairman of the registration appeal board.

Mr. Rotenberg: You've got a deal.

Mr. Nixon: Under those circumstances, and if we could work out an agreement, the bill might have some residual usefulness. Otherwise, I really think such a bill might tend, in fact, to chill the approach. A citizen might feel that he and his group—whether it's the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the Federation of Labour, or the Community Homo-

phile Association of Toronto, or any of those groups—are somewhat restrained from approaching the individual member of the Legislature. "My God, I'm not registered and somebody might hear that I approached a member, therefore I hesitate to do so."

We should encourage in every way possible approaches from the community on matters which concern individuals or groups. As a matter of fact, I'm sure we all belong to pressure groups of one sort or another. I pay my dues to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. I also pay a nominal fee to the Liberal Party of Ontario for which I get tremendous returns.

Mr. Breagh: Which Liberal Party is that?

Mr. Rotenberg: What about the federal Liberal Party?

Mr. Nixon: Whether a person is a teacher or a lawyer or a doctor or even unemployed—otherwise unemployed—the person belongs to some sort of pressure group. The value of our system is that members of the Legislature are wide open to receive information, prejudiced or otherwise, from individuals and groups. It is up to us to make our decision. A person may be advised by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture or the Ontario Federation of Labour or even by his wife around the kitchen table as to how to vote, but we can only thank God that when the electoral decision is made, when he/she goes into the ballot place, the magic of democracy works and an individual decision and a judgement is made, a decision which we say holds great expectations for the Liberal Party of both Canada and Ontario.

I would say that the same approach applies to us. It is up to us as individual members to listen to our friends who are objecting to or are in favour of the wolf bounty, who are concerned about the control of denturists, or the control and the payments of chiropractors and other cervical manipulators. It is up to us to make those decisions.

I personally think if we went forward with this resolution we would be simply setting up another bureaucratic hodge-podge of meaningless registration and I simply find, with the information available to me, that it would be impossible for me to support the resolution.

Mr. Samis: I rise in support of the resolution. I can't quite agree with my good friend from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—not Nixon—although I do share some of his sentiments.

I congratulate the member for introducing the bill. Considering his right-wing views, I am a little surprised that he has come forward with such a constructive piece of legis-

lation. I don't think it goes far enough, though, and I will outline the reasons I don't think it does.

Lobbyists are not necessarily a necessary evil, but a fact of life in Canada, the United States and probably in most western democracies. Most of us in the House don't like lobbyists, don't want lobbyists, but we accept their existence.

Mr. Nixon: Not even Cliff Pilkey?

Mr. Samis: We have to accept all sorts of things in this life, don't we, Bob?

In the United States I think the lobbying industry is probably in the most developed, most intense, most powerful, most well-financed condition of any society in the world. I read an article recently which said it is estimated there are upwards of 15,000 active, paid lobbyists in the city of Washington, which is an army unto itself when you consider the number of legislators and you work out the ratio of lobbyists per legislator.

Mr. Nixon: A lot of free lunches there.

Mr. Samis: I noticed Senator Abraham Ribicoff, the Democratic senator from Connecticut, said, and I quote: "Lobbying has reached a new dimension and is more effective today than ever before in history. It has become a big, computerized operation in which the Congress and the public are being bombarded by single-issue groups. The Congress and the people should be aware of who is trying to influence them, why and for what."

Obviously in the States it is an extremely difficult situation that they have to contend with in view of the numbers, the power, the size and the financing of the lobbyists. In fact, they are so powerful that I understand when the bill alluded to by my friend from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk was introduced in 1976 in the American Congress, a small group of lobbyists lobbied very intensely against that very bill, which is similar to the resolution introduced and facing us today. They were able to scuttle that one.

That one did go further, though, than the resolution introduced today. That bill not only wanted some form of registration; it is my understanding they wanted to know who paid the lobbyists, whom were they being financed by, who did the lobbyists represent in the various activities, and they had in some way to delineate what issues they were seeking to lobby and so shape government policy or congressional policy. That bill was successfully scuttled by the efforts of the lobbyists.

Then I understand there was a weakened or watered-down bill after that one. That one has now been scuttled and put into limbo. It

did go to some committee in Congress and I gather it is now dead as a doornail, especially in view of the upcoming election. Despite the active intervention of President Carter, that weakened bill is now in limbo, which shows the power of the lobbyists in the American congressional system.

If anyone thinks it is just an American intervention or an American problem he is kidding himself, because as we all know, in Ottawa, in every provincial province—

Mr. Nixon: You are certainly downgrading the intelligence of the elected member.

Mr. Samis: —in every provincial capital we know lobbyists are a fact of life. The headline on an article in the *Toronto Star* is kind of interesting: "Hard Sell on the Hill is \$100-Million Business." If we are talking \$100 million in Ottawa, I think that gives us some idea of the scope and the presence of the lobbyists.

In 1976, the same year as the bill was presented in the States, I believe Walter Baker, the member for Grenville-Carleton, introduced a bill very similar to this one which would provide for registration. Like many private bills, that bill right now is in limbo, although Baker somehow clings to the hope that, if the Tories were to get into power, Joe Clark would give it some credence and pay some attention to legislating it. I think Walter Baker is living in a fairy world if he believes that; he doesn't even believe it himself, I'm sure.

There is one trend I notice in our society that is even more disturbing than the mere presence and power of lobbyists; it is who the lobbyists are. If you look in Ottawa, for example, the trend there seems to be that some of the most powerful and influential lobbyists are former mandarins, bureaucrats or members of the government. Some of the people who are on the list of lobbyists make you wonder about the excessively close connection between the bureaucracy and the lobbyists.

David Mundy, former Assistant Deputy Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, now is head of the Air Industries Association. Henry de Puyjalon, formerly of the Treasury Board, represents the Canadian Construction Association. Ernie Steele, a former Treasury Board official, heads the Canadian Association of Broadcasters. We all know about Bill Lee and David Morley, another former bureaucrat. We all know about Simon Reisman from Finance, and Jim Grandy, from Industry, Trade and Commerce in the famous Lockheed affair. What Mr. Trudeau had to do was come out with guidelines for ex-

mandarins within a space of two years. So it is a serious problem in that sense, the excessively close relationship between some of the lobbyists from government and the private sector.

My colleague from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has outlined some of the more famous lobbyists in this particular city: the Goodmans and company people like that.

I would point out again that I am of the opinion that this bill does not go far enough. I think we have to know more than just who are the lobbyists. I think we must have some idea of what the lobbyists are doing.

I noticed that, in a speech in the American Senate, Senator Chuck Percy outlined some of the criteria he would set down for a bill. Obviously this was not accepted. He said, first of all, he would want to require every lobbyist to be registered; which is in keeping with this bill.

Their committee adopted provisions which dealt with certain concerns beyond just registration, and they delineated who would not have to come under the scope of the bill—even the registration aspect—and who would.

For example, they said individuals and volunteer organizations do not have to register; nor do organizations with paid employees unless they are paid staff and engage in a threshold amount of lobbying, as they call it. Organizations located out of Washington and with a total budget of less than \$75,000 do not have to register. Organizations which make a single lobbying effort of six days or less during a year do not have to register—which is a pretty exotic category, I must say.

Then they delineate who they want to register. They say organizations with a paid staff which spend at least \$1,750 in a quarter to hire professional lobbyists would be covered. Then they say organizations whose own paid staff communicate in person or by phone at least 20 times in a quarter with members outside their home state delegation or with congressional committees would be covered. They also talk about an organization with a lobbyist spending more than \$5,000 in a quarter on a single grassroots solicitation. Then they talk about information as to disclosure as well—who is putting up the money—and they go to even further delineation.

But I think you have to say registration does not solve the problem. We all want to know who these backroom boys are, true enough. But I think we want to know also, who do they represent? I think we as legislators have a right to ask, in an annual report, for some brief delineation of their activities. Obviously we are not going to ask

how many times they went out with a Premier, or a cabinet minister or one of the big mandarins. But I think we could define it in terms of what causes or activities they were representing on behalf of a particular group, and how much money was spent on that particular lobbying effort.

If this bill would go beyond the simple question of registration to deal with who contributes the money and who they represent, and have some form of delineation or explanation of the activities or issues upon which they lobby, I could support that with far more enthusiasm than this particular bill. But I do recognize this bill as a first effort towards bringing the lobbyists out into the open, to making the public aware of who they are, and in that sense I am prepared to support it.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate today with regard to the resolution that is before the House—not a bill, but a resolution—presented by the member for Wilson Heights. I do so because I feel that this is an important matter that has too long not had the appropriate attention of this Legislature. [5:15]

There are really two elements that make up the life-blood of governments in the free democratic societies that we have today and two of those elements happen to be the right of lobby and, also, the right of financial contribution to ensure that the political party or party process can continue to function.

The very essence of the democratic process is to have people, such as you and I, as elected public figures serving as the vehicle by which an individual, or group of individuals, or some other vested group or groups can approach that person and make known their views with regard to certain interests that may be of a broad public nature, or may be of a specific nature that pertains only to their specific problem or area of endeavour. Nevertheless, were it not for the right of those people to be able to come freely and without fear to their elected representative and clearly make known their views, their concerns, perhaps their objections, then the democratic process surely would not function properly.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, lobbying is an integral part of the democratic process and, as has been noted by a number of members, it is unfortunate, notwithstanding that fact, that there is an unsavoury connotation applied to the term "lobby" or one who is involved in the lobbying process. It's unfortunate and regrettable that this unsavoury or sinister

connotation is applied, because it is as legitimate and appropriate a form of political activity as you can find. It's the heart of the democratic process in that sense.

The other aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that political parties, political representatives, you and I as candidates during elections or serving as members in a Legislature, cannot continue to function without financial support and contributions from people or organizations or unions or companies or whatever who have confidence in that individual or the political party that that person represents. Yet as soon as the matter of political contributions is raised in certain situations, an ugly or sinister connotation is applied inappropriately to the involvement of the passing of money to a political organization or into the campaign coffers of a political candidate. It is regrettable that not a few people in the public sector have this view, this cynical view of politics and the involvement of lobby and of financial contributions.

Today the resolution before us addresses itself specifically to lobbying, but the reason I make reference to financial contribution is because all the members, I think, have referred to the American experience as one that we should be looking towards when we consider having this matter referred to committee for further assessment and consideration as is suggested in the resolution. In the American setting there is a substantially different arrangement from that in this jurisdiction, because in the United States, while they do have professional lobbyists, an integral part of lobbying is the provision of financial contributions up on the table and through the professional lobbyists to elected representatives, through the organizations that the lobbyists represent. An essential and important difference I think, Mr. Speaker, is that what is being proposed as I understand from the resolution is that we would remain separate and apart from the type of lobbyists who are designated in the States as financial interest lobbyists. They represent large corporations, large unions, other large vested interests. They are designated specifically to arrange for financial support or assistance, or if they wish to assist they must at least record what financial support is being put forward.

In this jurisdiction the matter of financial contributions to parties and to candidates is kept separate from the lobbying concept. We have some of the most enlightened legislation to be found anywhere in our election finances reform legislation, which separates the lobbying element from that of legitimate financial contribution to parties and to candidates during and between election periods.

In the United States, as has been pointed out, it has been a way of life for some period of time. I believe the federal legislation in the United States was enacted in 1949 and virtually all of the states of the union followed suit. I believe that without exception every state of the union also has its own legislation that regulates and controls the professional lobbyist.

The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk had suggested that it just would serve as another opportunity for the legal profession to broaden its horizons. I am well aware of his biases with regard to the legal profession, but I think, as the sponsor of this resolution pointed out, government today is so complex that in order to deal with it in a meaningful and knowledgeable way the people have to be educated as to what is going on, what legislation has been passed, what the procedures are in dealing with ministries and government people and elected people.

It is only appropriate there should be people who are trained professionally to deal in this fashion so that if some group—say from Kenora or from Winchester, Ontario—had a problem and might not have the resources to go to Toronto and know the ropes as to who they should see and what their background should be in preparing a brief to submit to the politicians, if there were professionally recognized and registered lobbyists, they could engage their services and have these people who would be trained in this area, such as lawyers and engineers and doctors are in their particular professions, to deal with people whom they are well acquainted with and whose workings they understand as far as the process of government is concerned.

So in my mind it is an entirely legitimate and wholesome type of undertaking that should be recognized in a more professional manner by permitting the registration of the professional lobbyist. But I would make two observations here. I would make one exception to the observation made by the sponsor suggesting they should not in any way be regulated. I would disagree with that. I may have misunderstood his point, but I feel that in registering professional lobbyists they should indeed be regulated.

The other important consideration is that they should not have the right to engage in any way in lobbying that involves financial aid or contributions to parties or candidates, and that this should be kept separate and apart in the way in which it is in our jurisdiction today.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Williams: I think there is sufficient merit in the resolution to warrant it being referred to committee, as asked for by the sponsor of the resolution, and I would certainly encourage the House to support this resolution.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in the debate on the resolution of the member for Wilson Heights. I personally do not favour the registration of interest groups and I really haven't seen any need for it in the time I have been here.

The member for Wilson Heights has stated the tactics of some pressure groups could be responsible for pressuring the government into ill-conceived legislation and so forth. Personally, I haven't seen the response to representations to this government acted on so well as to make that a worry for any of us.

The matter I would really like to question is what is a lobbyist? Who is termed a lobbyist? We have many groups come in from time to time. Every day members are approached by a sporting body, a group of labour representatives, or various groups, all of whom are trying to point out to the members of the Legislature the benefits of such and such an action towards that particular group.

Personally, I have found I benefit very much from meeting with people who are really knowledgeable in their field of activity. It is quite readily understood that all of us are not familiar with the needs of all the groups of people within Ontario. We don't understand what happens. A bill can be introduced in the House and I might very well say it is a bill worthy of support. In approaching the matter, I can see it is perhaps going to handle a situation that may cause problems. However, if the group that is going to be affected most by that bill can come in and in a professional way and in a technical way point out what really are the ramifications of this matter, I am the one who benefits. The people who really benefit from it are the people of Ontario. Then we are going to get better legislation.

I don't believe that everybody who comes to speak to a member of the House, a committee of the House, or a group of people, or a caucus, are people who are coming here to try to do something that is not in the best interests of the people of Ontario as a whole. Most of the people come to show how legislation can be formed to benefit specific needs in the province.

For instance, I can see we can benefit very much from a lobby group of farm people. Many of us have never lived on a farm a day in our lives and know nothing about it. We can benefit by that. This resolution, while

not saying so, seems to imply something sinister. I don't believe there is necessarily anything sinister in the whole situation. It is really just the thoughtful actions of a group of people who feel something can be bettered. If there is anything sinister about lobbying groups it really isn't the group, it is the member of the Legislature who could do the sinister things because of a lobbyist activity.

Since I have been here, we have had lobbying groups, if that is what you want to call them, from everything ranging from labour organizations to farm groups, senior citizens, Catholic Women's League and Gay Alliance of Canada; all of these things. I have listened to them all. I could buy the views some of them were placing before me. In some of their cases, I benefited very much by certain information of which I was not aware before. I think, to a certain extent, it probably has been responsible for certain responses I have made to that group.

[5:30]

I want to repeat that there is nothing sinister in a group of people coming and trying to influence our decisions. There is nothing sinister in the lobbying of a group of people who see something that could be bettered in the way of legislation. The only thing that could be sinister, as I said before, is the fact that certain people in the Legislature may act in a sinister manner after having seen that.

There has been talk this afternoon, in debate on this resolution, about what is happening in Washington, for example. That is really a different field from what I consider to be the lobbying going on in Ontario and here at Queen's Park. If there are any lobbyists here at Queen's Park that we ought to watch and maybe register, it might be a few people with names like Bill Kelly and Eddie Goodman—people like that. They are the ones who seem to be successful in their lobbying of this government.

Mr. Conway: Shame. Fifth column.

Mr. Blundy: I would like to mention also that I was told recently by a journalist that a year or two ago the Toronto Star was planning to do a feature story on lobbyists at Queen's Park and in Ontario. As they usually do, they did some initial spadework, some investigation, and they contacted a number of people with a view to lining up the material that would go into that feature story. What did they do? They dropped it. Why did they drop it? They didn't drop it because they were afraid of uncovering something; they dropped it because they knew it wasn't newsworthy,

there was nothing in it. There was nothing bad, there was nothing sinister that they felt they had to expose. So I don't really feel registration is necessary.

I would like to touch on one other matter in this resolution. We talk about the registration of lobbyists. The member for Oriole said yes, indeed, there was a need for regulation of lobbyists. Other speakers have mentioned looking at the financial background of lobbyists, people who come to us and so forth. Here we are, on the threshold of building another bureaucratic setup that is going to cost the people of Ontario more money, or we are building up a committee or commission which will be a haven for Tory party hacks and former members to serve on.

Mr. Kerrio: Right on. We don't need any more of that.

Mr. Blundy: If there is anything that this province doesn't need it is more regulation, more registration, more bureaucrats to look after it and more havens for retired and tired-out party hacks in Ontario.

Mr. Kerrio: There will be more all the time as we defeat them.

Mr. Blundy: Anyway, I have not been convinced in the debate this afternoon of the need for such registration of lobbyists. I don't think we can register a group of labour representatives or a group of professional people on the one hand, or, on the other hand, a small group of people coming here about some athletic endeavour and so forth. Who are these people? They are the people we govern. They are the people who ought to be able to help us to decide what the government of Ontario should do.

Mr. Speaker. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Blundy: The members of this Legislature are not the only people in Ontario who know what is best for Ontario. We can profit by hearing from those people out there whom we serve.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution that is before us. My comments will be brief, but it is something that does concern me. I have to ask the question myself as to why we are dealing with a resolution only and not a bill. I presume it's probably some more of the government's kite-flying to try to find out just exactly what people think. It is certainly not very clear in the resolution which just asks the government to give immediate consideration to such legislation.

I support the resolution with some serious reservations, but I want to indicate why I support it and what the reservations are. I

don't think we can hide our heads in the sand in this province. The practice exists; lobbying is going on. It's going on by a variety of groups, some of which are a little easier to take than others, and I suppose one's biases enter into that as well. If it does exist, then I think it should be out in the open.

Certainly if we are going to register lobbyists, we want to be sure to get not only the labour people, which I am sure would be a target for some of my colleagues across the floor of the House, but, as has been mentioned here, the Goodmans and some of the lobbyists that were much in evidence, such as the HUDAC people, when we were going through some of the first rent control bills. I expect that it might have been useful if we had had a registration of lobbyists federally when we were into the famous Sky Shops affair involving the senator, with the pressure in Ottawa at the time.

Like my colleague from Cornwall, I don't think this resolution goes far enough. If the government is going to consider it, there are a few other minimum steps that have to be taken, not only the registration as a lobbyist, but a clear indication of whom the lobbyist is acting for, what the limitations are in terms of what a lobbyist can do, can there be money passed out, how many meals and gratuities is he allowed to give in terms of the attempt to influence people on an issue and, above all, if we're going to bring in this kind of legislation, what kinds of standards or what kind of a code of conduct is expected of a lobbyist and what can he do or not do in terms of influencing the members of a House.

I say that from some personal experience with lobbying in the United States. I had the privilege of working for a little better than a year on Roy Reuther's staff with the UAW out of Windsor. That meant I was across to Detroit to Solidarity House a number of times. While I wasn't personally directly involved, I can remember a number of the lobbying efforts.

The offshore oil deals of a good many years ago in the States was one of them, where I was absolutely appalled at the kind of information, the kind of tactics and the kind of pressure that was exerted. We were obviously on one side of that particular issue. I forget the exact numbers, but there were something like four or five registered lobbyists in Washington for the union I worked for, the UAW, at the time.

What we were up against, I can recall at that particular time, was some 90-odd lobbyists registered by Imperial or Exxon dealing with that particular oil issue. As we

attempted to line up some of the members in the US Senate and in the House of Representatives, we found that the professional lobbyists, by the very fact that they were registered as professional lobbyists, had an awful lot of influence and also had access to the members on the US side. We're naive if we think we are that far removed from this kind of situation.

One thing that they listed was a total voting record on any issue of every member. There's nothing wrong with that at all as I see it, but they also listed their preferences, whether it was in booze or in entertainment or in women. They listed their hobbies. For example, could you get to them because the guy was a gardener or a stamp collector or a coin collector? They listed the things that they liked and they didn't like, such as the kind of movies they would like to attend if they did get out. They listed the kinds of trips and the places they went on their vacations.

It was an eye-opener to me, a good many years ago, to see the kind of information, the kind of book that was made on every single one of the members across the line. There is no question whatsoever that the pressures were exerted in terms of a specific bill or a specific piece of legislation, how you could influence, how you could badger or cajole, or how you could actually pressure and threaten a member into voting your way on a particular issue. That made an impression on me, and it bothered me at the time.

What I wonder is do we take one small step along that road here by the registration of lobbyists? Do we give them, as individuals, a lot more power than they now have in talking to us as the president or as an executive member or as a committee member or an organization, whatever that organization is? That's a much looser and a much more informal way of lobbying that we have in Ontario and in Canada at the moment.

By registration, do we set up some kind of status for these people? I tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that you're going to find these people developing their skills, importing some of the techniques they can get away with that you'll find across the line, in an effort to do their job. If you have registered lobbyists and if they're paid to do a job, their effort is going to be to produce. That's how they'll pick up the contracts they'll have in future, that's how they'll make a name for themselves. There's a danger that could lead to the kind of personal pressures, the kind of personal, bookmaking if you like, on each one of the members in an effort to be able to influence them on individual issues.

That bothers me; and that's why I say if we're going to go this route in the province we have to take it a step further than just the registration. There has certainly got to be some standards, some code of conduct, some things that are do's and don'ts, and they've got to be very clear; and we have to at all times know whom a lobbyist is working on behalf of.

Those are my reservations. I think those things have to be done if we're going to support this bill. I think because lobbying does exist and because we seem to be more and more moving into that kind of an American sphere, we'd better take the precautions now and make sure that if a bill like this comes in it does have some of the safeguards.

My belief and my trust, and my real love of our own party system in this country as against the American system, is simply that I thought you couldn't get away with that kind of lobbying here, that you were going to have to lobby an entire party. I know that's done, and I know you have your various interest groups you listen to more quickly than others; but that at least was a protection against the kind of lobbying of individual members that could be done that we found across the border.

The point I'm making is that once we start registering them—and it now exists so maybe the time has come to do it—they are going to start developing their skills and trying to find ways and means to be able to deliver when they decide they're going to sign on with somebody to try and get a particular point of view put across in this House. If that is going to be the case—we have them now, they will certainly develop their skills a step further—let's make sure that in the legislation, if such legislation comes into this House, we very clearly set the kind of standard we'll accept, the kind of conduct that's acceptable and what can or what can't be done in the job of a lobbyist.

Voicing those reservations, Mr. Speaker, I will support this initial resolution.

Mr. Rotenberg: I wasn't planning to use the whole seven minutes left, if another speaker wanted two or three minutes I'd like the last two or three minutes.

Mr. McCaffrey: Let me first congratulate my colleague, the member for Wilson Heights. I think this is an important resolution. By the way, I'm not at all sure I'm going to support it, and I'll make some of my reservations clear.

I think raising an issue that deals with this sometimes sinister word "lobbyist" is important in itself. I share with the member

for Sarnia his concerns about what registration might mean, if there would be additional costs, because my basic concern is that this exercise of lobbying legislators—or educating, I prefer to think of it that way—of educating legislators, is an important exercise, and I for one would like more people to do it and to do it openly and to do it enthusiastically. I am just a little bit afraid that any kind of registration or disclosure of information might preclude the very thing we all, I believe, want to accomplish.

[5:45]

I was surprised and frankly never thought I'd live to see the day that I would be supportive of a couple of points the member for Hamilton East made.

Mr. Warner: You've come a long way.

Mr. Samis: He may reconsider his position now.

Mr. Warner: He is going to rewrite his speech now.

Mr. McCaffrey: He suggested that lobbying, or educating if you want to call it that, is going on—that it is happening and it is happening regularly—and, in that case, why don't we open it up and recognize it. I support that sentiment. I think that's an important part of the exercise. At the same time, he suggested there should be guidelines made clear and I think very public for all these people who would opt to be classified as educators or lobbyists. I think that is an important part of the thrust of this resolution.

I can't help but go back to some of my own experiences as an MPP in the last year or so.

The member for Hamilton East did mention HUDAC in the context of the committee looking at rent review in Ontario. That committee is still meeting. I think the member was talking about the earlier phase of that committee. I think he's quite right that HUDAC was one group that did come before us to represent the concerns of the landlord part of that exercise.

I think it's only fair and important to point out that during the whole life of that committee, and it's still operating, we have been blessed with some excellent lobbying, educating or monitoring—all of those things—by extremely active and articulate tenant associations. The Metro Tenants' Federation is one. There were people from the Tenant Hotline there assisting many of the committee members throughout the months of our exercise. I don't think their presence there should be in any way seen as sinister

and I, for one, don't see it as sinister. I think they should be complimented publicly by other tenants in Ontario. All of the members who have been aware of this new legislation should be complimented for the work they've done. But I think it would be a little unfair—

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member has about a half a minute.

Mr. McCaffrey: Thanks very much.

It would be unfair to single out HUDAC, simply because they represent the other part of that argument, as somehow being sinister.

I think one of the key observations was made earlier by the member for Sarnia when he said that we as legislators have a great deal to learn. We know society is becoming more complicated. Legislation is obviously reflecting that—becoming more complicated too—and our real need for expert advice, be it from tenants' or from the landlords' side, to use that committee again, is pressing.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, I have several comments on the speeches this afternoon.

I'd like to point out to the members of the Liberal Party, who do not seem inclined to support this resolution, that at no time did I indicate we would try to inhibit, in any way, individuals or groups of individuals from coming before us and presenting information. As a matter of fact, I think I tried to make it clear that these types of groups, the voluntary groups, would not have to register. My feeling about legislation that may come from this resolution would be that they would be exempt from registration. And as my colleague from Armourdale said, I did not imply in any way anything sinister about lobbyists or that type of lobbying.

I'm not suggesting setting up bureaucracies and all types of new civil servants for simple registration. Simple registration of lobbyists could probably be handled by one clerk in the Ministry of, say, Consumer and Commercial Relations. I'm not talking about setting up bureaucracies and so on.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Can we have some order, please, out of deference to the person who legitimately has the floor?

Mr. Rotenberg: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My own colleagues were interrupting me so I didn't want to say too much.

I want to thank the members of the New Democratic Party for indicating support for the resolution.

Mr. Nixon: The same old gang.

Mr. Rotenberg: I've been asked by the member for Hamilton East why it is a resolution and not a bill. Frankly, I feel that in this as in many things in private members' hours, a resolution is more appropriate to get a general sense of the feeling of the principle, to get some of the details, to find out what details we agree and disagree on, before being bound by the explicit details of a particular bill. But I would say to the member for Cornwall, and I thought I indicated it in my presentation, that I certainly agree registration of a lobbyist has to include who pays him, whom he is representing, in any particular instance or in a general way.

Mr. Bolan: That would be very embarrassing for your party.

An hon. member: You'll find some way to exempt all the Tories.

Mr. Rotenberg: Without this kind of information as to whom he's representing, the whole point of registration just doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Bolan: That would amount to disclosure. You wouldn't want that, would you?

Mr. Warner: Eddie Goodman will be on his way out. He's packing his bags now.

Mr. Rotenberg: The member for Hamilton East raised the problem of a code of conduct for lobbyists. The code of conduct is for the members of this Legislature, not for the lobbyists. I have no qualms whatsoever about the conduct or the honesty of any member of this Legislature. If a lobbyist is trying to do something improper, trying to bribe, trying to give whatever benefits to a member of this Legislature, that, in my opinion, is contrary to the criminal code of this province. If any person does come to any member of this Legislature with improper overtures, I would hope that member would report it either to the Speaker or to the Ontario Provincial Police. I don't think that kind of conduct is necessary.

Mr. Mackenzie: There are things other than money, and you'd better realize it.

Mr. Rotenberg: Mr. Speaker, in asking for support for this resolution from my colleagues on all sides of the House, I am simply saying that we do not want to inhibit anybody from coming before us; we just want to know who they are, those who are paid to come before us. We want to know who they are, who pays them and what they are doing. That is the simple point of the resolution.

Mr. Wildman: In other words, the rich lobbyists don't register.

Mr. Bolan: What about those who don't pay?

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS

Sufficient members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on resolution.

REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Rotenberg has moved resolution 4.

Those in favour will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Resolution concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, prior to rising for the supper hour, may I indicate, pursuant to standing order 13, the order of business for tonight, tomorrow and next week?

This evening, we will debate the motion standing in the name of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) with respect to interim supply, following which we will take into consideration the supplementary estimates which were tabled earlier this week by the Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Mr. McCague), in this order: Ministry of Community and Social Services, Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Ministry of Northern Affairs, Ministry of Correctional Services, Ministry of Natural Resources and then the Ministry of Health.

Tomorrow morning, we will continue with, and hopefully, finish, the supplementary estimates.

Next week, on Monday, we will have the reply to the throne speech; Tuesday afternoon and evening, reply to the throne speech; Wednesday, April 4, the general government committee, resources development committee and administration of justice committee may sit in the morning; Thursday, both afternoon and evening, reply to the throne speech; and next Friday morning, reply to the throne speech.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in her chambers.

Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Her Honour has assented:

Bill 2, An Act respecting the County of Middlesex;

Bill 7, An Act to amend the Milk Act;

Bill 20, An Act to amend the Residential Premises Rent Review Act, 1975 (second session);

Bill 74, An Act to establish a Code of Procedure for Provincial Offences;

Bill 75, An Act to amend the Provincial Courts Act.

The House recessed at 5:58 p.m.

APPENDIX A

(See page 383)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPERS

INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES

93. Mr. Laughren: Will the Ministry of Industry and Tourism provide a list of the applications received for incentive grants, excluding those applications to ODC, since the announcement of the Ford grant for the city of Windsor. Will the ministry detail those applications by company and by industry grouping. Will the ministry further indicate the approximate dollar value requested. (Tabled March 15, 1979).

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The province of Ontario's assistance to the Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited's \$577 million Essex engine plant was announced in July 1978. Since that time, the Ontario Development Corporations have continued to evaluate and process applications under their Ontario Business Incentive Program (OBIP). As there are no other incentive programs in place at the present time, there have not been formal applications made to the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. In light of the announcements made in the Legislature concerning the formation of the Ontario Employment Development Fund and board, the Ministry of Industry and Tourism has received approximately 25 enquiries ranging from letters outlining companies' future plans to general telephone enquiries.

The approximate dollar value of the above inquiries is in the order of \$20 million.

EMPLOYER-SPONSORED TRAINING

94. Mr. Cooke: 1. Will the Ministry of Colleges and Universities indicate: (i) The number of firms which have been informed of the employer-sponsored training scheme announced in June, 1978; (ii) the number which have expressed positive interest in participating in the scheme; (iii) the number which have reached an agreement to train workers under the scheme; and (iv) the num-

ber which are now training workers under the scheme? 2. Will the minister indicate, giving a breakdown by occupational group, the number of workers who are now being trained under the employer-sponsored training scheme, by occupational group? 3. Will the minister indicate the number, and composition, of Community Industrial Training Committees which have been established? In which communities are these agencies now established? In which other communities has the ministry discussed the establishment of such agencies? 4. How much of the \$8 million federal funding for employer-sponsored training referred to in the minister's June 6 statement has been disbursed so far in the 1978-79 fiscal year? What provincial funds have been disbursed, in addition to the contracted federal funding, during this fiscal year? (Tabled March 15, 1979)

Hon. Miss Stephenson: 1. (i) It is impossible to estimate the number of firms which have been informed of EST in the course of the promotion campaign launched after the June announcement. It can be said with great certainty, however, that information on the creation of EST has reached a large number of the manufacturing firms in this province. In addition to the literature widely distributed by government officials, EST was the subject of extensive coverage in the media. For example, the new program received very positive comments from the press in most Ontario industrial centres. Trade publications and television have also been used to explain the program. (ii) In excess of 500 firms have expressed an interest based on contracts through local meetings, workshops and inquiries. (iii) Approximately 225 firms have reached agreements to train workers. (iv) Approximately 220 firms actually have programs in place.

2. Precision metal cutting (includes machinists, tool and die makers and mold makers)—approximately 450 workers; industrial maintenance mechanic—approximately 80 workers.

3. (a) Twenty-three committees are now in operation. While the key members of these

committees are representatives from industry and labour, the committees also include representatives from school boards, colleges, and local, provincial and federal governments.

(b) These committees are established in centres in all regions of the province: Communities include Atikokan, Belleville, Brampton/Mississauga, Brantford, Brockville, Cornwall, Etobicoke, Hamilton, Hearst, Kitchener, London, Niagara area, Orillia, Oshawa, Peterborough, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Smiths Falls, Thunder Bay, Wallaceburg, Windsor, Woodstock.

The Canadian Tooling Manufacturers' Association (CTMA) also has an active committee.

(c) Six additional communities and four associations have received presentations from employer-sponsored training staff but have not as yet developed functioning committees: Communities include Chatham, Cobourg, Ottawa, St. Thomas, Simcoe, Sudbury.

Associations include Canadian Diamond Drilling Association, Canadian Machine Build-

ers' Association, Magna International Limited, United Cooperatives of Ontario.

4. (a) It must be emphasized that when EST was announced the federal government expressed its support for this pilot program by earmarking \$5 million from CMITP (Canada Manpower Industrial Training Plan) and \$3 million from CMTP (Canada Manpower Training Plan). The clear understanding between the two governments was that the money was to be diverted from these earmarked funds to the EST pilot projects when they met the criteria and when required in 1978-79. It was further understood that the first year of EST was to be devoted to a series of pilot projects in Ontario designed to test various innovative concepts in industrial training. To date just under \$1 million has been allocated to these pilot projects.

(b) In order to satisfy training needs which could not be met because of the regulatory restrictions on the use of the federal funds, Ontario has allocated a total of \$585,000 to EST.

APPENDIX B

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1979

STANDING RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The committee met at 10:07 a.m.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1977,
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I will call the meeting to order. Mr. Bounsall has just stepped outside; there is a quorum.

First of all, Mr. Starr would like to make a reply to some of the questions raised by Mr. Davidson last night.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Before I do that, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen I want to advise you that on the request of Mr. Horne yesterday we have filed sufficient copies of the 29 research projects that we spoke about. They are being distributed now.

Mr. Van Horne: The name, for the record, is Van Horne, a small point.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Davidson spoke yesterday off the cuff and I did not make notes of all he said but our secretary did, so in addition to the answers I gave yesterday, this morning I would like to deal with some of the matters that he brought up in his presentation yesterday so the record will be complete.

First of all he mentioned the fact that the vocational rehabilitation activity in the Workmen's Compensation Board should have been started 10 or 15 years ago.

I think it would be only fair to the committee if Mr. Wisocky, who is executive director of vocational rehabilitation, could give you a brief outline as to—

Mr. McClellan: I don't want to cut off your answers, but I think it would be more helpful in terms of a detailed presentation about rehab service and Mr. Wisocky's own operation which is of major interest to us, if we dealt with that in detail when we get to the section.

Hon. Mr. Starr: All I am doing is carrying out the wish that was expressed yesterday, answering some of the questions that were brought up.

Mr. McClellan: Rather than have Mr. Wisocky make a presentation about his service, maybe you could just deal with some of the criticism that Mr. Davidson raised in terms of the limited number of people that are being served.

Hon. Mr. Starr: All right. If that is agreeable I would ask Mr. Wisocky to deal with that aspect.

Mr. Wisocky: Thank you. I think the figure mentioned yesterday was the 600 jobs that employment specialists and rehabilitation counsellors found in the year, either 1977 or 1978. For the record we should say that 1,425 jobs were found by the employment specialists during the year 1978; of the 1,425, 418 were utilized by a counselling staff in the placement of injured employees. In other words, we don't simply want to place an injured employee in any job; it has to be a job that is within his capabilities, his skills and interests, and that is our prime objective.

I think that with the passage of time we will become a bit more expert in this field where our utilization rate will increase. A prime example of this, or a good indication, is the first two months in 1979 when we have already found 308 job opportunities and have utilized 153. So I think it is a good trend and that we are going in the right direction.

This is one of our prime thrusts for 1979 in the sense that we want to get as many job opportunities as possible for utilization by the counselling staff in the placement of some of the difficult cases that have been mentioned in these committee meetings.

Hon. Mr. Starr: In your remarks yesterday, Mr. Davidson, you mentioned back problems of some 100,000 people and you referred to the back education program which has now encompassed some 600. If it is agreeable Dr. McCracken will explain to you when this program started, how it has proceeded and why it is only dealing with 600 so far.

Dr. McCracken: Mr. Chairman, I am not certain where the figure of 100,000 came from as I am not privy to that figure. We do have a computer program which I implemented four years ago so that we could identify the total number of back injuries being reported to the board year by year with the appropriate breakdown. It is remaining quite constant despite the fact the labour force is slowly increasing, so I think the incidence of back injuries is slowly declining.

The numbers, however, are 33,000 in round figures per year of lost time back injuries. Of this group no more than 3,000 are identified as being the type of back injuries which tend to become complicated,

long-term, difficult back injuries to deal with from a medical standpoint. Of that group, in turn, it is now currently estimated that in all probability, no more than one half that number, or about 1,500, might be suitable for the back education program.

Currently I don't have the last figures as to the total number of people who have gone through our back education program, but at year end it was nearing 600 and at the time the information was given to the chairman of the board for his report to this committee it had exceeded 600. This represents a fairly sizable percentage of those cases which will be identified to go into the program.

Having said that, it is my plan to expand the capabilities of the back education program at the hospital and rehabilitation centre and this will, of course, have to be done by additional staff, both medical and paramedical, and we hope and expect this will be accomplished in the coming year so we can increase the number of cases.

Over and above this we are looking at the feasibility of taking the appropriate portions of our back education program outside of the hospital and into industry to see if, indeed, we can present the appropriate prophylactic parts of the program to the workers, hopefully to the majority of workers who have not sustained back injuries, so this might well be a preventive tool which will pay real dividends as far as future back injuries are concerned.

The back education program itself was started on an experimental basis slightly over one year ago. We developed the experience with it last year at the hospital. With the exception of, possibly, Rancho Los Amigos Hospital in Los Angeles, it has the largest number of patients who have gone through the program of any unit I am aware of. The back education program is an extremely new concept. Rancho Los Amigos was one of the pioneers in developing this and I visited with them to get information several years ago.

One of the senior orthopaedic surgeons in Metro Toronto has also developed a back education program, but I do not have figures as to the total number of patients put through his program and on speaking to him some time ago, he didn't have those figures available either. However, I would be of the opinion that ours still represents the largest number of cases that have gone through a back education program in Canada.

Mr. M. Davidson: You mentioned, Dr. McCracken, that there are some 33,000 back

injuries per year registered with the board, is that correct?

Dr. McCracken: Thirty-three thousand lost time back injuries.

Mr. M. Davidson: Lost-time accidents relating to back injuries.

Dr. McCracken: That is right.

Mr. M. Davidson: And there are approximately 3,000 per year, if I understand you correctly, which are extended, long-range injury type?

[10:15]

Dr. McCracken: Of that group, year in and year out there are approximately 3,000 which will be complicated problem back injuries, that is right.

Mr. M. Davidson: Out of that group there are approximately 1,500 which would fit into the back educational program?

Dr. McCracken: This is our estimate at the present time, yes.

Mr. M. Davidson: When I was making my remarks yesterday—and I don't have Instant Hansard here in front of me—I was talking about overall back problems. When I mentioned approximately 100,000 I was talking about the number of injured workers in Ontario today, not for one year, but there are approximately 100,000 injured workers in Ontario who suffer from major back problems.

Dr. McCracken: I don't have that data. I don't know where—

Mr. M. Davidson: Yesterday you mentioned yourself you went down to Los Angeles, I think you said a couple of years ago, to take a look at that type of program which they have there. Could you tell us how long that program has been in effect down there?

Dr. McCracken: Rancho Los Amigos started their pilot project, as I recollect, several years before I visited with them. It usually takes about 24 to 36 months to really get such a program operational.

Mr. McClellan: When you say you don't have the data, Dr. McCracken, how many injured workers are there as of this month who are in receipt of permanent partial disability pensions from the board for back injuries?

Dr. McCracken: I don't have that data. I don't know whether Mr. Kerr would have that information.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, I don't have that with me.

Dr. McCracken: I have no occasion to break out our statistics in that fashion, be-

cause we are not utilizing our statistics in that way.

Mr. McClellan: You have a back program for injured workers and you don't know how many injured workers there are in the province who are receiving pensions for back problems, is that what you are saying?

Dr. McCracken: That is correct, because the back education program is not primarily directed to those persons who are receiving pension.

Mr. McClellan: Who is it directed to?

Dr. McCracken: It is directed to persons who at the present time are identified as not going to recover within the initial three or four months. These are the cases we are attempting to address because these are the cases where we feel something can be done to help them. They are taking top priority at the present time.

Mr. Bounsall: How many of those do you have at any given time, any given day or any given week?

Dr. McCracken: As a matter of fact we don't know, but I have requested our statistics people to see if they can identify the number of back cases we have in active files less than 13 weeks and then in multiples of 13 weeks up to two years. They are working on developing that program now for me.

Mr. McClellan: So you don't even know what the current demand would be in terms of people who are in receipt of service now, in terms of the criteria you just laid down? You don't even know how many people are potentially eligible for the program?

Dr. McCracken: In actual hard figures, no. It is very difficult to come by those figures, and this is why I was so interested in the 100,000 that was mentioned, because it is difficult to even take the 33,000 cases that are reported each year and add them, because it is not simple arithmetic. There is a certain number of those cases which have had previous back injuries and you are going to be double counting them, for instance.

Mr. M. Davidson: I would suggest maybe our research is a little better than the board's.

Mr. McClellan: It illustrates a major dilemma at the compensation board, that you don't have an adequate information retrieval system. You still don't have an adequate information retrieval system in 1978. We keep raising this year after year and you keep coming back in front of us with shrugs or guesswork, so that leaves us in the position of having to guess.

How can we assess your programs if you don't even provide us with basic statistical material? How can you assess your programs yourselves if you don't know what the demand is for particular kinds of services from people who are currently coming to you for help?

Dr. McCracken: If I might, the problem has to be identified, of course, before the statistical program can be put in place. This is a pretty basic premise.

Mr. McClellan: It is also a fairly basic administrative procedure.

Dr. McCracken: Not at all, not at all.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe not in the board it isn't, but in most organizations it is.

Dr. McCracken: Most organizations don't have this type of statistic at all.

Mr. M. Davidson: Who decides whether a patient qualifies for the back education program?

Dr. McCracken: We developed criteria in developing the back education program as to the types of patients that would be suitable for admission, just the same as we developed other clinical criteria for patients to be admitted to any of the other special clinics.

This is decided by the medical staff at the hospital in conjunction and in consultation with the director of the hospital, myself, and the consultants sitting on the medical advisory committee of the hospital. It's the same way as it's done at any other general hospital.

Mr. Vice-Chairman: Is there anything else?

Hon. Mr. Starr: In my remarks yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned in the appeal section that, as far as the appeal adjudicators were concerned, the waiting time for a hearing with the adjudicators had been cut back to four weeks. I guess it was misleading in that I did not mention in my statement what the waiting period was for hearings before the appeal board itself. There is some difference there.

In order to clarify the whole situation I thought that Doug Hamilton, who is our commissioner of appeals and a corporate board member who is active in that field in the organization could now try to clarify the whole situation for you.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the wish of the committee, as expressed by Ross McClellan this morning, you would like to deal with the appeals in detail when we come to the matter of appeals. At that time, I would like the opportunity to give some background material about the appeals system, how it has progressed,

where we're at now and so on. But, at this point in time, all I will endeavour to do is to answer Mr. Davidson's question, which he posed last night.

The chairman, in his speech, said that the waiting period was four weeks at the appeals adjudicator level, but at the present time it's closer to three weeks at the appeals adjudicator level and seven weeks at the board level. When I go into the matter of appeals and make my explanation as to how we got there, I think you will see that we've done exceedingly well this past year and we're now seeing daylight in the whole appeals procedure and structure, which I'll talk about later. Specifically, we're in good shape, I think, except in one area, and that is this whole postponement, which I want to deal with when we deal with the appeals.

But, in reply to your question, the waiting period at the appeals adjudicator level is three weeks and at the appeal board level it is four weeks at present; six months from now, they'll both be down to three weeks—

Mr. McClellan: The appeal board is seven weeks.

Mr. Hamilton: Pardon?

Mr. McClellan: It's seven weeks.

Mr. Hamilton: It's seven weeks; and in six months or so we'll have them both down to three weeks at both levels. I think that's as low as we're going to be able to go with the large volume and the staff.

Mr. McClellan: We'll want to pursue that in detail when we get to the section. You might keep in mind that, if my memory serves me, you've slipped back a week or two from the last time we had an update from Mr. Farquharson at the Ombudsman committee on the number of weeks it took to schedule an appeal; so we'll want to go into that.

Mr. Hamilton: I'll explain that later, Mr. McClellan, but we had a large backlog at the appeals adjudicator level when we switched from one system to the other system. We dug into that backlog, which now is being reflected in a larger volume at the board level; and we're digging ourselves out of that one also. I'll explain that later on. Does that satisfy you, Monty?

Mr. M. Davidson: For the time being.

Hon. Mr. Starr: In addition to yesterday's answers and today's answers, we will still peruse the Hansard reports, once we get them, to see if there is any other aspect that we should make a comment on. That completes my comments.

Mr. McClellan: There is just one other supplementary. I wonder if I could have an update from Dr. McCracken on when we'll be able to receive an anonymized set of medical reports from the hospital and rehabilitation centre on the use of sodium Amytal.

Dr. McCracken: The request, as I recollect from last night, was that you wondered if I would be able to produce a copy of a hospital file on one specific case, the case that received sodium Amytal treatment in 1978.

I have given this matter some thought overnight. In view of the fact that it is only one case and, therefore, in my opinion very readily identifiable, even if I were to strike the name of the patient from the record, I am of the opinion that I well might be in violation of the Health Disciplines Act about divulging medical diagnosis, medical treatment and medical information to third parties. I will have to consult with the registrar of the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons before I can take any action.

Mr. M. Davidson: If I am able to get a consent release form signed by the person involved, will you then release it?

Dr. McCracken: If I have a signed waiver from the patient then I will be in a position where I can supply a copy of the hospital record.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Brounsall.

Mr. Brounsall: I've been trying to drop the last "I" all my life, being a believer in the George Bernard Shaw alphabet, but I never thought of adding an "r."

Mr. McClellan: If you drop one you've got to add one.

Mr. Brounsall: If I drop one I've got to add one.

Mr. McClellan: You've got to add two "r"s.

Mr. Brounsall: I have two or three areas under the main administration vote that I'd like to bring up, but before I get into it, just let me make an aside comment. What a pleasure it is finally, through the work of the Ombudsman committee, to have before us readily available, four copies in our caucus only, copies of your book, Rehab Branch Manual, and Claims Adjudication Branch Manual, and your Claims Adjudication Branch Manual. It is a pleasure to have those readily, legally available to us. Having been critic for four years, and critic for another year after a tremendous holiday from this, one does have one's means of getting hold of these things when they weren't available to us. One had to go through, from time to

time, the game of casual conversation with board workers over the phone saying, "Oh, what does that policy actually read?" in order to get over the phone bits and pieces of what we now can read at our leisure. So it is a pleasure to have it without having to go through the kinds of charades we had to go through before, to try and help ourselves, as members, to understand the workings of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

On that point, I gather from what was said last night, I may be corrected on that, that any MPP or any, I think the phrase in your statement was any appropriate inquirer, would be eligible to receive this documentation and the updates on that documentation. Up to this point, we only have four copies of it. Do I understand that to be maybe not the appropriate inquirer?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We have made arrangements, and I think I said this yesterday, with the provincial bookstore which would have all of these copies available to anyone and copies will be distributed throughout all the universities in Ontario and all the libraries.

Mr. Bounsall: All right. That would be all the full depository universities and libraries and the full depository MPPs who would not have to buy it through the bookstore, I would assume.

Hon. Mr. Starr: No sir.

Mr. Bounsall: May I suggest there be another corporate board policy decision that perhaps the MPPs be looked at as a full depository library in terms of receiving this material rather than having to pay for it. I'm sorry the minister is not here because he would know, as perhaps you don't, that MPPs now have a maximum of \$100 per year of documentation they can get free of charge and they have to pay themselves for any documentation above and beyond \$100 a year that comes in. If you don't classify us as a full depository library and we have to go through the bookstore for this, we are paying out of our own pockets in order to get these policy manuals.

[10:30]

I suggest the corporate board, in its next deliberations, makes a decision that those MPPs who request them, receive them free of charge. Maybe all of us don't want them. Maybe you could send a note around—I know it's costly—for those who fill out the form saying they would like to have these manuals and any updates of the manuals, that they be supplied free of charge without going through the government bookstore.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I shall bring your request before the board.

Mr. Laughren: There probably wouldn't be that many requested.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, but for those that would it would be—

Hon. Mr. Starr: So far as I know there's been one request from one member and that was Mr. Mackenzie, I think, from your party. I know of no other. Some of the members have copies of it through the special committee. Ross McClellan, I am sure, has one on the Ombudsman.

Mr. Bounsall: The only way our caucus has access to it easily is one of those committee members supplied our research library with his set of copies. That's how we got it. I have them here with me this morning and had them overnight last night so if any other member wanted our research copy, it wasn't there.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We shall bring it before the board.

Mr. Bounsall: This leads into one of the major areas I wanted to discuss, and that is the whole area of corporate board decision-making, and what it is they deal with. It's very difficult, or has been, to determine and establish, if you're working on behalf of an injured worker who brings his whole case to you, the policies of the board, particularly with respect to decisions in the past on individual areas.

If we can get into it generally, then we will certainly derive specific questions from the general description. Just what is the pattern of decision-making in the Workmen's Compensation Board? Just what decisions are made by the corporate board and just what is made by administrative officers, top administrative officers, without going to the corporate board? Just where do you draw the line between what would be a top administrative decision with no necessity of going to the corporate board and just what goes to the corporate board?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think in order to give a detailed answer complete in every form, it might be advisable, if it's agreeable to you, to give you a written statement on this matter, because you're asking about not only the corporate board but also about the executive director for the management board decisions, and which goes where and what comes forward to the board itself. I think it might be useful if we gave it to you in writing so there would be no slip-up of anything.

Mr. Bounsall: Would you have to write that up or is that written down already?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It's written down already so that's readily available.

Mr. Bounsall: That would be helpful; I would have thought you would have had that written down so someone wouldn't have to make an ad hoc decision daily as to what should go before the corporate board and what can be handled administratively. It will help us in determining to whom we should direct our question with respect to policy and to whom we should direct our request for decisions to be made.

Let me ask a couple of specific questions then: Who made the decision, if in fact it was a decision, to prosecute certain troublesome claims for trespass? There was one before the courts which was then dropped, and so on. Where was that decision made?

Hon. Mr. Starr: A decision of that nature, particularly that decision, was made by our section of the resources division which also has the responsibility of making certain of security.

Mr. Bounsall: So the decision to prosecute for trespass was made solely by your security area. Did the corporate board show any interest in the fact, or even hear of it then, that there were going to be some prosecutions for trespass at the board?

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, the corporate board does not make that decision. In certain instances it may be brought to my attention, for example, and in one particular instance it was. I felt at that time the prosecution should not proceed, however we could not stop it from going before the court. But our representative was there to ask for the withdrawal, and that was done.

Mr. Bounsall: It was no doubt a positive decision in every respect to go in and ask for the withdrawal. I wonder though if, as you have illustrated it, that doesn't illustrate one of the points I was getting at. You took up some time of the public system in scheduling a court hearing and what have you—

Hon. Mr. Starr: We didn't schedule that. We tried to get it withdrawn before, but we were advised that it could not be done.

Mr. Bounsall: All right. But because of a decision made at some administrative level and by one administrative section, without having to have a major step of that kind—I haven't heard of many prosecutions for trespass over the years made by the board. That was made by a particular administrative grouping in the board which then took

up some time of senior board people and some time of court scheduling in order for that decision to be reversed. I guess the question is when that division decided to take the most unusual step of going into prosecutions for trespass, why did it not check with the senior administrative officers or the corporate board as to whether or not it should go ahead with that?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think I know the case you are talking about and it was checked with me within two days.

Mr. Bounsall: But it had already been started.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Even then it was too late because we checked out with the arresting officer and we were advised that we couldn't stop it until it appeared before the court.

Mr. Bounsall: Was there then a policy statement or a guideline issued from your office or subsequently from the corporate board about procedures like that in the future? In other words, that same section can go ahead and make arrests and start prosecutions for trespass, and you would again hear about it two days later, and you would then make the appropriate decision to stop it? That could be a normal happenstance at the board?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Bounsall, I don't think that in cases of this type you can have a clear-cut policy. Each case would have to be judged on its own situation and merits.

Mr. Bounsall: Have you said though, "Before you actually enter that, before you make that arrest and before the procedure to prosecute"—

Hon. Mr. Starr: We didn't make the arrest.

Mr. Bounsall: All right, "Before the decision to prosecute was made in each of those individual cases, perhaps you should check with the senior administrative officer"? Has that gone out? Because there could be similar things occurring right down the line now.

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, nothing further has been done in respect of this matter at all. I think we can only deal with each matter as it comes up and be guided by the circumstances. I still maintain that we can't just have a clear-cut policy.

Mr. Bounsall: I am a little disappointed that the chairman of the corporate board has not said, "Hey, before anybody in the board enters a prosecution in the courts, it might be good to check with one of us." Am I being unreasonable?

You are an organization that tries to maintain a positive public image and you spend some money on public relations; but on the other hand there is one section of the board going out entering prosecutions in the courts. This perhaps could have some positive public relations spinoffs but it would stretch your mind a bit to arrive at that being a positive public relations gambit, wouldn't it? I would think that is something you might want to consider. Some portion of the board runs off and enters prosecutions—

Hon. Mr. Starr: In this case it was brought to my attention and I did give it consideration. It was too late but we did withdraw the charge.

Mr. Bounsall: So the board is saying now though that it sees no need to issue a directive to any section of the board saying, "Before you prosecute, maybe you should check with us"?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That hasn't arisen, no. That aspect hasn't arisen.

Mr. Bounsall: But in the lack of taking any positive action to see that occurs, that is really what the position of the board currently is?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think it has to be judged by those people responsible for this area, where a serious threat is made against the life of any one of our employees, or the disruption and the usage of foul language et cetera has to be dealt with at the time and with each particular case. I have no other answer for you, Mr. Bounsall.

Mr. Bounsall: As my colleague, Monty Davidson, stated before, I am not wanting to see any person at the board harassed. My point was simply the board is currently stating, by the lack of taking any action, that it is okay for any section of the board to enter a prosecution without checking with anybody in the administrative or board section to see that that prosecution would be appropriate.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Only the security people.

Mr. Bounsall: Narrowing it down, the board is saying it is okay for the security section to enter a prosecution without checking that decision as a whether or not to prosecute with anyone else on the board? That is the decision?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes, if in their discretion they feel it is not necessary and that action of that nature should be taken, it is at their discretion.

Mr. Bounsall: Okay. It is an interesting way to operate. I would think one would want to check—have a little conversation with those in the board whose job it is to publicize the

good efforts of the board as to whether or not that is a good public relations situation to be allowed to continue to exist. I don't want to dwell any more on it.

I can assure you this is in no way a personal comment on the chairman of the board, but when the chairman was reappointed I felt I had to make some sort of public comment, and—

Mr. McClellan: The temporary partial appointment.

Mr. Bounsall: —in that I laid down what could be construed I suppose as the current deficiency of the present chairman in my way of outlining the type of person that should be filling the position in terms of what they should be doing. One of my points was that the chairman of the board should be willing to make public, on a continuing basis, the legislative changes that the chairman would wish to see made, to make further operations of the board either more efficient, effective, or fairer to the injured workers.

My question, therefore, as it relates to the chairman and to the corporate board, is as far as changes to the Workmen's Compensation Board Act are concerned, how active are you in proposing those changes and who proposes those changes? It is a change that would be initially proposed to the Minister of Labour and Manpower. I understand that; but who does it and how active are you either at the corporate board level or at the chairman's level in proposing those changes?

Let me put it in a slightly different context. The former chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board would come before us briefly and we would always get to some point in each and every discussion where he would say, "Gentlemen, that is not my responsibility; it is the way the legislation reads. If you want to change it, if you want me to be able to operate differently, you have got to change the legislation in that area."

I would think the chairman of the corporate board should be exceedingly active then in proposing—he was implying that he actually supported the views that were being presented in terms of the problems that were resulting. He was implying that when he said, "It is not my fault." You must run into this at the corporate board level and at the chairman's level. Just what has either of those two entities been doing in terms of proposing legislative changes?

Hon. Mr. Starr: In 1974 amendments the Workmen's Compensation Board itself made quite a number of recommendations to the minister of the changes that should take place in the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Also, based on the task force report of 1973, these were all incorporated into the amendments—not all of them, some were not—based on the judgement of the government at the time.

In 1975 again we played a part in proposing some changes that were accepted and amendments were also made.

[10:45]

By 1978 we had organized a joint consultative committee, as provided for under the act, and composed of management, labour and other interested citizens. I think there are 12 on that board. They sat down and made certain recommendations that came through the board. We approved those recommendations and passed them on. At least, we passed them on to the minister and the government for their consideration at that time. Consequently, the result was that you were dealing with these amendments in July 1978.

Mr. Bounsall: That's very interesting. Are you saying, then, that the actual changes and increases to the pension levels—those amounts which found their way into legislation—in fact emanated from the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Starr: The joint consultative committee.

Mr. Bounsall: The joint consultative committee. Was the actual level of change, as indicated by the joint consultative committee, approved by the corporate board before it went to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We noted them and passed them on to the minister.

Mr. Bounsall: There was no approval or disapproval? You just noted them?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That's right.

Mr. Bounsall: It was left to the joint consultative committee to make that decision. You just passed that decision on. No input was made by you, as the chairman, or by the corporate board, as to that level of benefit change?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That's right.

Mr. Bounsall: That shows what happened in 1978. There was no input by the corporate board or the chairman on that suggested benefit change; just a pass-through of the joint consultative committee's decision.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. Bounsall: What happened in 1975?

Hon. Mr. Starr: There were recommendations. I outlined—

Mr. Bounsall: Okay. But who made that one?

Hon. Mr. Starr: The corporate board.

Mr. Bounsall: The corporate board made that one. In choosing between the corporate board and its recommendations, and the joint consultative committee and its recommendations, I would suggest that the corporate board be the one that makes those recommendations in the future. The 1978 change was very niggardly; and the then Minister of Labour could not understand why the numbers were what they were. When asked three times in the Legislature, she could not explain those numbers.

Does the corporate board, or the chairman, understand why those numbers from the joint consultative committee were what they were?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It was after careful survey by management and labour representatives and others in that group—who make up a good cross-section of the various people—that they arrived at these recommendations. They thought they were appropriate.

Mr. Bounsall: Did you ask why they were recommending those numbers?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We were also interested. But they did take into consideration the total of the cost-of-living from 1975. That amounted to something like 26 per cent or 27 per cent.

Mr. Bounsall: Not quite. They tried to look at the pattern.

Mr. Watson: On a point of information: would somebody tell us who comprise the joint consultative committee?

Hon. Mr. Starr: This is a joint consultative committee, provided for in the Workmen's Compensation Act, and composed of 12 people. They are an advisory committee to the Workmen's Compensation Board. The personnel of that committee is composed of labour, management, and other interested people among our population.

Mr. Laughren: Injured workers?

Mr. Riddell: And some non-government people.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes. We have an injured worker on it.

Mr. Riddell: Non-government?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That's right. They're all non-government.

Mr. Wildman: Out of the 12, could you tell us what the division is in terms of management and labour: how many management people, how many labour people, how many injured workers; the interested groups, and who they are?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: We would be happy to give you the detail of the actual

membership, which we would give you in writing, but would say that the representation is roughly equal between management and labour, with an equal representation from the general public as well.

Mr. McClellan: Did the joint consultative committee make a recommendation for an amendment to increase benefits in 1977? Did they make a recommendation to the corporate board in 1977?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: The joint consultative committee's recommendations were made to the board and to the minister in 1977.

Mr. McClellan: What action did the corporate board take on the recommendation in 1977?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: We passed it on to the minister at that time.

Mr. M. Davidson: The same figures that were implemented in 1978?

Mr. McClellan: Were they the same figures?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Practically the same figures.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: I think I should make it clear that there is one figure that was not part of the joint consultative committee's recommendations and that is the adjustment for 1977. They dealt only with the year 1976.

Mr. McClellan: Did the corporate board make the recommendation to the minister in 1977 with respect to an amendment increasing the benefits?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That's the one we're talking about.

Mr. McClellan: There was a formal recommendation in 1977 from the corporate board to the Minister of Labour to raise the rates in 1977?

Hon. Mr. Starr: But the 1977 cost of living was not included. That was added on.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, I understand, but the answer to my question is yes?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. McClellan: Was there a recommendation in 1976 from the joint consultative committee, or had it been set up then?

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, there was no recommendation in 1976.

Mr. Bounsall: I don't want to embarrass the corporate board or the chairman over this point, but I want to pursue it one step further. Did you ask them why they had picked the particular figures they picked? They almost defied analysis as to why they

picked those particular percentages. Did you ask them how they got those percentages that they recommended?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Insofar as indexing is concerned they recommended the cost of living index adjustments for those two years, 11 and eight per cent.

Mr. Bounsall: In point of fact, they didn't. Let me explain that. We have argued for some years here as far back as I can remember, as far back as January 1972, that pensions should be adjusted, and they finally were, that those adjustments should be based on the per cent increase in salaries and wages, industrial composite that occurred in Ontario. If there's anything that should be tied to the salaries and wages in Ontario in terms of percentage increase, it's pensions or compensation rates for those who are withdrawn from their workplace because of an industrial accident. Maybe anything else would be inappropriate to tie to that. Not the cost of living, even in those years.

The adjustment made for 1975, looking at those numbers, was a very interesting number. It was exactly half-way between the per cent increase in salaries and wages that occurred and the cost of living that occurred. It was neither, but exactly midway in between; the number was exactly half-way in between. So, of course, my heart flutters with great ecstasy; the board has partially recognized that pensions should be adjusted on the basis of percentage increase in salaries and wages.

Then look at the adjustment that was to be made on pensions for 1976. Here my heart flutters with great joy again. It's exactly midway in between what the percentage increase in salaries and wages were and what the consumer price index was.

Then you get to the 1977 one and there was quite a disparity between the cost of living index, 12 per cent in 1977, and the percentage increase in salaries and wages, six per cent. Instead of following the pattern, if there was one, set for the 1975 changes and the 1976 changes, of splitting the difference and coming out with nine per cent, you chose—guess what number? My heart really fluttered, because there was the establishment of what should have been established, the six per cent figure, which was the per cent increase in salaries and wages as opposed to the cost of living figure at 12.

That was the question I posed three times to the then Minister of Labour, and she couldn't answer as to where the numbers came from. If you look at the numbers for 1975, you took the average between the two

indexes in 1976. In 1977, for those 1978 amendments, you took the lower of the two, but the appropriate one, the percentage increase in salaries and wages. That was an indication of the effect of AIB in holding wages down as inflation was going out the window at the other end because prices were not restricted.

That being the analysis, could I ask the corporate board, since obviously 1975 amendments were based at least on the true cost of living increases and, hopefully, that board rather than the consultative committee will be making suggestions in the future, or at least questioning the numbers being brought forward by a joint consultative committee, what index are you going to base it on in the future? Are you going to do what you did for 1975 and 1976 and split the difference? Are you happy with that situation, a difference split between the cost of living and salaries and wages or are you going to do what you did in 1977 and take the salaries and wages increase, the industrial composite of Ontario?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: It was the intention of the joint consultative committee to recommend for the two years in which they made the recommendations an adjustment based on the cost of living index period.

Mr. Bounsall: They missed by one per cent in each year.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: I would suggest, Mr. Bounsall, that you sit down with the statisticians concerned and see just how they did it and what the comparison was. I repeat it was their intention to adjust by the full cost of living index. I know because I was there for the discussions. It was on the same basis and on the same statistical analysis used by the board in the previous amendment which you suggest the board recommended.

As for the 1977 decision to have an ad hoc adjustment of six per cent, that was made in concert with the government as it relates to having something less than full indexing. The board is not entirely privy to all of the matters relating to that. Certainly one of the matters that is going to have to be considered in the future as a matter of policy is the extent to which one can have full indexing in this kind of economy.

Mr. Bounsall: For the year 1977 that did not come from the joint consultative committee. Was there a figure from either the chairman or the corporate board as to what figure should be the adjustment for the year 1977? Did you actually put a number on it,

or did you leave that entirely up to the Minister of Labour and the cabinet?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: I would say that after discussion that was a joint recommendation. The board produced information for the government as to the cost of adjusting at that particular level. To say that that was a recommendation of the board would not be entirely correct.

Mr. Bounsall: The joint consultative committee didn't do it.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: No, they did not.

Mr. Bounsall: You said there was consultation between the board and the minister, or words to that effect. Who in the board consulted with whom on arriving at that figure?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Those of us who are involved in these calculations. It was discussed with us.

Mr. Bounsall: It was not a corporate board decision.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: The corporate board, after the calculations had been developed, did discuss it as a board. I would say that it could be said that eventually the board did recommend a six per cent figure.

Mr. Bounsall: The corporate board was therefore happy to recommend a figure which did not reflect the full cost of living index for the year 1977. It was a corporate board decision to be happy with the recommendation which turns out to be half of what the cost of living index was in 1977.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: I think it is fair to say that the board was aware of the implications of making that recommendation by having regard for the overall requirement to look at indexing as a concept at this particular point in time.

[11:00]

Mr. Bounsall: I withdraw any of my previous remarks about leaving decisions of this nature in the hands of the corporate board.

How could the corporate board be happy with the decision and recommendations of the minister that in the year 1977 pension increases were to be only half the cost of living increase? Don't you gentlemen have consciences at all—or any hearts, if that is the kind of recommendation you are happy to make?

Look, if your recommendation gets turned down on a political basis, that's another thing. That's not your responsibility. But, as a corporate board, you were happy to sit and make a recommendation on pension increases that were exactly half the cost of

living increase—if what you have said to me this morning is correct.

Well, that's what the corporate board did to the injured workers of Ontario. I will leave it now. I think the situation is clear enough. I think that if the Workmen's Compensation Board is going to adequately serve the injured workers of Ontario, it had better have another review—a thorough review—of itself with a view to submitting a report as large as the 1973 report we got. And one of its sections should speak to the persons who will sit on that corporate board.

Getting back to my major general question in this area—the proposal of legislative changes—we have seen how it has come out in pensions. You mentioned the 1975 changes. That was a corporate board decision. We have gone through what happened in the 1978 changes and where they were derived from. The only other one you mentioned was the 1973 report, which the board dealt with, and then came out with the 1974 changes in the legislation; the reorganization changes.

I suppose I don't need to pose the question because I know the answer. But, do you really think the chairman and the corporate board should be satisfied with that degree of legislative proposals to the minister? I mean, it sounds as though from 1973 or 1974 until now—one was major in 1973-74, I will admit—there have been three times when the corporate board or the chairman sat down and made some recommendations to the Minister of Labour re legislative changes. Do you really think that is enough? I mean, are you that happy as a corporate board, and that happy as the chairman, Mr. Chairman, with the Workmen's Compensation Board Act in the province of Ontario that over a period from 1973 or 1974 until now, you have proposed three—one was major, I will admit—legislative changes?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It is not within our power to make legislative changes.

Mr. Bounsall: No. I said proposed legislative changes. I think that has to be one of the major requirements of the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, one of that person's main functions. Are you happy with three times since you became chairman?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I would like to see the act amended to give the compensation board itself power to adjust automatically for the cost of living increase every year.

Mr. McClellan: Have you made that recommendation to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We have talked about it and, of course, you are in the Legislature—

Mr. Bounsall: You can't hide behind that because we don't —

Hon. Mr. Starr: —you discuss the act and you discuss the clauses of the act and I haven't heard any suggestions from anyone.

Mr. Bounsall: Oh, come on.

Mr. Wildman: We make a lot of suggestions about amendments.

Mr. Bounsall: There are private members' bills that have been placed before the Legislature by members.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I withdraw that, but this is what I would like to see. I don't know whether that answers your question.

Mr. Bounsall: Would the corporate board and the chairman find it inappropriate to once a year publish proposed list of changes to the Workmen's Compensation Board Act and make it public as one of your normal at least yearly functions? Do you not see that as a role which the board should be playing, proposal for legislative changes? Do you not see that as a function of the corporate board or the chairman? The previous chairman used to imply that he would like to make some changes but, after all, he was hindered by the act; he couldn't do certain things because the act prevented him. Neither did he make public legislative changes that he had in mind.

The corporate board and the chairman have to work under the restrictions of an act. Would it not be appropriate for this arm's-length board to make public its annual look at how it thinks the legislative changes should be made?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Bounsall, it has been requested by this committee at the last hearing and now that they should not be at arm's length, that there should be close co-operation with the government and the Minister of Labour, which we are trying to do as much as possible. Consequently, it would be impossible for us to say publicly we propose these changes if they were not acceptable to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Laughren: You are a political tool.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes, everybody is, like you are and I am.

Mr. Laughren: I advertise the fact that I am—

Hon. Mr. Starr: So do I.

Mr. Laughren: —a partisan politician and you hide behind it.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I am too.

Mr. Laughren: Are you? That's the role of the board, is it?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I conduct the role of the board in an impartial way, my friend.

Mr. Laughren: But you're a partial politician, a partial administrator. You get caught up in your own contradictions.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Everybody's entitled to their rights.

Mr. Laughren: Except the injured workers.

Mr. Bounsall: We need a chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board appointed who sees as one of his or her roles public proposals as to the way the act should be changed and doesn't fear a consequence of being let go should he or she make those proposals. The corporate board is playing just as political a role in propping up any Conservative Minister of Labour and his policies if it as a corporation doesn't see that as one of its roles.

Mr. Van Horne: Can I interject and seek a point of information or clarification? The member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) a while ago asked for some information on this joint consultative committee and the response came from the chairman that it's covered in the act. I'm assuming this is section 70 of the act that you are referring to.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Section 70.

Mr. Van Horne: Okay. As I read this, the wording is such that it is very permissive and suggests committees or councils. There is another section, 120, which also allows for the establishment of committees of employers. Following the theme that Mr. Bounsall has been hammering away at, could you indicate to us are there many committees of employers, what is the liaison between them and such a committee as the joint consultative committee, if any?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. MacDonald can answer that.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: There are no formal committees that operate under the other section.

Mr. Van Horne: Have there ever been?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Not to my knowledge. There are a number of trade associations which may come to the board from time to time and make representations on something that they're concerned with.

Mr. Van Horne: In the instance of Bill 126 and the criticism offered by Mr. Bounsall about the percentage increases, did you, in fact, get representation from the union representatives or from any source outside of your board?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: The recommendations made by the joint consultative com-

mittee were a consensus decision of a group of people, including both unionists and management people, including in one case the division manager of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Van Horne: Are you suggesting that he supported the recommended increase?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Yes, I am.

Mr. Van Horne: He wasn't pushing for anything more than the recommended increase. In other words, he wasn't insisting on the cost-of-living percentage as opposed to what was recommended.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: My point was that the cost-of-living index adjustment was recommended. Mr. Bounsall and I are debating whether or not that figure is correct. Certainly it was the intention and the statistics which were produced for them were cost-of-living index changes over a 12-month period on the same basis used by the board in the previous amendment.

Mr. Van Horne: Let me go back to the first question. Section 70(3) (g) and (h) allows for the establishing of this committee. Are there other committees? Again the wording is broad enough to allow for advisory councils in the plural or committees in the plural. Is there any other council or committee, other than this joint advisory or consultative committee that you have referred to?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: No.

Mr. Bounsall: Just to carry on with my two other major points, although I have one additional point on this, the numbers that I used were not one that I looked up in terms of the cost of living but were fed to us by our very excellent research team from our NDP research caucus, which hasn't been known to make many errors in calculation over the past. Maybe they did but maybe they didn't.

Let me ask you if the intention was to adjust for 1975 and 1976 by exactly the cost of living, and if the board is out by what I claim to be one per cent in each year, can I assume there will be a recommendation coming from the chairman and the corporate board to make that appropriate one per cent adjustment in each of those years?

Maybe I shouldn't prejudge your decision. Could I ask that that decision be looked at by the corporate board with a view to actually adjusting it to the cost-of-living index if they are one per cent low, as my information is, in each of those years? I won't even ask them to review their policy of settling for half of the cost-of-living index for

the year 1977. I won't embarrass the corporate board by asking them to do that. But if the intent was that they adjust it by the exact cost of living for those two years and if that turns out to be low, I am asking the corporate board to look at that and recommend immediately that the act be amended to make up for that little error.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I have noted your request.

Mr. Bounsall: I am sure the injured workers in Ontario will have noted the answer as well.

I want to get back to the 1973 report which the chairman was intimately involved in and as a result of that became chairman. I am trying to get myself on some committee that writes a report in some area so that I can receive an offer of chairman, but no one has appointed me to anything yet. There is one thing in that report which again really warmed the cockles of my heart at the time.

Mr. Laughren: We are not here to discuss patronage.

Mr. Bounsall: We have just heard that this is the way it all operates anyway. I may be misquoting and it may just be the way I interpret it—and I am sorry I don't have that green report here with me—but one of the criticisms that was made in the 1973 report of the board was that there were too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

In the reorganization bill that took place and in sitting down and discussing it with you at that point in the committee stage hearings that took place outside the House, going through that reorganization that was about to take place, we were assured that the situation would be reversed, and it was. There was some nice stuff happening for a while as a result of that 1973 report. We need a 1979 report because of the positive things that flowed for a while from that.

[11:15]

Why have you completely reversed yourselves at the Workmen's Compensation Board and become almost incredibly top-heavy with chiefs again? More than 40 per cent of the employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board now are chiefs. You have done a complete reversal.

Mr. Riddell: What is a chief and what is an Indian? What do you classify as being a chief?

Mr. Bounsall: Just wait, Jack; it will come.

Why have you reversed yourself? It was a positive policy. Are you aware that around

40 per cent of the employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board now are chiefs?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I am not aware of that.

Mr. Bounsall: You are not aware of that? One of the criticisms in discussions at the time was that there were too many chiefs. Since about two years ago, you now have a return to the chief situation in virtually each section. In virtually each section you have a director, an assistant director, a supervisor, an assistant supervisor, a manager and an assistant manager. As a result of that reclassification into chiefs, they found that only slightly less than 60 per cent of the employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board were eligible to be included in the bargaining unit.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Oh.

Mr. Bounsall: It is a classification into chiefs.

Hon. Mr. Starr: What you are saying is that the claims adjudicators are chiefs, are they? Because they are not included in the bargaining unit, they are chiefs?

Mr. Bounsall: Let me pick up on that point. Would the corporate board again consider making a recommendation to the minister that the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act be amended to remove the phrase "adjudicators or anyone who determines a claim pursuant to any statute" so that the people in claims adjudication—and let me tell you, they are not all chiefs; they are good, hard-working, honest people—can be included as part of the bargaining unit and can have some collective strength in determining their own salaries, which they are prevented from doing by the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act?

Since I assume you wouldn't want to disadvantage your own employees to that extent, the corporate board might well say to the minister: "Look, this is not political. It doesn't affect the board at all. It is not the Workmen's Compensation Board Act we are speaking about; we are speaking about another act, the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, which prevents all our honest, hard-working people in adjudication, or those determining a claim, from having collective representation."

Hon. Mr. Starr: That is a situation where those people themselves will have to make that determination; not I.

Mr. Bounsall: That is interesting. Are you willing to have all your employees in adjudication or those who determine a claim have a non-interfered-with vote as to whether they would like to see the Crown Employees

Collective Bargaining Act amended so they could be included in the bargaining unit; and, if they so did, would you as a corporate board make that strong recommendation to the Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Starr: No.

Mr. Bounsall: There you go. Back to the old chief situation. You are very happy with that situation.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You counted all the claims adjudicators as chiefs; that is where you are wrong in your percentages.

Mr. Bounsall: More than 40 per cent are excluded. They include all the claims adjudicators. I have had representation—and I'm certainly not going to mention names—from people within claims adjudication saying: "What the hell can you do for us on our salaries, if anything? Because no one speaks for us, no one takes care of us. We can't be part of the bargaining unit. We're getting, in our opinion, shafted on salaries and working conditions."

Perhaps one of the interesting examples of this that was given to me by employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board—by employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board—was what took place in the counselling area. Jack, as well as having directors, assistant directors, supervisors, assistant supervisors, managers and assistant managers, you also have senior specialists. It just so happens that in some areas, and this occurred in the counselling area, none of the senior people in the counselling area wanted to be classified as a senior counselling specialist, because that would have made them management and put them out of the bargaining unit. So in that area what happened, as it's related to me, was that junior people in the counselling area got designated as senior counselling specialists and, in fact, are making less money than those who aren't counselling specialists who are part of the bargaining unit.

Mr. McClellan: It's another triumph of administration.

Mr. Bounsall: I don't know. You talk about this close liaison which you had with the Minister of Labour, yet the Minister of Labour upholds a Labour Relations Act statute which encourages the formation of organizing of employees into unions in this province. If you have that close liaison which you have—and if you have, and you might in this one, a Minister of Labour who believes that preamble to the Labour Relations Act—it must be in quite a bit of conflict with the minister over the way in which you have designated people outside of the ad-

judication branch for the purposes of excluding them from the bargaining unit.

Hon. Mr. Starr: The matter has never been brought for discussion between myself and the minister.

Mr. Bounsall: We'll ask the minister in writing. We'll ask you to discuss it with the minister and we'll ask the minister in writing to discuss it.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think you've made some statements in respect to certain of our employees, particularly as they are in the claims section. I think Mr. Kerr should be given the opportunity to clarify some of these statements that have been made by Mr. Bounsall.

Mr. Bounsall: Let me be very clear to Mr. Kerr, I haven't had the time. It would be interesting. I'd be welcome at the board, I always am, to go over and talk to all of the claims adjudicators and so on and ask them individually what they think about their situation. I can only tell you what I'm relating is what some of the claims adjudicators have come to me about. I know who put them up to it, but—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In the claims services division, it's quite right that some of the employees are in the bargaining unit and the employees who are adjudicating claims, the claims adjudicators, the pension adjudicators, are not in the bargaining unit. So we do have this situation where some of the employees are in the unit in the division and some are not.

In so far as how the people feel, the claims adjudicators, I quite honestly can't tell you how they feel because in my position I don't, frankly, go around asking them: "How do you feel about that?"

Mr. Bounsall: Maybe you and I could make a joint trip.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That would be very interesting, I'm sure, Dr. Bounsall. But if I may continue for a moment, it could be misconstrued. Personally, as a manager of the board it would not inhibit me in any way if they were all in the union or if they weren't all in the union, which they weren't for a number of years until CUPE was certified.

As a manager of this rather large division, I have no feelings one way or the other. If they were all unionized, it would not inhibit me as the executive director in operating that division. I can't contribute very much, Dr. Bounsall, except to say that I have no feelings one way or the other. With respect to whatever decision is made, it is very difficult when you get into this kind of situation. It has been said that whatever the employees

want is perhaps what should be done. That seems to be the democratic way of doing it.

I was very pleased, Dr. Bounsall, to hear you say that these adjudicators are good hard-working employees.

Mr. Bounsall: Most of them.

An hon. member: You sound surprised.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We are not surprised; we are very pleased.

Mr. Bounsall: How many are we talking about?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We have 756 employees in the claims services division.

Mr. Bounsall: Could I sum up your comments by saying that we can count on you not to fight any proposal made by the corporate board that that section of the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act be amended?

Mr. Van Horne: So help you God.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: My answer to your question is yes, you can count on me.

Mr. Bounsall: Fine.

Mr. Riddell: To substantiate what Dr. Bounsall said, of those 756, how many are so-called Indians and how many are so-called chiefs? We have been led to believe that we are top-heavy with chiefs.

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, not at all.

Mr. Bounsall: In that section, how many of the 756 would come under the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Those who adjudicate will determine the question.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may add something to that, I think I can. I don't have all the figures at my fingertips. We have three branches in the claims services division. One is the claims information counselling services branch which also operates the area offices. Of the 284 employees in that branch only about 60 are non-bargaining-unit employees. Of that 284, roughly 220 are in the bargaining unit. In that one branch of my division, the vast majority of the people are in the bargaining unit.

Mr. Bounsall: Those aren't adjudicators.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No. In the claims adjudication branch in that category of adjudicators, including the management people whom you call chiefs, who would be the real chiefs and not just the claims adjudicators, we have about 285 to 300. We have a vast majority of that branch not in the bargaining unit. Then we have a claims review branch, which is very important but small in numbers. None of those people is in the bargaining unit be-

cause they are all adjudicators or management people.

Mr. McClellan: That is 300 out of how many?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Out of 447.

Mr. McClellan: Then 300 out of 447 are not in the bargaining unit in that section?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's right. That is the branch where the vast majority are not in the bargaining unit, the claims adjudicators to whom Dr. Bounsall has referred.

Mr. Riddell: I find it rather peculiar that they would come to Dr. Bounsall to complain rather than go to the person who might be able to do something about it, such as yourself. Am I correct in assuming that if they went to you they would be jeopardizing their position? Why are they going to Dr. Bounsall? Is it the fact that they don't particularly want to be included in the bargaining unit?

Mr. Bounsall: He doesn't know that and neither do I.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may respond to that question, the director of the claims adjudication branch, Mr. Darnbrough, who is with me today, and I have received no comments, presentations or complaints of any kind from the claims adjudicators on that particular subject.

Mr. Bounsall: As I said, I didn't make a survey and neither has Mr. Kerr.

Mr. Martel: That's like going to Dracula when you have the blood bank with you.

Mr. Riddell: Neither can you look at it from one point of view.

Mr. Martel: We look at the difficulty of organizing in this province.

Mr. Bounsall: Let's not kid ourselves. The point is well made. You are putting it much more forcefully than I would ever think of putting it when you make the analogy to Dracula.

Mr. Riddell: I maintain, and I have more faith in labour, that they have got more—

Mr. Martel: You have no faith at all in labour.

Mr. Riddell: —intestinal fortitude than you indicate. If they can't go to management and talk over some of their problems, then I find that a ridiculous accusation.

Mr. Martel: Of organizing? Let me tell you, it is management you had better look at.

Mr. M. Davidson: I have been organizing the trade union movement for 10½ years. I have yet to see a worker who went to management and said he would like to get a union.

[11:30]

Mr. Bounsall: That would, in fact, jeopardize its formation because management can't get involved in any discussions about the formation of a union. So they can't do that, Jack.

Mr. Martel: God help me. That's his knowledge of the whole matter.

Mr. Riddell: The fact of the matter is that management is tied down so damned tightly.

Mr. Martel: Here it comes now. Give us the whole spiel.

Mr. Riddell: If unions want to get into a bank and they come up to a bank manager and talk to him, the bank manager has to be very damn careful of what he says.

Mr. Bounsall: That's exactly why they don't go to —

Mr. Martel: That's why they didn't go to Bill Kerr because Bill would have let them organize.

Mr. Riddell: You have to look at it from two sides.

Mr. Martel: Not when you are organizing.

Mr. Bounsall: To focus this: may I ask the corporate board again to consider another policy decision, but not just as to whether or not they would ask the Minister of Labour to amend the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act. Would the corporate board consider making a decision to allow myself or Mr. Kerr to anonymously survey the employees who are prevented from unionizing by the crown employees act—the adjudicators and all those who determine a claim—as to whether or not they have some interest in being able to be part of the bargaining unit? Could I ask the corporate board to make a decision as to whether or not—

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'd want to be certain that Mr. Kerr concurs with you in this request.

Mr. Bounsall: He has already said he is not going to fight it.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: May I comment on that, sir? I believe, Dr. Bounsall, a member of your party said that management can't be involved in such a matter. I think that's true. Would that not be viewed as suspicious by the union, if a senior member of management became involved in such an exercise?

Mr. Bounsall: I said—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think I would have to be excluded, sir, with respect.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Then I can only ask, Mr. Bounsall, that you put your request in writing to the corporate board and we will consider it.

Mr. Bounsall: Can I send you a copy of Hansard?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Send along with your letter anything you like.

Mr. Bounsall: Would Hansard please carefully note: I am now requesting the corporate board somehow to take, without management involvement, a confidential survey of the employees in adjudication, as well as all those who determine claims, and who are restricted by the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act clauses from organizing; that a survey be taken of those employees to determine whether or not they would like to see that act amended so that they can be represented by a bargaining unit. I will send you that copy of Hansard.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bounsall knows it is quite an illegal proposition he is making. I sit here very patiently and quietly and listen to these innuendoes and snide remarks but he knows this proposition is quite illegal. There is a bargaining unit established at the board. There has been no interference at any level of management that I am aware of. If there is, I want to hear about it.

It is incumbent upon the collective bargaining unit in the board to expand that unit to the best of its ability. It is the unit's job to get whoever they think is out of the confines of the bargaining unit into the bargaining unit. If they are not doing that, they are not doing their job. They shouldn't have to rely on the corporate board to organize their bargaining unit. Mr. Bounsall, that's not a fair proposition and is quite illegal, as you know.

Mr. Bounsall: Doug, I was not being at all snide. Because the only way they can get in is through a change in legislation, I was asking the corporate board to consider making a recommendation to the minister that the section which prevents them from becoming organized be removed. Whether or not—

Mr. Hamilton: There are other ramifications involved.

Mr. Bounsall: —whether or not, if it is removed, the majority would vote to get in is up to the trade union or the collective bargaining situation. I am not asking you to help organize. What I am asking the corporate board is to consider whether or not they would say those employees should be eligible to have a collective bargaining agent, something they are prevented from doing now. There is nothing snide in that.

Mr. Hamilton: There are other ramifications, as you know, Mr. Bounsall, and that is that they are not in the appropriate bargaining unit that now exists. There are avenues open to have a collective bargaining unit that is suitable to their job.

Mr. Bounsall: They're excluded from organizing.

Mr. Hamilton: That may very well be the avenue they should pursue; I don't know.

Mr. Bounsall: Like in the category of the security guard where they can't have any contact with any other union member whatsoever.

Mr. Hamilton: Well, office units are the same; they're apart from the main unit. I don't know whether this is feasible, possible or what, but it seems to me that if that's an avenue they want to pursue they should pursue it. But there has been no—

Mr. Bounsall: You've raised a possibility. I think there are legislative problems with it, but you have raised a possibility.

The final area, and hopefully I won't dwell too long on the details, is the Wyatt report. I assume the Wyatt report recommendations as they affect benefits—and the policies they are recommending, would be a decision at some point of the chairman or the corporate board. Is this correct?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Mr. Bounsall, the Wyatt report is not a report to the Workmen's Compensation Board, as you know. It is a report commissioned by the minister and a report to government which has been tabled with the government. We understand the minister has formed his own task force committee to study that report and to give him recommendations concerning it. The board itself has not been asked to make any recommendations concerning it, although our joint consultative committee has just recently been asked to formally study the report and make recommendations concerning it.

Mr. Bounsall: So the corporate board has been asked to study it and make recommendations?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Through its joint consultative committee, yes, but formally the board itself hasn't been asked.

Mr. Bounsall: We will get into a discussion of the Wyatt report in detail and its stance. It's tremendously against liberalization of benefits. It warns throughout about over-insurance; let's not stack benefits; and they characterize certain levels as being excessive. It's a really reactionary report. I would hope the board—one always hopes, doesn't one—in its most positive way will look at each of

those recommendations of the Wyatt report and be seriously prepared to accept or reject—and hopefully reject—most of them; because it's a strong stand.

Mr. Hamilton: Has your caucus studied carefully the whole proposition, whether it's retrogressive or not, of consolidating the benefits that are outlined in the Wyatt report?

Mr. Bounsall: I will let my colleague from Nickel Belt who is going to speak later—

Mr. Hamilton: Because it is a proposition that somebody is really going to have to come to grips with in the not-too-distant future. Whether you liberalize them and consolidate them or niggardly consolidate them, the question about consolidation will have to be faced.

Mr. Bounsall: Doug, I won't pre-empt the member for Nickel Belt who will be speaking on consolidations.

Mr. Laughren: For the seventh or eighth year in a row we will go at it again. The board continues to have the problems it has had in the past.

I had a conversation with Mr. Kerr a few minutes ago in which I was saying that in the Sudbury area we understand some of the special problems caused by the six-and-a-half-month strike—so far. That does pose certain problems both in terms of special supplements to injured workers and the whole rehabilitation program for workers who are on strike. We know that poses problems for the workers and for the board in decisions they make. But, at the same time, even given that, the problems we're facing in our constituency offices are more numerous than they have been in the past.

The woman who works in my constituency office, an extremely capable young woman, must spend I'd say, without a word of exaggeration, 75 per cent of her time on compensation problems. I'm sure that's true of Mr. Germa and Mr. Martel and I know Local 6500 has one man working full-time and occasionally two people working strictly on compensation problems. So we're a long way from being out of the woods with the administration of the board. I know the board likes to give the impression that it solves 90 per cent of the problems quickly and efficiently—"but there is that 10 per cent we have problems with." That's what the board likes to say. But surely that's how you measure the efficiency of any organization: how it deals with the difficult problems and not how it deals with the ones that just go through a computer without any question.

That's where the board has fallen down—coping with cases where there is something different about them. That's where the board is failing and it's failing very seriously, and it's not getting better. That's what is really disturbing me. As a matter of fact, I think it's safe to say it's worse because you now have more people out there in the field than you used to have and they can't cope with it. The unions hire extra people. There used to be no one in our constituency offices when I was elected back in 1971 and now it simply would not be possible to handle the workload of compensation cases without a full-time person in a constituency office. So there is no question that it's not getting better; it's getting worse.

I think you would have to admit, in the Sudbury area certainly, we have never attached a great deal of blame to the local Sudbury office for the problems. We understand where the problem lies. We understand they get as frustrated as we do. We get angry at some of the attitudes that some of the people will display from time to time in the local offices but basically it's an administration problem that cannot be solved out there the way the board is set up now.

I understand that in your opening remarks you commented on a decentralization study that should be finalized this spring. I hope very much that study will recommend that you do decentralize the board because places like Sudbury understand the problems of miners better than they do down here on Bloor Street. I would hope you would be able to resolve some of the administrative foul-ups in this way.

The other thing still hanging out there is the whole question of back injuries. The board does not know how to deal with back injuries. It's as plain and simple as that. You don't know how to deal with back injuries and I've never, and this party has never, pretended that was an easy problem or that there is a simple formula with which you can resolve a low back injury problem.

I guess the real dispute centres on whether or not a degenerating disc or degenerative disc disease, call it what you will, can be caused by being worn out with manual labour. I think that's where the board is wrong and that medical evidence is inadequate. For example, I have a bad back but I can probably go on in my present job as long as the people want me to without my back causing problems. But if I were to go and work in a mine my back would be gone probably within six months or a year, I don't know for sure. Then the board says that's

a degenerative disc condition and employment doesn't cause that. I think employment can cause the disc to wear out. That is obviously a layman's view, but I think you would have to start with that premise if there is going to be justice for workers with back injuries.

[11:45]

Back injuries and industrial diseases are the areas where I see the board as being most inadequate in its policies, aside from the level of benefits and pensions and that kind of thing. So those are areas where I think the board should move very aggressively to try to resolve problems. I don't think they are insoluble.

Basically what I would like to say this morning is to encourage the corporate part of the board to abolish itself. The board should be abolished and in its place established a comprehensive social insurance scheme. Strangely enough, I am not alone in these feelings. I believe the chairman of the board, Mr. Starr, has himself indicated he wants to see the board abolished.

I believe you were talking to the Hamilton Law Association a year or so ago when you indicated you thought the board should be abolished and there should be a universal scheme in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Starr: If I may, our task force report visualized the possibility, as you know, that this may come about. In the interview after my speech to the lawyers in Hamilton, I was asked about this aspect and I just repeated what we said in the task force.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, which was a very commendable thing to say.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I visualize something even more comprehensive in the future, sure.

Mr. Laughren: That is certainly what we feel, that it must be abolished. You will never resolve the problems that are there now with the existing system. You simply can't, I don't believe it is humanly possible. I don't care who the chairman of the board is or who the Minister of Labour is, you are not going to resolve the problems at the board as long as you have this adversarial system that is down there now. It is not possible.

Decentralizing it will make it better and there are ways to make it more humane, but you will never resolve the problem with an adversary system. That simply is not possible. There are people who argue for the—

Hon. Mr. Starr: Excuse me. I wonder if I could ask you to define to me what an adversary system in your opinion is?

Mr. Laughren: An adversary system in my opinion is when the onus is on the worker to prove that he or she is entitled to compensation. That is, plain and simple, the way it is now. There is no question in anybody's mind. If you will be impartial for a moment, and I know that is hard for an old political warrior like yourself, but be impartial for a moment and you will admit that the board is seen as an adversary by people who have problems with compensation. When they come down to an appeal, it is against the board's decision they are appealing, so the worker unquestionably sees the board as the adversary rather than as an organization set up to dispense justice for injured workers. That is how I see it as an adversary system.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I see what you mean.

Mr. Laughren: It is not logical in my mind either to have a system of social insurance that would just insure workers from the time they left their door to the time they got back home again the next day, because it is very difficult to separate injuries and where they happen. That is one of the problems. That is what turns it into an adversary system, the fact that the worker has to prove the condition was caused by an incident on the job. It is as simple as that. That is what they have to prove.

I have always felt there are three basic principles to any system of compensation: one is prevention, the other is income maintenance and the third is rehabilitation. Those are the three. The adversary system doesn't allow for that.

There was a fellow from the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board who made a statement to the Woodhouse commission in New Zealand when they were recommending the establishment of a social insurance system there. I would like to quote what he said in the 1969 report:

"Financial rehabilitation is provided by adequate compensation as a stimulus, rather than a deterrent, to speedy recovery. Prompt and regular payment of compensation during the period of incapacity is important in the rehabilitation process.

"Doubts and fears unconsciously fostered by an adversary system should be prevented if at all possible. The patient should not be allowed to be unduly disturbed about financial hardship during the course of his total disability, or to have fears and forebodings about the future. Such fears accentuate the stress reaction so ably described by Dr. Selye, prolonging disability and driving reputable citizens to the only refuge they know: litigation.

"Knowledgeable rehabilitation officers attached to the staff of the administrative authority can dispel the doubts and fears of the injured workman at an early stage of treatment. They can point out to him his rights and responsibilities under the act and influence positive thinking about rehabilitation and employment possibilities."

That was a statement made by Dr. Steele, who was a commissioner at the Workmen's Compensation Board at the time. That's how I feel too about the problems of the adversary system which we have in Ontario.

If we had a comprehensive social insurance system—I know this is a political act; the government of the day would have to be committed to it, but I really believe that the Workmen's Compensation Board has a role to play, as my colleague Dr. Bounsall was saying, in urging change upon the government of the day, regardless of what that government be. I think that's where the board has not done its job, in ensuring that there are changes made. This would be one of them.

The chairman has no problem with this. I don't think this chairman would see it, but others perhaps would, as a form of creeping socialism that was going to destroy the free enterprise system. There may be some of your colleagues who would. But what it really is, is a way to dispense justice to injured workers, no matter where they are hurt.

The main purpose of a comprehensive compensation system is the following—and I'd like to put it in almost a formal way: to promote the rehabilitation of earners who suffer personal injury by accident, wherever the accident might occur; to promote the rehabilitation of anyone who suffers personal injury by a motor vehicle accident so as to seek to restore all such earners and persons to the fullest physical, mental, social, vocational and economic usefulness of which they are capable; and, further, to make provision for the compensation of earners who suffer personal injury by accident and of every person who suffers personal injury by a motor vehicle accident and certain dependants of those earners and persons whose death results from the injury.

That would be the purpose of a compensation system, to compensate people irrespective of fault or where the accident occurred. That's the basic, fundamental purpose of a comprehensive social insurance scheme.

What I'm saying to you is that, by taking the adversarial aspect out of the system, we would remove punishment from the system. That's a tough word, but at the present time we really do punish people who get injured

—people who are contributing to our society in a way that most of us agree they should.

In our system it's good to work; that's the work ethic we live with. It's insane, then, that we punish people who are injured as a result of working. It doesn't make any sense at all. I don't know how anyone can live with this kind of compensation system in good conscience when we know it's wrong to punish people who get injured because of working. That's simply not fair.

Another quote from the Woodhouse commission in New Zealand:

"Just as a modern society benefits from the productive work of its citizens, so should society accept responsibility for those willing to work but prevented from doing so by physical incapacity. Since we all persist in following community activities which year by year exact a predictable price in bodily injury, so should we all share in sustaining those who become the random, but statistically necessary, victims. The inherent cost of these community purposes should be borne as a basis of equity by the community."

What they're saying is that people live their lives and take part in community activities; they drive to and from work and to and from functions in their community. By being part of the community, they expose themselves to injury and become the inevitable random statistic that gets hurt.

That says there should be a community responsibility for people who are part of our community who get injured. I think that's a very important principle from which to begin. If you begin from that principle, you say it doesn't make sense to cover people who get injured on the job but not people who are in the community doing normal things. They are not covered. That is why the comprehensive system is so important.

Another reason it makes so much sense is the whole question of accident prevention. If you had a central body called a comprehensive social insurance system, you would have a central body that could assemble statistics on who got injured. I think it would help tremendously in something like back problems where you could take a very close look and compensate people for back problems. There may be a relationship between people's jobs and the activities they carry on in their everyday life. How do you separate that out? If a person is a miner and does prospecting part-time because of his interest in mining, why should it be separated if he gets hurt when he is prospecting?

I will get to the question of who pays in a moment, but in principle it doesn't make sense. All sorts of people pursue hobbies

based on the kind of job they have. That is another reason. There could be a central data gathering body through this comprehensive social insurance system that would analyse all accidents and see the relationship between injuries and back problems and so forth.

I know there is always that question in people's minds out there—and this is where the board gets itself in trouble too—and that is, how many people would beat the system. A certain number of people will beat any system, but you don't design the system based on that fact, you design it based on the fact that most people don't. Surely you don't cater to that kind of lowest common denominator theory of social policy.

An orthopaedic surgeon from the States was talking about this problem of who beats the system and he said, "Most of the patients whom we used to call malingerers are not that at all, they are frightened individuals. They are afraid they are never going to be able to hold down a good job again, and hence are worrying about how they are going to support their families. To overcome this is a challenge to every doctor who has to deal with compensation injuries. Even our private patients experience a good deal of that same worry."

There is a real problem with an attitude at the board that people are trying to beat it. That is a lot of the reason why we get hang-ups on claims, particularly recurrence of claims. I think most of us know that if someone gets injured there is a greater risk of a delay in the settlement of a claim if it is a recurrence than if it is an original injury. That inevitably happens.

Then of course there is the question of efficiency. What makes a system efficient? In terms of cost, I believe the Workmen's Compensation Board in Ontario is efficient. I believe its administrative costs are only about six per cent or seven per cent, as you said in your opening remarks. I believe that to be an efficient operation in terms of costs. It is certainly much better than the private automobile insurance industry has ever been able to do where the cost of administration is up around 20 or 25 per cent. The balance is paid out in claims. Here you are paying out 94 per cent of your costs to injured workers.

I see no problem with this comprehensive system being any different in terms of efficiency because that is basically what you have got. There is no competition to pay injured workers. Right? You have a monopoly on the compensation of injured workers in

Ontario. That means you have been able to realize a lot of the efficiencies of a monopoly. Although people tend to be nervous about monopolies, in certain social areas like this, they are better. I see the same thing applying if you broaden it to include accident insurance in the home and automobile insurance. You would have one large policy. [12:00]

Saskatchewan had a task force a year or so ago. They already have public auto insurance so it's a little different, but they said what they should do is establish, first of all, a sickness and accident program to go alongside the public auto insurance which sits beside the compensation system in Saskatchewan. You've got three of them operating independently. They don't now, but they're recommending there be a sickness and accident one. So you'd have three systems set up: compensation, automobile, and sickness and accident for injuries not covered under the other two. When they all get operating and the sickness and accident one gets going smoothly, at the opportune time you put them together and therefore have a comprehensive social insurance system. That's the way it should be done.

A person would get injured, would file for compensation and would be paid. It would be decided internally which piece of the pie it came from, because when it comes to funding the system, the automobile drivers would still pay their levy, the employers would still pay their levy and the sickness and accident part would be paid for either by premiums or by a general tax levy. I could see the dispute would be adversarial internally among the three groups, but not with the worker being the adversary. The one who can least afford to be in an adversarial position would be spared that. That's what is so good about a comprehensive system.

I feel very strongly that's the direction in which we have to move. It would certainly help if the compensation board would start pushing in that direction too because I believe there's a natural reluctance on the part of a conservative private enterprise kind of government, which we have in Ontario, to implement something like that because they would see it as expansion of the public sector. They'd see it as a socialistic kind of measure that they wouldn't be comfortable with, when in fact that's the wrong basis for deciding whether or not you're going to have this kind of system in the province. I would encourage the board to do something on that.

I'd like to close this part of my remarks by outlining the kind of system we'd like to have. It has seven points:

1. Immediate compensation to every injured person irrespective of fault or whether the accident occurred on the highway, at work, on public or private property;

2. The scheme to be financed by the whole community from a levy on employers, on salaries and wages paid, from a levy on operators of motor vehicles and as appropriate from universal premiums and/or general revenues;

3. Injured persons to receive compensation both for permanent physical disability and for income losses on an income-related basis with regular adjustments to the level of payments to allow for inflation;

4. Similar compensation to be paid to those who are incapacitated by illness;

5. The right of court action based on fault to be abolished;

6. The Workmen's Compensation Act to be repealed and private carriers to be excluded in the field of accident and sickness coverage except for supplementary coverage;

7. Death benefits so as to ensure continuing and adequate income for surviving dependants.

That's one of our policies of which I am the most proud as a New Democrat. That's the system I would encourage the chairman to pursue, to lean on the Minister of Labour (Mr. Elgie). I know he doesn't have problems with it personally because of comments he has made both publicly at meetings and also when he was on the commission that looked into the system before he became chairman. I know that's not what's holding him back.

The only other two comments I wanted to make, stepping back from the comprehensive system for a moment, are about this question of increases in the level of benefits. I think Saskatchewan has a good arrangement, and I introduced a private member's bill and we debated it last year in the Legislature. This was last June. What I suggested—and I took it right from the Saskatchewan one, I didn't dream it up myself—was that in any given year, of the number of people who make claims to the board, any time 10 per cent of them exceed the maximum that's allowable now, it be bumped up \$1,000 so as to take the number down below 10 per cent. What's the maximum now in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It's \$16,200.

Mr. Laughren: If 10 per cent of them had earnings of more than \$16,200, you would bump up the maximum to \$17,200. Then, when 10 per cent exceeded \$17,200, you'd bump it up to \$18,200—or whatever the level

was at that time. I think that would be a good, automatic way to do it. It would take it out of the political arena as well, so you wouldn't have to get it before the Legislature every year. It is difficult getting legislation before the House sometimes. So, in other words, it would take it away from the whim of any particular Labour minister who, at any given time, might not be so disposed to give increases to injured workers.

The other thing is this. A couple of years ago we had an NDP task force on the compensation board. That was in 1977; two years ago. We went across the province and listened to injured workers in a number of communities. We presented a report and even the chairman at the time commented that it was a very reasonable report. I think he expressed surprise because there was very little rhetoric in it—very little hostility. It was a very reasoned report. There were a number of recommendations in that report. None was outrageous. None would have bankrupted the employers in Ontario. But you haven't implemented them. I wonder if I could, just very quickly, highlight the main ones. I won't go over them all.

1. That the Workmen's Compensation Board be decentralized. That's being looked at, anyway.

2. No benefits or pensions should be reduced without at least two weeks' notice in writing to the compensation recipient and the reasons for the reduction or termination must be fully explained.

3. Vocational rehabilitation must be related to what the injured worker needs to establish an alternative vocational career. It must no longer be related to the degree of disability. That's a major problem.

Others:

Every injured worker must be informed of his right to vocational rehabilitation when it becomes apparent that a degree of permanent disability is the result of an industrial accident or disease. In some cases, we found people didn't even know they had a right. It's a right under the act to have rehabilitation. It's not a privilege.

Also, a committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board, trade unions, employers and injured workers' organizations, should establish a committee to investigate the entire problem of back injuries. I know there was a committee on back injuries. If it has reported, or if it has made recommendations and the board has adopted them, it is not solving the problem. That's a really tough one.

A committee should be set up to investigate ways and means to require employers

to hire injured workers. I don't know whether there's a quota system or not but something has to be done to help.

Medical rehabilitation centres should be established in several locations other than Toronto. The board should consider such centres as Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Windsor and Ottawa in order to have a decentralized system of medical rehabilitation. You had such a beautiful opportunity in Sudbury to do it with the former Burwash prison there—the big gym and housing facilities and everything. It's still sitting there empty. You could do that there. We're not talking about the highly specialized aspect of rehabilitation. We're talking about the more general ones—back problems and that sort of thing. You really did have an opportunity. I've been through the Laurentian Hospital. There's a section there but that's not the kind of thing we're talking about. A large number of people still come down to Toronto.

Also, in addition to providing regular medical rehabilitation, each of the centres should be encouraged to develop expertise, through research projects, in the medical problems related to employment in the area. For example: in Thunder Bay, it would be problems related to working in the woods industries—forestry, pulp and paper. In the Sudbury area, it would be to work on problems related to the mining industry—in particular, low back problems and that kind of thing, and perhaps some of the respiratory problems as well.

Finally, and the most important one of all, the board must operate under its motto, "Justice humanely and speedily rendered." Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would appreciate a response.

Hon. Mr. Starr: May I make a comment, Mr. Laughren, about your presentation? I would like to say that, regarding all those points you read out to us just now—the recommendation of your task force in 1977—with the exception of the second to the last one, we have moved on all of them. We have moved and made some progress, actually on every one of those suggestions.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe you could give some elaboration on that.

Mr. Laughren: I'm a little confused. By moving on it, do you mean that you have a committee looking at these things?

Hon. Mr. Starr: On decentralization, we're moving on that. On trying to get jobs for workers, it's a year now since we established a special division to move in that direction,

with quite good success. I've just quoted from memory. Those are some of them.

Mr. Laughren: There are still people having their benefits reduced, and so forth, without notice. Don't even put up your hand, Mr. Kerr; don't even put up your hand. I can remember the pious promises to ensure that no workers would be reduced without prior notice. Don't do it to us again.

On the whole question of the right to vocational rehabilitation, has there been a change of policy on informing—

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes, we've been doing that in all aspects of the rights of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Through our communications department, we've launched upon a program to advise people. We're printing pamphlets based on the recommendation of the ombudsman—I think Mr. McClellan can vouch for that—in all the languages et cetera.

Mr. Laughren: It's not happening, though; that's what we're saying.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It's being prepared now.

Mr. McClellan: It's notification we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Let's get the facts straight. Ask Mr. Kerr—

Mr. Laughren: You listen to Mr. Kerr, then; it's going to be painful.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, as a result of a suggestion that was made in this committee a couple of years ago, we did put out a directive concerning the termination of compensation retroactively; it is in the book there, the book that has the claims administrative directives on page 60-A.

In most instances compensation is terminated on the basis of medical information contained in the doctor's progress report, which is the form 26 that you're all familiar with, or on oral reports received from the employer or the employee indicating that the man has returned to work.

But there are other cases where compensation is discontinued or reduced even though the employee has not yet returned to work. Such action could result from an asbestos report, where the man has been sent to a specialist to determine his present condition and whether he's fit for work, and it may take some time for that report to be typed up and sent to us.

What happened and brought this to our attention a number of years ago was—I forget which one of you gentlemen brought it to our attention, but I know it was one of you—we were receiving the report and then reducing or cutting off the man's com-

pensation retroactive to the date he was seen by the doctor. That wasn't fair, because in that instance the doctor had not told the man to return to work. We introduced the policy and practice that in that instance we continue full compensation.

When the report comes in, it's evaluated by the claims adjudicator or the medical adviser at the board. If it's determined that the man is fit for work, he is sent a letter telling him that compensation will be reduced or terminated, whichever it is, and the reasons are given in that letter; his compensation isn't affected retroactively.

If this has happened in a recent case, it has been an error, and I would appreciate hearing about it. We agreed 100 per cent, and we put across to our staff, that this is not a fair thing to do.

Mr. Laughren: Perhaps we could pursue this further under claims, because I've cut into Mr. Wildman's time.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I would be delighted to.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Chairman, under the main administration I would like to ask a couple of questions first about the board's—I was going to say propaganda, but I won't; I'll say its advertising program.

What bothers me specifically is a television ad I've seen which shows what looks to be a farm kitchen. There's a gentleman in his bib overalls sitting in a chair, and there's a lady preparing dinner or something; they're concerned about the fact that he hasn't received his compensation cheque. The wife says to the husband, "Why don't you give them a call?" So he gets up, makes a phone call, sits down and has some coffee; then the phone rings, he gets up and says "The cheque's in the mail?" and hangs up. facetiously, I wonder how long it is between those two calls. At any rate, I would like to know, first, the purpose of that ad as far as the board is concerned and, two, how much did it cost to produce and to air?

[12:15]

Hon. Mr. Starr: Well, I should give the opportunity of answering to Mr. Errol Weaver, our director of communications.

Interjections.

Mr. Van Horne: How many of these people are on your staff?

Hon. Mr. Starr: All but a few at the back there.

Mr. Van Horne: So, it is either the staff or the NDP research staff?

Mr. Wildman: No, there is no NDP research here.

Mr. Riddell: Certainly if the advertisement is no good, why use farmers?

Mr. Wildman: Well, I don't know whether he is a farmer or he just looks like a farmer.

Mr. Weaver: Mr. Chairman, the advertising campaign the member refers to began as a result of a survey we took in 1978. It indicated to us there was a considerable lack of information in the public sector on some of the details of the board's programs and its procedures, so we did develop an ad campaign. The one you refer to says in the voice-over, if you consider just the audio portion, "If you have a question about workmen's compensation or pension the answer is not far away. We have 14 offices in Ontario ready to help you and they are equipped to find out the facts fast."

Mr. Wildman: There is one thing I wanted to know. Could you tell me just before I go on, because we don't have much time here, how much that cost to produce and how much it is costing to air?

Mr. Weaver: The entire ad campaign, which involves television throughout the province, radio throughout the province and print in all areas where we have area offices—because the print campaign involves contact with the local offices—cost \$600,000. It ran from September 1978 until last weekend; the campaign ended on March 24.

Mr. Wildman: Okay.

Mr. Laughren: In Sudbury 600 miners threw their crutches through the sets when that ad came on.

Mr. Martel: How long is it between the phone calls? I'm interested because—

Mr. Wildman: In relation to that ad and the explanation we have had about the voice-over—and it really was to explain that there are local offices and that you can get information quickly and so on—I would just like to point out it is my experience that since the local office opened in Sault Ste. Marie—and I supported the opening of that office, and I think the people there work hard—but all they do is they check with the computer. They can check with Toronto and they get the computer and the computer says something. They were lucky on that one because the computer came back and said his cheque was in the mail. What happened, though, is sort of like a Wintario thing—

Mr. Weaver: The ad is not intended to display a specific case. It's intended to get the impression across to the public they can get the answers by contacting the local office. In order to put that concept across the ad was

created in that way, and I think it is very effective.

Mr. Wildman: Oh, I think it is quite effective. I just wanted to say it is my experience that in many cases when they contact a local office the poor guy there is tearing his hair out because he doesn't know what the hell is happening in Toronto with that particular case. As a matter of fact, I have had individuals come to me and I have said, "Well, have you contacted the local office?", and they have said, "Yes, and they said to come to you because they can't get anything out of Toronto."

Interjection.

Mr. Wildman: I didn't mention anyone's name. That is hearsay, anyway, because I didn't get it from the person at the board.

The other thing I would like to refer to is this WCB report, which I think comes out quarterly.

Mr. Weaver: Yes.

Mr. Wildman: The one I am thinking of is the autumn 1978 issue which dealt with rehab. It is very ironic because just as this came out there was an individual named in it, a Mr. La Fleur—he had a job in Sault Ste. Marie but he lives in my riding—and a nice picture at the bottom with the two rehab people and he is smiling and he has got a job in the parks department and everything is wonderful. What was ironic about this was that this individual, just prior to the publication of this piece of material, was out of a job. He didn't have a job in that parks department any more. As a matter of fact, he had received a letter from the Workmen's Compensation Board stating they didn't think he was entitled to rehab.

Mr. McClellan: Take that to Frank Drea for false advertising.

Mr. Weaver: When the story was prepared the facts were correct. I am sorry, I don't know the case so I don't think I—

Mr. Wildman: We went to the board afterwards—I don't want to deal with the particular case—and we spent a whole afternoon there, my assistant and the individual. We went to a lot of different offices, talked to a lot of different people. Each time we raised the matter they looked over the case, if they could get hold of it, or we waited until they could, and then we looked over it and they said, "Well, it says he doesn't have a great enough disability for this." Then I would show them this. They would then back up and say, "Maybe we had better look at it again."

Anyway, they say they have reopened his case and are reviewing it. There is no decision on it as yet.

Just in relation to rehab in general, I would like to make a couple of comments. One of the problems we have in northern Ontario is that when a person has been injured and he is told by his physician or by the board that he can do light duty, there isn't very much light duty. It is a problem we have right across northern Ontario.

I have a situation in Hornepayne where an individual was hit in the face with a sledgehammer. He isn't getting disfigurement for some reason so we are going to appeal on that; neither do I think he has been assessed for psychological disability, but he does have some difficulty working now because it seems every time someone raises his arm he ducks. He is quite reticent about getting involved.

Anyway, he has been told he can do light duty. But there is very little light duty in Hornepayne. It is a railway community. There is a lumbering company where he used to work. There is just not much there, so there is nothing there for him.

The question is, if he so-calls "refuses" to do light duty, is he going to be cut off or is he going to have to keep up the charade of going around looking for jobs in Hornepayne that are light duty? It is something that has to be dealt with in small communities in northern Ontario. Even in larger communities there is not very much light duty. I would really like the board to do something about that.

I have another case. We had the chairman telling us how they are trying to speed up claims so that we don't have long periods when people are waiting, so that they can call and get information, as it says in the ad, and so on, and they will have their claims resolved.

I have a case here—and I am just using these as examples—where we went to a hearing in June. Subsequent to that hearing it was decided by the people hearing the appeal that they needed further information. So the board wrote a letter in July to—I think a chiropractor was involved in this case—requesting further information.

I didn't hear anything from the worker. He had gotten used to waiting a long time and anyway he was back to work so that it wasn't as if he was out of money completely—he just was claiming for previous back time. I didn't hear anything further, but I met him in December and I asked him, "What happened? It must have worked out because I didn't hear from you." He said,

"No, I never heard anything again from them." So we got in touch with the board. They couldn't find his file at first. Then they said, "We didn't get that information yet from the letter we wrote in July." Why on earth didn't you write the guy back between July and December to ask him for information?

They did write a letter on January 2, after we talked to them, and asked for the information. There is still no decision on that case. That is from June to January—to March now. These are individual cases, but I wonder.

One other area I want to talk about is the board's process in terms of perusing files. I really don't understand why you have to file for an appeal before you can go and look at the file. It seems to me kind of ridiculous. I know we don't like to talk about an adversary system, but if you use the analogy of law it would seem inconceivable to me that a lawyer would file for an appeal before seeing the evidence. It seems to me he would have to look at the evidence before deciding whether or not he is going to file for an appeal, but we have to write a letter saying we intend to appeal before we can go and look at the file.

Interjection.

Mr. Wildman: It doesn't make sense. I would like the board to consider changing that policy to a far more sensible and logical one so an advocate for an injured worker—if he be a member of Parliament or whatever—will have the right to peruse the file. I know there is concern about protecting medical information, protecting the patient and so on but if the person is actively working on behalf of that worker and has a consent form from that worker—that patient—then he or she should be allowed to peruse the file before deciding whether or not to appeal. It is ridiculous that you can file for appeal and go and look at the file and say, "Gee, we don't have any evidence here." It is just ridiculous, so I would like the board to change that.

In terms of appeals themselves, I would like to know something about this board's policy with regard to surgical consultants. It seems to me sometimes when there is medical controversy at an appeal, the board will consider it and they will refer medical evidence to a surgical consultant for scrutiny, analysis and opinion. It seems questionable to me how a medical practitioner of any type can make a decision simply on written evidence without even having seen the patient. That is something I would like to have answered.

Secondly, I would like to know why the worker or the patient, or his physician, who has given the other information that this person is looking at, does not have the time or the opportunity for due process, that is for arguments against the position taken by the surgical consultant or for submissions on the surgical consultant's position. In other words, why doesn't the worker and his advocate and/or physician have access to the advice given to the board by the surgical consultant, and why isn't the appeal reopened when a decision is going to be made on that kind of evidence so someone has the right to make submissions on it?

I have a lot of other stuff, Mr. Chairman, but I will have to bring it up, I suppose, when we get to the particular issues here. These are policy questions. I wanted to raise questions regarding the amount of compensation benefits and how they are determined, and also on the whole question of scarfers, but I notice the minister isn't here and I was hoping he would be. At any rate, I will leave those until later. I would like, if we can, to get some response to the matters I have raised.

[12:30]

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'd like to leave the first one, the file availability prior to the filing of an appeal, for an answer, maybe this afternoon. I wonder if Dr. McCracken could talk about the surgical consultant.

Dr. McCracken: I'm rather limited in what I can say about this because you are obviously speaking about a case that is in the appeal system.

Mr. Wildman: No, I'm talking about any case, generally.

Dr. McCracken: No, I mean a case. In other words, an appeal system situation. Under those circumstances, the role of my medical staff is extremely limited, if indeed they participate at all.

What happens, however, is that if the commissioners hearing the appeal are of the opinion that a further medical opinion is required and that the file should be reviewed, then from time to time they will indeed ask the appropriate consultant at the board to identify a person whom they consider to be an extremely senior, knowledgeable expert in that particular field, for instance, orthopaedics. Having made that identification, then the arrangements are made to have that particular outside specialist examine the file and the materials in it.

People of that calibre with their experience, I would submit, are in a position to

take the medical reports from the family physician, from the other specialists who have seen the person during the course of the injury and treatment and come up with a very valid evaluation. By and large, it is not necessary to carry out yet another examination. From time to time, after they have reviewed the file, they will come to the conclusion that there is something obscure and they do want to see the patient. Under those circumstances, arrangements are so made that they will be able to carry out consultation.

Mr. Wildman: Frankly, I find it very hard to understand, when someone has been referred to a well known specialist in a particular field who has examined the person and has made a recommendation to the board and that evidence is used in an appeal, why you would go to another specialist who may also be well known, and I am sure is, and have him evaluate the evidence. Perhaps he may give advice to the board in opposition to what the other specialist has said without even seeing the patient. I mean one has seen the patient, the other hasn't.

Dr. McCracken: That really, as I say, has no bearing on the final decision because these people are of such stature they really don't have to go through all the routine of carrying out an examination on the patient except under circumstances where they so indicate. The fact is that the board is attempting to gather a preponderance of expert medical opinion. Incidentally, the opinion expressed by the treating family physician is indeed taken into consideration and his reports are examined by the consultant who is brought into the case.

Mr. Wildman: I know that. I'm talking about the fact that when he considers that but he also considers another specialist.

Dr. McCracken: That's quite correct.

Mr. Van Horne: To the injured worker, it looks as though the board is looking around to find somebody who will disagree.

Mr. Wildman: That's exactly right. I don't want to get into the medical argument about that except to ask about one case. Is it always the case, let's say in a back injury, that if it is referred to a surgical consultant the person who makes a decision is an orthopaedist or is it ever the case that a specialist in some other field makes a decision on a back problem?

Dr. McCracken: Certainly, we receive many opinions and very valuable opinions, not only from family physicians but in more particular from people trained in general

surgery rather than being trained specifically—

Mr. Wildman: No, I'm talking about the people you use as your surgical consultants.

Dr. McCracken: The people who are used now in the type of case that you are talking about, it is the appeal system that is using this specialist not the medical branch. Having said that, it would be totally illogical for them to refer a complex orthopaedic problem to an internist specializing in chest or heart disease or it would be totally irrational to say under the same set of circumstances, "We will refer this case to a general surgeon," because if the specific problem is orthopaedics, the people who are considered to be the most expert in orthopaedic matters are indeed orthopaedic surgeons. If the matter appears to be a problem in neurology, then it should be a neurologist. If a matter appears to be psychiatry, it should be a psychiatrist.

Mr. Wildman: I would certainly agree it would be irrational to do that. What I'm asking is, does the board do it?

Dr. McCracken: Not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Wildman: There is no case where a gynaecologist, say, might make a decision on an orthopaedic problem?

Dr. McCracken: That would be most interesting. I would think that he would be stepping so far out of his field that—

Mr. Wildman: If we can supply that kind of information to you I'm sure you'll give us some kind of an opinion on that.

The other matters I suppose I'll have to leave until we get to the particular area.

Hon. Mr. Starr: If you wish, we can deal with them. With your first suggestion, Mr. Wildman, that in your opinion a file should be made available to a designated representative of a claimant prior to filing an appeal, it may be that after perusing the file that person may say there's no point in appealing the thing.

Mr. Wildman: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It may save time for both them and us. I think that's a very good suggestion. You can rest assured that we'll give that consideration.

Mr. Hamilton: would like to answer the question of surgical consultants as they apply in the appeal area.

Mr. Hamilton: With reference to the real point you made about the surgical consultants, where we get a bundle of evidence at appeals from various sources, the family doctor, a hospital, and so on, when we get all the evidence on the table we refer that to the surgical consultants for an analysis of all

the medical opinion and ask them to pull it together for us in a medical way. But, if it is going to significantly affect the decision it's been my practice, at least—and I think that of most of my colleagues—that whoever the rep is he would be made aware of the opinion of the surgical consultant before the decision was made, and we would ask him to comment on it. Maybe not in all cases, but in significant cases where we think it is going to have an impact we would ask for the comments of the advocate in that particular case.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think that answers your questions, Mr. Wildman.

Mr. Chairman: We will now adjourn until 2 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 12.36 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. Chairman: I will call the meeting to order.

I think Mr. Van Horne wanted to ask a few questions about what had been presented just before we adjourned at noon.

Mr. Van Horne: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are dealing with section 1, as I understand it, main administration. I have a couple of observations that perhaps should have been made in my introductory comments last night but were not made at that time; because I think they do come under the general heading of administration, I would like to take this opportunity to make these points.

The first point is that in a fair number of the difficult cases you deal with, the eight to 10 per cent that causes concern for members of the Legislature, for constituency offices and certainly for your staff, I gather that a fair bit of correspondence takes place. Aside from visits to constituency offices, or from us to the regional office, and aside from the telephone calls, you do write a lot of letters; I would have to assume that.

My point in raising the issue of correspondence is that when a recipient of funds or cheques from the Workmen's Compensation Board, or a person who is in receipt of some correspondence from WCB, is directed to come from his home to Toronto, or is dealt with in any way in which he is given some direction, I would submit that out of courtesy you should give an indication of the reason to that person.

I have in front of me a letter directed to a Mr. LaBlanc, one of my constituents. It says in the first two lines, "You are requested to report to the reception desk, 14th floor, 2 Bloor Street East, Toronto, for examination."

To my knowledge, the examination has already taken place. The rest of the letter is form, as far as I can determine: "An appointment has been made for you at 10 a.m. Transportation warrant is attached," and so on; that is straightforward stuff. But, aside from those two words in the opening lines, "for examination," there is no other explanation as to why this person is being recalled.

[2:15]

He was concerned enough to come to me on Monday of this week to seek some information because he wasn't able to get it in calling the office in London. My point is if you are corresponding with a person, out of courtesy can you give enough detail in the letter so that he or she would understand what he or she is being called to Toronto for? I think that's a reasonable request.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think that's a very legitimate suggestion. Thank you very much for bringing it to our attention. We'll try to correct that.

Mr. Van Horne: Thank you. The other general administrative complaints that we have come from the inconsistency in information that seems to happen on occasion between a regional office and central office. I have an example that happened fairly recently. My secretary neglected to put the name in here, so I'll have to give you the specific detail afterwards, but I think the complaint has come to us often enough to draw it to your attention.

The claimant was unable to find why a decision was not given or why a decision was delayed on calling the local office. Not being satisfied with that, on calling Toronto, he immediately got an answer. The credibility then of the local office in London was left up in the air. In fact, the point put to me was, "Don't they know what's going on?" I would have to submit that there may be some case made for the file being lost or difficult to find. I understand that 48 hours is not an uncommon period of time for a file to have to be located. It may be that the London office couldn't locate it. Again, we have good cooperation from the people in the London office, but in this type of complaint there is a breakdown in the information available for the claimant in London versus what he or she gets when they call Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think that Mr. Kerr has made a note of this and he will try to bring about a better liaison. If there's any breakdown in liaison between the London office and the Toronto office, we want to know. We'll certainly try to rectify that.

Mr. Van Horne: Again, I haven't the names in the specific cases that we have, but there have been enough of these to bring it to your attention. I'll try to get the specifics later.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You might help us out if you would be kind enough to give us at least the claim numbers so that Mr. Kerr can investigate.

Mr. Van Horne: We don't do anything without the number.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We can see whether any special circumstances were involved or whatever and give you an explanation.

Mr. Van Horne: All right. On the final point—and I made a reference in general terms to this kind of thing in my comments last evening, I would go back to last July when the former ombudsman, Arthur Maloney, requested that Workmen's Compensation Board publish and make available to the public its adjudicative policies in manuals and start publishing an index of appeal decisions. In this way, injured workers—and I am almost quoting verbatim from Mr. Maloney—who are most affected by board policies would not be kept in the dark, and awareness of board policies would help them in preparing a relevant case when they must appeal their claim. I'm wondering from that point to now what consideration the board has given to that.

Hon. Mr. Starr: This matter was discussed by the select committee on the ombudsman of which Mr. McClellan—and I'm referring again to him—is a member. In that particular case, if my memory serves me right, even though I was not in attendance at all the hearings, though our Mr. Reed was, the select committee itself did not recommend to the Workmen's Compensation Board that this be carried out.

Mr. Van Horne: I'm aware of that. My concern is whether you saw any merit in it and what action has your board taken, if any, in this instance?

Hon. Mr. Starr: We've seen what British Columbia has been doing in that respect and it's been very small. It has just been in select cases. The fact is that you may not pick the type of case that the person might want for comparison purposes with his own. It seems to me, at the moment at least, that it would be a sort of futile effort.

Mr. Van Horne: Those are the only other points I wanted to make.

Mr. McClellan: I'm in the awkward position of having a couple of concerns that I

wanted to raise under administration, but I wanted to raise them with the minister rather than with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I want to say at least for the record, since I believe I'm accurate in saying this, there isn't a single, solitary soul in this room from the Ministry of Labour apart from the Workmen's Compensation Board. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Chairman. There is not a single, solitary soul from the Ministry of Labour office in this room. This is the first time in my experience in the Legislature, and I've been at every Workmen's Compensation Board estimate since I was elected, that we have not had the full-time attendance of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Labour (Mr. Elgie) informed me last night that this being cabinet meeting today he would not perhaps be here for most of the hearings. That's all I can tell you.

Mr. McClellan: I'll say again for the record, since there isn't anybody for me to say it to other than Hansard, that I think it's contemptible of the Minister of Labour to absent himself from the estimates of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Our political problems, to the extent that we have political problems with the Workmen's Compensation Board, are addressed to the Minister of Labour. I hope he will read Hansard, but he should at least have the courtesy to this Legislature of attending these estimates.

I will not present my remarks in the absence of the Minister of Labour because they fall within his area of responsibility and I'll hold most of them until he graces us with his presence if he so deigns. Maybe I could just ask a couple of questions of the chairman for purposes of information for my own understanding.

On the temporary supplement provisions out of the Workmen's Compensation Act section 42(5), I have some extended remarks that I want to make about that section but I don't want to make them in the absence of the minister. That is utterly futile since only he can bring in amendments to change inadequacies in the section.

But I want to ask the chairman, do the minimum compensation provisions of section 43 of the act apply to a benefit under section 42(5)? That is to say, if an injured worker is receiving pension plus temporary permanent/partial disability plus a supplement under 42(5) would the minimum amount of compensation provisions of section 43 apply?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I don't quite understand your question, I'm sorry.

Mr. McClellan: For example—let me put it this way—take a man who was injured in the 1960s and was receiving the minimum wage: would he qualify, so that 75 per cent of his pre-accident earnings would be below the minimum provisions under section 43 for purposes of computing his entitlement?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: His earnings have already been upgraded. If he's receiving a pension his earnings have been upgraded by the provisions of the escalation clauses—having regard for those minimums established under section 43.

Mr. McClellan: That's all I'm trying to understand. Is it impossible for somebody who is receiving the equivalent of full benefits through a combination of pension and section 42(5) supplement to receive less than the minimum as set out in section 43?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Yes, I would believe so.

Mr. McClellan: I need a little more certainty than that.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Is it a hypothetical situation you're asking about, or does it exist.

Mr. McClellan: I don't have any cases—actually, I do have a case; I'm sorry, I do have a case of a recipient who receives a pension plus a wage-loss supplement and who works at the March of Dimes and has a total income that is below the minimum wage.

My question is, does the minimum amount of compensation, as set out in section 43, apply automatically to somebody who is on a pension plus a supplement?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Not necessarily, because the pension is established on his original earnings rate and may have been escalated. The supplement may or may not bring him up to the equivalent of total disability. The degree of supplement isn't necessarily to total compensation.

Mr. McClellan: I may not understand the section then.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: If the man is being supplemented to the equivalent of full compensation—

Mr. McClellan: That's what I'm asking.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: —then he would receive—

Mr. McClellan: Automatically?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: If that proviso is there, that he is being supplemented to the full amount.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: He may have a 10 per cent pension and a ten per cent supplement; then he's not going to get the full amount.

Mr. McClellan: I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear: a permanent partial disability plus a supplement to make up the equivalent of total disability benefits; so that he would be covered under section 43.

Mr. Hamilton: You can't go below the minimum.

Mr. McClellan: As I said, Mr. Chairman, I have issues to pursue that require the presence of the Minister of Labour, and I'll have to wait until he is kind enough to make himself available to the committee.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other member have any questions to ask or do you want to go down your program here and follow it without general remarks? Mr. Bounsall?

Mr. Bounsall: Are we now on claims, the subsection on applications?

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mr. Bounsall: Two points come to mind here. I know the provisions in the act with respect to the filing of claims—when they should be entered and so on. You have that provision where, when you have an injury, you have to fill in the report form, a claim must be filed within a certain number of days, and so on. But if the worker is sent to the company first-aid station and it looks to be a little more serious than the company nurse can deal with but it is not all that serious, she does something, he works till the end of the shift, and she says, "Maybe you should see your doctor." He goes to see his doctor and he doesn't do too much more, but he wants to keep in touch; the chap keeps coming back to work when he can over the next month.

Then, all of a sudden, he finds himself in some difficulty; there is a more serious situation than prevailed at the time—certainly more serious than would cause either the nurse or he, not knowing anything much about what happens, if it's his first injury at work and he has no contact with the board to file an application. He then wakes up to the fact that they should file an application, which they do.

In those cases, even though it's a month after the accident and after the nurse has recorded his visit and he can show that he visited his doctor the next day or that evening and so on, why does it seem to take so much longer—statistically, you might prove other-

wise; I would be interested if you could—why does it seem to take so much longer to establish whether or not that person is eligible, when clearly he has got a problem as a result of it, just because he filed a month after the injury occurred, the nurse was bright enough to say, "We had better fill out that form and get it in today just in case it happens to develop into something?"

[2:30]

When you run into that delay, that later recognition that the initial injury was one that is going to cause lost time but which isn't clear until a month later, why does it seem to take so much longer to establish the eligibility for that person than if he filed it on day one?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In the example you have given, it looks as though the nurse sent him to the doctor for a check. He continued to work and was in touch with the doctor and then had to lay off. Then the employer submitted the report. That is the way I interpret the case you are putting forth.

Actually, in that case what should have happened was, as soon as the nurse sent him to the doctor, even though there was no lost time, it should have been reported to us.

Mr. Bounsall: But it didn't happen.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That is right. I am just making that point.

Mr. Bounsall: A month later they then said they should file a form 7 or whatever it is.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Although this doesn't help the injured man, I would like to put this in before I forget it. That employer would be subject to a charge under section 117(3) of the act for failure to report the accident. We would do that. That is automatic.

To answer your question, I can't really give a definite answer without knowing the circumstances, but there are two types of cases. Some are rather obvious. If it is a laceration and infection sets in, it is rather obvious that something has happened. Fortunately and usually in those cases, we have some medical evidence on file, whether it is a report or an account form or something, that gives us something from the doctor saying he was treating an infection as a result of a laceration. That is not too difficult to adjudicate.

But if it happens to be sprains or strains, which are not quite as easy, I can see cases where we might have to inquire as to the man's condition. We may have to wait until we get something from the doctor to confirm that what he is treating him for now was a result of an accident that happened a month ago.

I don't think this is a very good answer to your question, Dr. Bounsall, because I can only give a general answer. There are some that are easy to adjudicate and others where we have to get information to tie together the present disability as being a result of an accident that happened a month ago.

Mr. Bounsall: I understand your problem. You have to determine that it was done at work and what he is being treated for is a result. It has been my understanding that eventually, two or three months down the line from the time of reporting, it is all accepted. He is paid the days he has lost and he is being looked at regularly by a doctor and so on. But almost invariably, from the time of that late reporting it does take a couple of months for it to get established, whereas if he had filed on day one, as should have been done without question, then a couple of weeks after the first half day he has to take off, he gets his cheque for the half day. There seems to be an inordinate delay when there is a late filing of an accident as opposed to when it is supposed to be filed.

I know the union people who have full-time staff members in the Windsor area who run into that situation—certainly I do in my constituency office—absolutely cringe when a guy walks through either of our doors or into our offices to say, "I think I've got a compensable accident. The company nurse filed form 7 yesterday." You say, "That's good. Everything is going along fine. When did it occur?" Then he says, "Six weeks ago."

You say to the chap, "Are you having to be off work now?" He says, "Yes, exceedingly so. I was able to work yesterday but I'm not able to work today. The doctor has now said, 'Don't go back into work until Monday or Tuesday.' He is going to give me more tests on Monday." Then you know it is going to be a couple of months before he gets that first cheque for any of those days off, but you don't like to tell the worker so as not to discourage him.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: What I would like to suggest is if you have a company or a number of companies in your area which are guilty of failure to report, if we could know about it, we would be happy to send somebody in and try to rectify the situation at the beginning.

Mr. Bounsall: There is no particular pattern to a company nurse or a particular company doctor or what have you in my area who is negligent in this regard. There are a couple of employers who hate to recognize that it might be, but they still file form 7.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Sometimes on the form 7 they cast a little doubt on the claim too, which necessitates an inquiry on our behalf.

Mr. Bounsall: IODE Windsor Western Hospital is a perfect example of that. If they can cast any doubt upon any form 7 that is filed they will, because they hate to pay it out.

This leads me to my next question along the whole claims applications area. I know you file them by claim number, but would it not be useful in terms of—you say to me that if I have a feeling about a particular employer or a particular area in which there are problems to let you know.

Shouldn't the board now be making some cross-reference by employer as to the type of problem that is involved? Let me give you two specific examples. If you were able to look at the claims coming from IODE Windsor Western Hospital, I am sure on many of them you would find exactly what you have mentioned on that form—doubts expressed, almost invariably. That should tip off someone on the board that somebody better go down and talk to IODE Windsor Western Hospital and say, "Why is it only you of all the hospitals across Ontario are casting doubt upon every form 7 that you file?" That is one example.

Number two—it would pick up, I think, what is happening almost invariably with Chrysler. They are well set up to file the accident reports and so on, but their major management employee dealing with WCB claims has no hesitation telling—he doesn't hand out a press release but he has been heard to say many times: "My job is not to deny workmen's compensation or decide whether or not it is giveable; my job is just to question every one of them and try to delay benefits as long as possible."

If you looked at those things and determined by employer which ones were always, or very often, questioning whether or not the accident did occur, you would find some employers were always questioning, and some weren't always questioning, or were only occasionally questioning. You could have whatever sort of talk you would need to have; you could say to that employee who is doing that in Chrysler at Windsor: "Hey, we have now gotten to the point where we are ignoring those requests from you because you cry wolf on 80 per cent of the cases." If you are really doing a job and interested in decreasing delays that occur, you should be doing that cross-referencing by employer to pick up which employers are doing what to the detriment of the worker.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Although we do not have a system of cross-referencing at the present time, we do identify that kind of employer; an employer who constantly, for example, says: "This claim shouldn't be allowed; request an investigation." If we get to know—and adjudicators do because it gets around—that this employer asks for an investigation and questions every claim, we are not going to investigate every one of those claims because we know it is the cry-wolf syndrome. So we deal with the information we have on file; and usually the claims adjudicator calls the company and says: "Look, there is no need for us to investigate this claim. From the information we have on file it is allowable, therefore we don't see any need to investigate it."

We also have a system whereby we identify employers who are constantly late in submitting their form 7, because just collecting a penalty of a few dollars doesn't really do the job. What we want to do is get the employer to report the accident promptly. So we send out staff members, either from head office or the area office, to visit that employer and review with them their reporting mechanism, to encourage and assist them in devising a system to get the reports in to us more promptly.

So although we do not have a system at this point in time of cross-referencing them in the records so to speak, we do identify that kind of employer and we do send staff out to visit them and work with them, as you suggest.

Mr. Bounsall: Therefore, what you are saying is you do have some way, informal or not?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes. It is an informal way.

Mr. Bounsall: It is the feeling of the adjudicator in the adjudication branch as to whether, from experience, they are running into this?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's right, yes. If it is an employer who only sends in a claim once in a while, but questions every claim once in a while, we probably wouldn't identify that one, but if it is an employer who has a lot of accidents and they are questioning them all the time, and I can think of a few, we know right off the bat, okay, that's another one of the "cry wolf" reports. So we handle it in the way I have described. We just don't automatically send a claims investigator in there to investigate the claim. It depends upon the circumstances.

Mr. Bounsall: As a matter of interest, is Chrysler Windsor in that situation?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I don't know about that, sir.

Mr. Bounsall: Because this certainly is a chap—he has never said it to me, but all of the people that work in the compensation area, from the union's side and all the chief stewards and what have you, know that virtually every case—I have heard him say it—"My job is not to deny it, that's the board's decision, but I will delay it if I can."

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's the Chrysler plant in Windsor?

Mr. Bounsall: The big Chrysler Windsor plant, and he does it by questioning whether or not it occurs. He queries the accident. I suppose some accidents are so very clear-cut within the Chrysler plant that it would be unreasonable to query them—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I would think so.

Mr. Bounsall: —so he doesn't get an opportunity to query everything, but if it isn't exactly clear cut the story within the plant is, he queries it, and maybe your adjudication branch does have that on—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I thank you for bringing that up and I will check with the adjudication branch on that particular item. I thank you.

Mr. Bounsall: One other point: How many prosecutions were there last year for late filing or non-filing?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I have a few figures here. For last year, for no-lost-time claims there were 5,937 charges, and for lost-time claims 6,948.

Mr. Bounsall: Did these all result in successful collections?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Some of them are subject to appeal and I don't know how many were relieved of the charge on appeal. I would guess, and this is only a guess, maybe 10 per cent, something of that nature.

Mr. Bounsall: Would be relieved on appeal?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Probably about 10 per cent, but I am not sure of that figure. That figure is better than it was say three, four, five years ago. Under the present administration a great deal of emphasis has been placed with the employers on the importance of filing your accident report with us, and I think generally the picture is better now, despite those figures that I read to you, than it was several years ago.

When we find an employer in this position, there is no doubt about it, we work with him and some of the charges get pretty heavy. They are not just adding up to a

couple hundred dollars. In one company it was a very heavy charge and it was appealed through the appeal system itself, going beyond my purview, and the appeal panel upheld the decision that was made and that company paid a hefty charge. So it is something that we take pretty seriously.

Mr. Bounsall: Is that company then watched thereafter?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Oh, yes, sir. We list that company for review by our claims people, our claims services division people, periodically, to see how they are doing.

Mr. Bounsall: So in the claims section you do have sort of a list of companies posted or a memo that they check from time to time?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I don't know if we would call it a list, but we have a special section where they have special projects, and that is one of their projects, to do that. What we will have available to us when the integrated computer system program comes on line, that's the portion that will serve my end of the business, we will be in a much better position to take a look at all employers through computer printouts, bearing in mind we have 147,000 employers under schedule 1 of the act. The way we do it now, without a computer printout of every employer, it is pretty difficult, but in the future few years to come our computer people will be able to write a program to kick out of the computer the employers who are offensive beyond a certain point. We will set our own parameters and it will report to us the companies that have exceeded the limits that we have set. In the future we will have a much more sophisticated program to catch this sort of thing.

Mr. Bounsall: I assume you would apply the minimum fine in the first instance of late filing on an individual company?

[2:45]

Mr. W. R. Kerr: There are two charges. There's a \$25 charge for a no-lost-time claim and a \$50 charge for a lost-time claim. We haven't as yet gone above a \$25 and a \$50 charge.

Mr. Bounsall: When was that minimum figure last updated?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think about two or three years ago. What we expect to do with this computer program is if we find an employer—we're thinking on the bad side now, and we must on occasions—who is constantly an offender—this has not been discussed with the board nor has it been recommended to the board which I would have to do at the time

—we feel in claims we should be in a position to say to a firm: "Show us just cause why we shouldn't charge you \$125 and \$150 instead of \$25 and \$50? But we can't do that now because we're not sophisticated enough in our computer program to provide us with enough data and detail."

We have in mind recommending to the board in due course that we apply that kind of thing within the regulations that are laid down so that if we have a constant offender we don't just charge \$25 and \$50 but we charge a more hefty penalty.

Mr. Bounsall: You brought up again an interesting concept. You are allowed to go and apply the \$25 and the \$50 assessment levels for non-filing automatically without having to get permission to so do, I gather.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's an approved policy. The adjudicators can do that for every case.

Mr. Bounsall: But is it the policy that they cannot go beyond the \$25?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: At the present time the adjudicators are not authorized to charge more than \$25 for failure to report a no-lost-time accident and \$50 for failure to report a lost-time accident in every instance for that firm. That's how some firms—a few, not too many in this category—run up a fair sized charge because there are a number of medical aid claims they haven't reported. If they haven't reported 10 medical aid claims, that's \$250. If it's 1,000, then 1,000 times \$25 would be charged against them.

Mr. Bounsall: When you find out they haven't reported them, is this through—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: An accident.

Mr. Bounsall: How do you even discover they haven't reported a no-lost-time accident?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In every compensation case there are at least three parties. There is the employer; there is the doctor or the person who gives the care; and there's the injured person. In a no-lost-time claim the person is being treated either at a hospital or by a doctor; therefore, that hospital or doctor will submit an account to us to be paid. That's one way we find out about it.

As soon as we receive a notification of an accident from a doctor—and about 35 per cent of the first indications we have that an accident occurred are from doctors—we immediately request a report from the employer. We have a built-in safeguard there.

When there's a no-lost-time accident, the injured employee himself is very likely concerned. So there's another check. He's looking for something from us fairly shortly; and if he doesn't hear from us within a reason-

able period, experience shows that either he or someone representing him contacts us immediately. It's not left entirely up to the employer. There are checks and balances.

Mr. Bounsall: I suppose how you hear about a lost-time-accident that wasn't reported to you is that it starts to become serious, involving a lot of lost time. I guess in the first example I quoted no one thought it serious enough to report it.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: They were in error. By law, in that accident you described, as soon as the nurse sent that man to the doctor, it became a medical aid claim. The law says a medical aid claim, a no-lost-time claim, must be reported to the board. The act says that type of claim, even though there was no lost time, should be reported to us because it was a medical aid claim. We're responsible to pay the doctor for his account, as an example.

Mr. Bounsall: I want to ask your personal opinion in one area. I quite agree that the whole thrust here is to get accidents out of the workplace, but where accidents still continue to occur in the workplace you want the employers to do what they should be doing in terms of getting the man or woman in contact with the board and the people we are employing. That is achieved through higher fines.

My question is: In trying to achieve that, would it be, in your opinion, better to be able to charge a higher initial fine or a fine higher than the automatic \$25 or \$50? Would it be better to do that? It's an opinion I'm asking. Would you like to have discretion in that?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: This is my own opinion and doesn't represent the opinion of the corporate board, of course. I think it has to be a combination of both. There are employers who really have problems in reporting accidents to us. They have operations all around the province and they have a centralized reporting system, and with everything the way it is it just takes too long. So where we send somebody in to work it out, work out a system for them or help them if they want help, we find a number of them do improve. Okay, so I still would think in the future that we should be able to provide that kind of service to the employer.

I think also that when the time comes, and I don't think it's ready now, but when the time comes when we do have our computer system so that we are more sophisticated and can have the computer printouts and compare a company with other companies and be in a position to say: "Tell us why we shouldn't

be charging you a \$100 and a \$150 rather than what we're charging you now for failure to report?" I think it has a role to play as well, because I think experience also shows that when somebody suffers in the pocketbook it has a beneficial effect.

So my direct answer to you is, yes, when the time comes, which probably won't be for two years, I would expect to be recommending to the board that we be given authority to increase the penalties, but I'll have to work out a basis on which it can be done and should be done. I feel there is a strong role to play there, but I also think from the humanistic point of view we have to get in there if the employer is agreeable. If the employer doesn't want to do anything with us, all right, there's only one thing to do then and that speaks for itself. But if the employer wants some help and is willing to co-operate, then I think we should be in a position to help him solve the problem.

Now you may say: "Why do you want to do that?" I think it's important for the claims services division to have a fairly decent rapport with the employers of the province in how we deal with them and how we handle them, because we count on the employers to co-operate with our vocational rehabilitation division and we count on them for a number of things in that area. I've always taken the attitude that if we can help an employer help us adjudicate claims—not the company adjudicate claims, but help us by getting the reports in earlier, responding to our correspondence earlier, getting the earnings in to us earlier—I think we can do a better job for the injured worker of Ontario.

My answer to your question is I think there's a combination of both that we should employ at the appropriate time.

Mr. Bounsall: That appropriate time may not be for a couple of years but then that would give you the capability to make the comparisons and identifications. It might take a couple of years, but that's the time at which you would have a good enough story to an employer to justify your saying to them and having the authority to say to them: "We're going to charge you higher."

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's right, sir. I think you've summed that up nicely.

Mr. Bounsall: Just one other question if I may. I hate to be local on this—I do have examples from other places in the province, but I have more remembrances off the top of my mind about one particular situation in the Windsor area. Let me generalize it. What do you do when you have a doctor or a group of doctors in a clinic who do not keep ade-

quate medical records of treatment? Are you aware that such things occur? Let me put it that way. Is there any provision for getting at the doctor who does not keep adequate medical records?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I was just checking with the branch directors here. They confirm that we haven't run into that for a long time. What I have run into, on occasion, and this was years ago, was the situation where you were investigating a claim and the doctor would say: "Gee, I'm sorry; if I had known this was a compensation case I would have kept better records." So I think that when doctors know they're treating a possible compensable injury, they're inclined to keep more records because they know we'll be asking for information—if nothing more than the diagnosis, the treatment and that kind of ongoing information. So in our experience, we found that when doctors are treating compensation cases they tend to have better records. Now I'm not saying they all do, sir, but this has been our experience.

I just checked with my colleagues here. If I may continue: if we found that, I think I would immediately contact Dr. McCracken, the executive director of the medical services division. I'm sure he would probably arrange for one of the senior medical officers to have a chat with that doctor. We would not leave it without taking action. We would take action when and if we identified it.

Mr. Bounsall: Sometime over the next few months would you drop in on the Industrial Medical Clinic in Windsor? This is a medical clinic set up by companies in Windsor to which all of those who have helped to set it up send their injured workers whom the plant nurses, for example, determine need more attention. They are told to go to the industrial clinic.

You can't ever say that they don't take an X-ray because the odd time they do; but again, one cringes in Windsor when a chap comes to you and says: "I'm now losing time from work. I'm having this done to me and that done to me. I'm having trouble with my claim." Then you say: "Okay, who is your doctor?" He says: "I was sent to the industrial clinic." And you know they're going to have minimal records. They won't have looked at the ailment as a man's family doctor would.

You say: "Do you have a family doctor?" He says: "Yes." "Then why didn't you go to your family doctor?" "I'm going to my family doctor now but the company sent me to the industrial clinic." You wished you were right there at the time. The word is out in

all the organized plants in Windsor: "Sure, you go to the industrial clinic because the company sent you there; but as soon as you walk out of that industrial clinic, you go to your own family doctor because his checkup is going to be in much greater depth than that done by the industrial clinic."

I'm not making any charges here. But if one wants to be paranoid about it, one would almost think that this industrial clinic, set up by the companies in Windsor, has somehow received a vibe from those companies to the effect that, "if we send you a guy from the plant keep a record, of course, but we're in the game of trying to deny any compensation. Don't take X-rays if you don't really think you have to," et cetera.

Here's a guy with an obviously displaced, dislocated, broken something or other for which no X-ray was ever taken at the industrial clinic. They say: "Put your arm in a sling and if it feels okay, go back to work tomorrow." He's got a dislocated shoulder. It's not okay to go back to work tomorrow but he goes back and tries it. He books off at the end of two hours and goes home because his shoulder is sore. Then, five days later, he realizes that his sore shoulder isn't getting any better. The only medical evidence available is a record in the industrial clinic that the guy reported in with a sore shoulder and they told him to take the rest of the day off.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Right. We'll be happy to take a look at this situation.

Mr. Bounsall: It's a fairly good-sized clinic.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: There's a large volume, I gather, from it?

[3:00]

Mr. Bounsall: Oh yes, a large volume. And it doesn't apply to every doctor there. Surprisingly, there are a couple now who seem to keep decent records and will say to the guy: "Hey, maybe in addition you should go to your family doctor." That has turned up of late—or "maybe you should go and see Dr. Bernstein; there could be something more serious here."

Mr. W. R. Kerr: When Dr. McCracken and I have a chance to talk about this, if you have some examples, perhaps you could share them with us at the appropriate time to assist us in identifying the proper personnel.

Mr. Bounsall: There is only one industrial clinic in Windsor.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, I meant cases with which you might be familiar and which would assist us. I'm not suggesting that you do it

now but, if I contacted you later, do you think you could help us in that regard?

Mr. Bounsall: Yes; on those who have gone to the industrial clinic?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, that's what I am after. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. McClellan, you wanted to direct some questions to the minister.

Mr. McClellan: I won't go out of sequence; so I will save the majority of the remarks that I intended to make until I come to the item. However, there is one item that I need to raise now while the minister is here; I don't know whether he is going to be able to stay.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I understood that you made some remarks. If you think that I was not doing what is in line with the custom, I sincerely apologize. My understanding, having just confirmed it with my deputy and with the chairman earlier on, is that it was not the custom that the minister was required to be here at all times. If that is not an accurate representation of the facts as they have been given to me, then I sincerely apologize. But I have just checked that out again. I want you to know that there was no offence intended.

Mr. Bounsall: There is no legislative requirement that you attend. But I can't recall—and some of the other hearings have been much shorter than the 15 hours—where the minister has been absent for a session of it.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You know I was here last night, and I am making every effort possible to be here as much as I can. I just want you to know that there has been no intent to slight your wishes.

Mr. McClellan: I accept that. But I do think it is useful, if you are not able to be here, to have senior officials from your ministry here.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Good point.

Mr. McClellan: Let me go straight into the matter that I wanted to raise—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You always do.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask if you would give us an update on the status of the study by Dr. Gibson on foundry workers and lung cancer at Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited in Hamilton. I would like to know where the evaluation of that study is at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: As you know, following the report, I asked the board to proceed with a review of the study. Would you mind if I asked Dr. McCracken to come over to the microphone? He has been actively involved

in that. What was the name of the epidemiologist from the Canadian Cancer Society, Dr. McCracken?

Dr. McCracken: Dr. Miller.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Could you tell us what has happened since the matter was referred to Dr. Miller for his review?

Dr. McCracken: Yes. The Workmen's Compensation Board was asked to take the Dofasco document back and study it in mid-November; so we are now looking at about three and a half months. This document was an epidemiological study in foundry operations and was carried out by the medical staff at Dominion Foundries and Steel.

Mr. McClellan: Excuse me. Just so that I understand, you are talking about the Gibson study?

Dr. McCracken: That's correct. Like most epidemiological studies, it's a complicated document and not readily analysed. The day after the document was turned over to me by the Ministry of Labour, I was in contact with Dr. Miller and discussed the document with him. I told him that we were of the opinion—and Dr. Gibson, the author of the document, agreed with us—that, standing by itself, Dr. Gibson was unable, first of all, to identify what the agent might be that might be causing lung cancer; and on the basis of the study involving relatively small numbers, even though it's a large foundry operation, he was not convinced that he had sufficient numbers that he could state that there was a specific industrial disease that had been identified.

We had analysed the document by that time—the two chest disease consultants to the board, myself, the director of the medical branch, and our consultant in epidemiology, Dr. Chovil.

Mr. McClellan: I just want to understand the sequence. Who is the epidemiologist the Minister of Labour indicated in his statement to the Legislature on November 14 would be commissioned to prepare a report which would express, in the minister's words, "a professional judgement as to whether a causal relationship has been established between the working conditions at Dofasco foundry and the findings of the Gibson study concerning incidence of lung cancer among workers in that foundry"; is that Dr. Chovil?

Dr. McCracken: No, Dr. Miller. Dr. Chovil is our full-time board epidemiologist and industrial disease consultant. Having reviewed the document in the initial 24 hours after we received it, we were instructed that

we indeed should immediately proceed to evaluate.

I made contact with Dr. Miller. I explained the problem to Dr. Miller and what would be required. He is totally knowledgeable in this type of study.

His first words were: "This cannot be done quickly, as you know." I said, "Yes, I agree." I said, "My greatest concern, Dr. Miller, is whether or not you are available at this time to consider accepting evaluating the study on our behalf." Fortunately, Dr. Miller said yes, that he would make time to carry this out.

The document was transferred to him. He carried out his preliminary evaluation and reported back to us approximately three weeks later, indicating he had found a number of areas in the study where he was concerned. He felt there had been errors made in the original study; which does not reflect at all on the original authors of the document, it's just due to the nature of the type of study that they are prone to develop these errors.

He subsequently met with the author of the document in Hamilton; reviewed the document and went back and reviewed the data that had been used in the development of the original document and made the corrections.

Following this, he carried out his review and he submitted his final analysis to us approximately five weeks ago. In that document he pointed out, having made the corrections, that in his opinion there were still more lung cancers in the study than what one would expect if there was not something going on which would give rise to the development of lung cancer. He still could not identify the agent of course. He felt that unless there were some other factors which he was not aware of from the study that it must be something that had occurred in the foundry operations some time during the previous 20 or 30 years.

He had reviewed the world literature—which incidentally consisted of about four or five papers which he considered to be valid, the rest he had to exclude. On the basis of the four or five other studies and on the basis of the document from Dofasco, he came to this conclusion.

Subsequent to that we then investigated the 27 claims that had been identified in all. We have obtained the work history data, we have obtained the medical data; and we are now in the position, in conjunction with Mr. Kerr and his staff, of putting it all together to make a determination as to whether or

not we are able to identify an industrial disease peculiar to the Dofasco foundry operations that may be giving rise to certain numbers of lung cancers. That's where it stands at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: So the general principle of a relationship was established, but the extent of it is being considered.

Dr. McCracken: That is correct.

Mr. McClellan: I gather from what Dr. McCracken said that the epidemiologist, Dr. Miller, established the relationship.

Dr. McCracken: If I might just correct that, he established that in his opinion and in conjunction with the four or five other studies in the world literature there appears to be some factor that was giving rise to more lung cancers than one would expect. That is his conclusion.

Mr. McClellan: What does that mean? Does that mean you are applying the principle of benefit of the doubt in the situation of the Dofasco foundry and that you are now proceeding to investigate and determine entitlement for each of the 27 claims?

Dr. McCracken: You don't apply benefit of doubt to a scientific document; you apply benefit of doubt to the individual case. What we are doing now, in conjunction with Mr. Kerr and his senior staff, is looking at all of the 27 cases, the details behind those cases, the details as to the medical diagnoses which, of course, must be established. In conjunction with these, plus Dr. Miller's analyses of the documents, we are now in the process of determining whether or not we can develop guidelines and submit those to the corporate board for approval.

Mr. McClellan: How long is that going to take?

Dr. McCracken: I would estimate that if all goes well we are looking at a matter of the next three, possibly four, weeks.

Mr. McClellan: And at the end of three or four weeks you will have criteria before the corporate board; is that what you are saying?

Dr. McCracken: I would hope that we might have it before the corporate board before then. We possibly might have a decision from the corporate board in approximately three or four weeks.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The other problem you should probably be interested in, since Dr. McCracken said the exact carcinogenic factor still remains unsettled, is, will whatever rules the corporate board approves of apply to other foundries, and that is the next problem

that Dr. McCracken and the group will have to consider.

Dr. McCracken: The answer to that at the present time is no, we don't see how we can apply them. If we are able to develop guidelines for the Dofasco foundry operations, as nobody has any idea what the carcinogenic agent is, we are at a complete loss as to how we could ever hope to apply these guidelines to other foundry operations, that is, directly and as they stand. However, this matter also has been studied since we took over the document and currently we are developing the necessary plan of action to see if we can fingerprint, which is a term we have coined for this, other foundry operations in Ontario, if possible both past and present, if they have records left in the ones that are now out of business, so that we can then make identification and relate one foundry to the other, especially in relation to the material used in the moulds and the core binders. We think now that it has really nothing to do with the metal used, but it well might be it is related to the core binders.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Is there any research going on in that area?

Dr. McCracken: There is research being conducted in the United States at the present time on core binders, but we don't know when that will be completed. We have contacted the people involved and they can't give us any answer. As I said, however, our first step will be to identify what type of moulding materials and what type of core binders the foundries in Ontario have used at present and in the past.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to ask the minister to make a copy available to myself of the Gibson study and the Miller evaluation of the Gibson study.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Dr. McCracken, is that something you can comply with?

Dr. McCracken: As you can appreciate, this is essentially Dr. Miller's document, once again, and Dr. Miller has told me that he has intentions of publishing the report. I would have to check with Dr. Miller to make sure that this won't jeopardize his publishing of it.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Will you check on that? The Gibson report has been published in the *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, so that is available.

Dr. McCracken: That is correct, the Gibson report has been published and it is a public document.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Do you have the reference to that handy? If not, we can get it for you.

It has been published in the *Journal of Occupational Medicine*.

Mr. McClellan: I am not sure I understand the other, quite frankly. That was a report prepared at the request of, and exclusively for, the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Dr. McCracken: That is correct, on the specific understanding from Dr. Miller that he is doing this as an outside specialist and expert in this and, therefore, his findings. He wanted to have the right to publish it if he felt that it was of such value as it should be.

Mr. McClellan: I do not edit or publish a *Journal of Occupational Medicine* and I don't think the good doctor needs to have worries about infringement of copyright.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: But you never know what you might be doing shortly. There may be an election.

Mr. McClellan: I would like, and it is of enormous importance to us and to the member for—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Well, Ross, if Dr. McCracken encounters any problem I will personally speak to Dr. Miller and ask whether there is any reason it can't be done.

[3:15]

Mr. McClellan: I would appreciate that. Let me say that we will expect this matter to be resolved with the utmost speed. I don't have to remind any of you gentlemen here, from the minister to the chairman of the board to Dr. McCracken to anybody else, about what happened in this matter. The Gibson study was produced and made available in the summer of 1977. Here we are in the spring of 1979 completing work that should have taken about three and a half to four months to complete. It is an utterly intolerable situation that I don't think, because I have a certain amount of trust in this minister, will ever be repeated. But we expect those decisions to be made and to be made quickly.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I couldn't agree more.

Mr. McClellan: If we don't have decisions within three and a half or four weeks—that was the time frame given to us—you will be asked why and I am sure you will be wanting to ask yourself why.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I probably will have asked before you ask me. I would also like just to remind you that Dr. McCracken has indicated they are now trying to see whether those rules, whenever they are drawn up and approved, can be applied to other foundries because there are difficulties. That is another process he has to go through.

Dr. McCracken: That is certainly something that will not be answered in three to four weeks.

Mr. McClellan: I am not talking at this point about other foundries. I am talking about the 27 claims at Dofasco that are outstanding. Some of them have been outstanding for a long time; some of them are death benefits. There are families waiting and depending on the processing of these claims. It is one of the sorrier chapters in the history of this Workmen's Compensation Board.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I don't think the board has to share all the blame. It was a joint problem with the ministry.

Mr. McClellan: Credit where credit is due.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That's right.

Mr. McClellan: That was the major point I wanted to raise with you. I will want to talk at some length about vocational rehab when we get to that section and about some sections of the act. In less than three minutes, let me make a couple of comments to you about what has happened so far.

Firstly, with respect to the sodium Amytal matter that was raised last evening, Dr. McCracken has informed us that he will consult with the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons with respect to the legality of providing the medical record of the 1978 case. I expect the answer will be no from Dr. McCracken. I want to ask you, both as minister and as a doctor, to review all of the cases—I think six were cited over the last couple of years—in which sodium Amytal has been administered to injured workers at the HNRC and Downsview and to report back to us on your own view on the appropriateness of that particular treatment and of the appropriateness of the way in which that treatment is being administered at the HNRC.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think there is nothing that prevents me from doing that. There goes Sunday but that is all right. What are you doing this Sunday?

Mr. McClellan: I am canvassing in Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I thought you might be.

Mr. McClellan: Secondly, I would like you to look at Hansard where we talked a little bit about the absence of statistics around current cases involving back injuries when the chairman of the board was talking about the back program. We asked some questions about the adequacy of the program in view of the demand, the numbers of people who needed the service, and it turned out from Dr. McCracken they have no statistics at all as to how many people currently being ser-

viced by the board have back injuries that could benefit from the program.

You need to look with senior officials of the board at some fairly basic administrative shortcomings in the operation of this board. I just ask you to review the Hansard and then to pursue that.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That's all in Hansard, is it Ross?

Mr. McClellan: Yes. Thirdly, I'd like to ask you right now, in light of a lengthy discussion that Ted Bounsall had with the chairman of the board and Mr. MacDonald, whether you intend to bring in a cost of living amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act which will compensate injured workers for the cost of living increase in 1978-79 and will, as well, make up shortcomings in 1977 which weren't granted in the previous amendments?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, is that an assumption that there were shortcomings I wasn't here for—

Mr. McClellan: That's our assumption.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The question of whether or not there should be some regular upgrading of the pensions on an annual basis is one that was put in the Wyatt report and that whole report has been put to two committees. One is an internal committee that's reviewing all of the items that were proposed in the Wyatt report and also the Wyatt report has been referred by me to the joint consultative committee for their views on it.

In addition to that, as I'm sure you know, the pensions committee is now sitting and their judgement is expected within the next two or three months I understand. When all of that material is before me then I'll be making a submission to the cabinet.

Mr. McClellan: All right. But that sounds distressingly familiar. I have my own version about the purposes of the Wyatt report and the causes of the problems that led to the commissioning of the Wyatt report related to the size of the board's unfunded liability and the refusal of the board to provide an assessment adequate to fund the compensation program as an insurance program.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think they came out looking pretty good on that though.

Mr. McClellan: They still have about, off the top of my head, in excess of \$300 million in unfunded liabilities.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: What was the final view on your unfunded liability? I thought that you came out—

Mr. McClellan: But let's not digress into the unfunded liability because I am not—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I didn't bring it up.

Mr. McClellan: I am not accepting problems with respect to unfunded liability as an excuse for letting injured workers suffer the ravages of inflation. You can run it through whatever series of committees you like. My constituents who are on workmen's compensation are entitled to an adequate adjustment for the ravages of inflation. Period. That's the only thing I'm interested in.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think that the minister responded to that last June with the introduction of legislation which did allow for those things over a three-year period.

Mr. McClellan: After a three-year wait in which enormous suffering was endured.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: All I can tell you is that—

Mr. McClellan: I understand the problems you have with your cabinet colleagues, but I would like an assurance from you that you will go to bat for the injured workers of this province and proceed, at the end of the current session at the latest—that is to say by June 1979—to bring in an amendment which will grant an adjustment for the cost of living increase since the previous amendment incorporating shortcomings in the amendments between 1975 and 1978.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The only commitment I can give you is that I will review the studies that are going on now when I receive them, and make some representations to cabinet as a result of those. That's the only commitment I can give you.

Mr. McClellan: If I could have an assurance, and I take that as an assurance, that you will take a recommendation to cabinet, that's all I can ask you to do.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It is one of several items that are being reviewed by committees, that's all.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any more discussion on claims?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Close the door, will you?

Mr. Martel: Yes. We're going to be here for a while.

Mr. McClellan: I was just stalling.

An hon. member: You were just stalling so he could get in here.

Mr. Martel: Just arrived on time.

An hon. member: Does the barber know you're here?

Mr. Martel: Not yet. I had to put him off. He's looking for me.

Mr. Lane: Why not have your hair cut now?

Mr. Martel: It will wait. It's waited this long; it can wait a few more hours.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Think of me as your doctor and treat me well.

Mr. Martel: My argument is with the board. I hope they don't take offence.

Mr. Lane: They never have in the past.

Mr. Martel: Oh, they have. As late as last night. I continue to be mystified—I really do—at what's going on.

In five months—a very careful tabulation—my riding office has handled 290 cases. Those are not cases where we just talked to the individual. We didn't include those—where people came in and asked for advice and information.

In September 1978, we had a caseload of 72 cases for the month. In October we had 48 cases and in November we had 65 cases. In December we had 43 cases—we were only open three weeks. I gave my assistant a week off for Christmas. In January we had 62 cases, for a total of 290 cases. Out of the 290 cases, 164 were resolved in favour of the workers. In 76 cases we were not able to alter the decisions of the board. Fifty cases were still pending as of February 1.

I would like to divide those cases into two groups: the short-term cases and the long-term cases. Those on which decisions had already been reached, I'll call the long-term ones; the others were short-term. I was gratified that the board sent someone to my office a week ago Monday. We spent from 10 o'clock in the morning until roughly 6:30 p.m. on it—two people, in fact.

What we were attempting to do was to try to find out where it is that things get botched up. And it is not in the Sudbury office. We pulled at random some 50 claims, all of which had gone a minimum of six weeks without payment and some running to about 10 weeks. The Sudbury office was most helpful. Mr. Rorik and his staff contacted Toronto and within 48 hours most of those people were paid.

What irritates me so much is this. Why would workers have to come to us in the first place and then, within 24 hours to 48 hours, cheques for those 50 or 60 claims—we gave copies to your staff and they're trying to find out why—could be on their way to workers who had gone six to 10 weeks without pay? There has to be something wrong when that can occur. It isn't just coincidence that Garnet Rorik can phone someone in Toronto and a file can be dug out and very quickly payment can be made. I'm gratified that the payment could be made.

What irritates me is, where is it getting botched up down here and how could it be resolved in 24 to 48 hours? Why shouldn't that be happening sooner? Why should we have to draw it to the board's attention? Where are these files being mislaid or lost—or whatever is happening that prevents a worker from being paid? There's something wrong. There's something wrong in the system at the main office that allows this to go on.

I think your people agreed with me that it just wasn't coincidence. It wasn't one or two cases they were able to resolve in a hurry; it was a whole series—50 or 60.

How does a worker in this province go six, eight or 10 weeks without any income? He has house payments to make and he's got all the payments the rest of us have. What does it do to a worker when that occurs? I just can't for the life of me understand it. I just can't. There has got to be something botched up somewhere.

[3:30]

We did this careful tabulation in order to try to indicate to the board that there is something wrong. I guess that is one of the reasons I would like to see decentralization. Maybe that wouldn't occur, maybe it wouldn't get left on the bottom of the pile. I don't know if it is getting left on the bottom of the pile and new ones are being thrown on top. I just don't know how that many get lost.

What also worries me is, if this many people come to me—and my other two colleagues from Sudbury get the same sort of workload I get—Jim Hickey from United Steelworkers is handling anywhere from 80 to 100 claims a week and I know Eddie Nitchie of the Mine Mill union is handling a bunch. That isn't our job, but we do it. I don't see that as my function as a legislator and I don't see that as a function of the United Steelworkers or the Mine Mill union; I see that as a board function to make sure that doesn't happen. There is something sadly lacking somewhere when that can go on and on and on.

I want to tell you, my caseload is now higher than at any other time in my 12 years in this Legislature. That is critical. I am being critical of the board, but on behalf of the people who are having a heck of a time. That has got to be resolved somehow.

I guess it leads me to some of the problems the board has. It has problems with employers who don't send in reports. I understand that. What action does the board take if you have this ongoing process? Some of

the excuses we get are: "We haven't got a medical report" or "We don't have a report of the accident." I tell you, it is time the board got tough in terms of making sure those reports are coming in, because while other people might be able to afford to sit back, workers in this province can't wait for that income. I am amazed that we have to go through this exercise when in fact once the thing is triggered in Sudbury, in 48 hours it is paid.

The second group of claims I want to deal with is the long-term claims. I get increasingly frustrated where the board has rejected a claim. I have handled quite a number of appeals, as many of the board members know, and they are frequent, both here and in Sudbury. If I can find medical evidence which changes or reverses a decision, why can't the board? If the board is truly interested in representing workers, why is it that I can find the medical evidence, and I don't have the investigation staff the board has, to get so many changed? That is the board's function.

I think of the case of the fellow from Nova Scotia—and I am not going to go into cases—where I could find three specialists' reports that were on file here in Toronto with different doctors and a couple of doctors from Nova Scotia and the board's decision is reversed. The point I am making is that if I can find it why can't the board? That, surely to God, is a board responsibility. It is not mine. I do it because that worker is in trouble.

I am saying the board should be making sure every doctor who is involved in the case is contacted and in such a way that—I can ask a question one way and get the type of answer I want, but if I take the time to ask the doctor, "Is there a reason? Is it related somehow to an original accident based on your having seen the patient and seen the history?" and if I can get a doctor to explain it in detail to me why doesn't the board do it? Surely that is the role of the board, to put together all of the facts on behalf of the worker?

I get the sensation all the time, and my colleague from Nickel Belt this morning put it to Mr. Starr, that it is an adversary system; the worker has to prove he is right. Surely the board should be interested in not proving the guy is right or wrong, but what are the actual medical facts?

It's with difficulty that members of this Legislature have to go continuously to doctors and ask for a doctor's report. We know how busy doctors are filling out reports. In the

Sudbury area doctors do not want to handle compensation claims for claimants. They prefer to put it through OHIP. They prefer not to have the patient come to them in many instances if it means dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board. That's no secret. That's a reality.

I think it's time the board, when it listens to information from the attending physicians, asked the pertinent questions. The most pertinent is, "Do you think the present condition is an aggravation of a pre-existing condition or is related to the original accident? If so, tell us why." That would get a whole series of us out of the ball game: we would not even be required to get involved. Surely, that's what we're after; the board should function—in the first group I talked about—to get the claimant paid. In the complicated cases, the board should be doing everything in its power to sort it out.

I know people are going to say, "We do that." You don't. I don't know how many claims I've got. I've got four appeals coming now in the next month. In the month of September I had five. In the month of October I had four or five. When we take the time to get the information, most of them are successful. That's what irritates me too. If I can gather it why can't the board? They could take a little more time, do the investigation more thoroughly, and render a decision that's fair.

Also in the long-term claims, I guess one of the things I find most irritating and one of the reasons—and I spoke to the minister on a number of occasions about this—is in the medical information itself. I'm tired of a system where the attending physician says this man is not capable of returning to work and some board doctor says, "Oh, yes, he's ready to resume work." Because the board then accepts, in my opinion anyway, the advice of the consultants at the board, over and against the attending physician.

I've seen this hundreds of times—not occasionally; too many times. In fact, some of the letters I write to Bob Didiuk I sometimes wonder why he answers because I become so indignant in them. If I do it's simply out of absolute frustration with the number of people who come daily. I can spend a Monday or Friday in my office when the House is sitting and nearly everyone I see is WCB and nearly every letter I have is WCB. So many times, the board doctor is saying, "He can resume work," and the attending physician is saying, "No, he can't resume work." Of course the board accepts the advice of the board doctor, but is that fair to the worker?

I said last night that maybe we should have a couple of doctors there to whom other people could turn for advice so that the worker has a fair shake. I don't think he gets the fair shake when the board says to the attending physician, "You're all wet; we're saying it's either not related or the worker is ready to resume work," and the attending physician is saying, "No."

I gave to your representative last week four or five letters. In the past five or six months I guess I've given 10 or 12 letters to the board where the physicians in Sudbury are writing me and saying, "Look, what the hell is going on? I think this man should be off," and the board is saying, "No, and I've treated him all along." That's got to be sorted out. This includes people like **Dr. Bateman** from Toronto; **Dr. Morgan** in Sudbury; **Dr. MacKay** in Sudbury; **Dr. Lloyd Kerr**.

It goes on. I'm not even soliciting or asking them to give me medical evidence. They're sending people to me with letters, asking us to sort them out. And I'm saying the board has got to sort those out somewhat better. I don't know how we do it.

If you accept the consultant's position as against that of the family physician or the attending physician, on what grounds? Frequently neither you nor your consultant has ever seen the man, just the medical reports. I'm no doctor, so I really can't argue who is right. But I find it very frustrating to find the family or attending physician coming to me to say, "Look, I think this man is being shafted."

Recently, a physician took an hour from his very busy schedule to sit in my office and give me the full details of the strangest decision that I have ever seen handed down on appeal. It was a decision which said, "You are not eligible for benefits for the past 18 months but, if you go to the hospital tomorrow and get the surgery which we have denied for 18 months, you will now be eligible for benefits." That was kind of strange. But it was the attending physician who spent an hour in my office explaining to me why it was that this man should be entitled to benefits.

I say there is something wrong in that area where the board doctors are making decisions. I don't know how we sort it out, but surely it has got to be sorted out.

There are the two areas of claims—and maybe I could get some answers on the two areas—but in the short term I would like to know what is happening, how they are getting lost and the whole thing about the complicated cases; those are the ones that I expect to be somewhat involved in, because

it is difficult—I understand that—to get all of that information. But somehow your investigations have got to become somewhat improved, because I can get the medical information, and I know that it is much easier for your medical staff to approach doctors and get medical information than it is for me. There is something lacking there somewhere.

The third point, which is second only to the latter one, is that when the board doctor or Downsview says he is ready to go to work, and the attending physician says he is not, it then becomes a major battle. How do we decide what we do with that worker? There are many of those cases.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It is very difficult, Mr. Minister, to answer the general discourse that Mr. Martel has given us in all of these cases, lumping them, as he does, into a matter of procedure that is taken when adjudication is taking place. I am sure that Mr. Martel will acknowledge the fact that Bob Didiuk has been of excellent service to him in trying to sort out some of these problems that he is facing.

There is no question but that most people are faced with problems. I recall very vividly when I was a member of Parliament that, despite the fact that this is a provincial jurisdiction, I was still inundated with compensation cases about which I wrote to the Workmen's Compensation about to get an explanation.

These things are not really going to go away, because we do make decisions which in many cases are not popular. It doesn't matter what kind of a system you devise, if you are making a decision, you are not going to make a decision that will be acceptable to the person concerned unless he gets the full amount of money that is available under the act.

You stated that when there is a difference between the opinion of the attending physician and that of someone in our own organization, say directly connected with our adjudication process, that we do take their side. I'm not sure about that. In most cases, I don't know whether favouritism is played in that respect by adopting the decision of our own doctors.

I wonder whether Bill Kerr could go into more detail, or probably Dr. McCracken, as to the operation of this.

[3:45]

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I would like to make a few comments, and perhaps Dr. McCracken would like to. With respect to the 41 claims to which Mr. Martel referred, as he knows, and as arranged with him, they are being reviewed by two senior claims people, two

supervisors, to find out what went wrong. The director of the claims adjudication branch and I will get a full report on it to see what we can learn from this. I believe, too, Mr. Martel, that Mr. Adamson said you would be provided with a report, so we will be in touch with you again on that.

There are some problems existing today that are coming to the foreground that perhaps didn't exist before. I think we are finding a little bit more difficulty and, by the way, may I just preface my remarks, these are not excuses, I am just sharing some problem areas with you. Since the Krever commission and the Williams commission hearings we find that a number of doctors are more reticent to give us information over the phone. For instance, if there is medical information outstanding in a continuing claim, the claim has been allowed but we need some more information on which to base further compensation payments, we will telephone either a counsellor in an area office or a claims adjudicator in head office, who will telephone the doctor's office to try and get information. They are more reticent now and are reluctant in many instances to give that kind of information out over the phone. That is one area that we are attacking.

Another development since these two commissions held public hearings is that the hospitals are very slow and, indeed, quite reluctant to give us information on local investigations from the hospital records of the individual, even though our man has his identification from the board and he has with him an up-to-date valid waiver, an authorization from the injured person to have this information made available to our claims investigator so that a decision can be made. That got so bad that Dr. McCracken and I have devised a list of hospitals to which a special letter will be sent, because we are finding that this is hindering us in trying to make decisions as promptly as possible.

I must say that not all hospitals in Ontario are like that. We are not using a shotgun approach; we are dealing with the hospitals who are giving us a problem in this area. In fact, some problems have been resolved by our staff in the area offices going out and visiting the hospitals.

Another area where I am encountering some difficulty is the length of time that it takes my staff, my claims investigators located throughout Ontario, to conduct investigations, to get the information locally to send to the claims adjudicator or, indeed, to the review branch or, indeed, to the appeal panels, which has been requested by those adjudicating bodies for adjudication purposes.

This is something that I will be discussing with the board on April 6, to see what arrangement we can make to improve our strength in that area.

In so far as our staff is concerned, claims adjudicators, we have a good bunch of people who are enthusiastic, they are people who have good potential, they are gaining experience as we go along and I think that we will find their skills will improve because of the kind of training they are getting now and I look for good things in that area.

I am hopeful that there will be fewer mistakes. The chairman and all of us have said that mistakes occur from time to time and we are doing everything we can to minimize mistakes and to improve the skills of our people.

So we are attacking these problem areas, and particularly the complicated unadjudicated claims and the complicated reopened claims, and Mr. Martel has heard me say this so often I am sure he is a little bit sick of it, but we still haven't completely solved how best to solve the challenge of making decisions on those very quickly. I personally feel the only way to do it is to have them investigated locally by a field investigator at a point earlier in time. We have this under discussion now and it is a point that will be discussed with the board. Recognizing that there are areas that we wish to improve, I hope this gives a little idea of the fact that we are cognizant of them and that we are trying to attack them with a sense of urgency so that we can make improvements rather rapidly.

Mr. Martel: Could I ask, Mr. Kerr, is there any indication where the system is breaking down here in the simple cases, the ones I handed to your people? It has got to be breaking down somewhere because those cases were all resolved, when Rourke got hold of you, within 24 to 48 hours. Most of the material had to be there.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: One of two things happened, Mr. Martel. Perhaps the material was there in some of the instances. Other things could have happened. They could have said, "This is so long, throw everything out the window and pay." Maybe it got to that point. Maybe they paid it without even any justification in view of everything that has happened.

I think my honest answer to you is that the system itself is good. When we analyse these 41 cases we will be in a position to tell you where it broke down and we will learn something from that. I do think that in a number of instances we will find that's what has

happened. They have just said, "It's so far behind and we're getting no place, we'll take a chance. The man says he is disabled, Mr. Martel says he is still disabled, pay the man." I have seen cases like that where we've had the troubles that I've described to you and we've just said that we have no alternative but to pay the man under those circumstances.

Mr. M. Davidson: May I ask a supplementary to that? Are you saying in fact that those cases sat there until some pressure was brought to bear and then they suddenly said throw everything out of the window and pay them?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, sir.

Mr. M. Davidson: Is that what you're saying?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, sir, I'm not saying that. The example is that we have a case that has been accepted and payment has been ongoing, and it's quite a legitimate claim, but for some reason we haven't been able to get a response from the doctor or get the information we need on which to base further compensation.

Two qualifications have to be present before we can pay compensation. One, the claim has to be allowed, basically it has to be allowed. Secondly, we pay compensation on the basis of medical information that confirms the man is still disabled and off work as a result of the accident. In the example that Elie has, the claim was allowed but we didn't have sufficient ongoing medical information on which to base further payments.

What I am saying is that I can visualize when you get to a certain point you have to do something. If we can't get any information from the doctor and we're in this position that the man has problems, financial problems, and he's up against it, then I think there's the odd time where we have to take a chance. Where we would normally not pay until we had supporting medical information on file we have to take a chance and pay it.

I am not suggesting that we do this with all claims or that we should do this as a routine, because there are certain checks and controls that are required when we pay compensation, but I do think that you have to use a practical approach.

Mr. M. Davidson: Had Mr. Martel not brought those matters to your attention or the attention of the board, what you're telling me in effect then is that they may still be sitting there waiting for that claim to be processed.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, there is a regular review. Claims are reviewed every 13 weeks

by somebody other than the claims adjudicator who is responsible for the handling of that claim, so that would be picked up on the next review, plus the fact that the man himself, of course, could go to our local office and share the problem with us.

Mr. Martel: Well, there's a problem though, because all the cases I gave you were just the ones we picked that were six weeks and over without pay, six to 10 weeks. Maybe that's got to trigger in much sooner.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: You see also, every two weeks we notify the man. The man is not without notification. There is a form that goes out that lets him know.

Mr. Martel: No, no, no. I'm sorry but that is not happening, Mr. Kerr; that's just not happening. You will find in those cases you are looking at that is just not happening.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: All right, we'll look for that in these cases.

Mr. Martel: I try to get from them any information they have. When they come to my office it's standard procedure they walk in and they've got a handful of envelopes. That's the standard procedure. You see the board thing on them and right away you think, "Oh, no, not another one." They've got a whole file. They just walk in. The way they walk in you know it's a board problem.

You see, contrary to what the chairman said the board image in the Sudbury area is not very high. If one looks at the ombudsman report, the ombudsman was in Sudbury just recently and out of 108 cases heard, 36 of them were WCB. They were fully one third of the ombudsman's cases. Then he went over to Sturgeon Falls and it was eight out of 51. Then he went to North Bay and it was 19 out of 82 people who appeared before the ombudsman. Their image isn't very high.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Going back to your point, Mr. Martel, we will look for that and if the notification was sent out it will be signified in the file so we will be able to identify that and report to you.

Mr. Martel: I would hope so because they tell me they are not getting it. I ask for information. I like to know what the problem is. That is one of the frustrations for me with this much volume in compensation alone—20 cases weekly. In addition to everything else we are trying to do, we are not doing the injured worker justice because we just have to handle it too darned quickly. We are not doing him justice when we have to go through it quickly and not read the information maybe as carefully as we should.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Every two weeks—just to go back to a point, Mr. Martel—as I men-

tioned to you, we do take action to try to contact a doctor, phone him, and send a letter. If we don't get a response, we get the director of the medical branch involved. There are occasions when we are up against a stone wall.

Mr. Watson: Had those people who came to you been to the workmen's compensation office first?

Mr. Martel: We are trying to sort that out now. We have an agreement with the Sudbury office that the first question we ask is, "Have you been to the Sudbury office?" If they have been, we say, "We are not taking any detail because we are going to give the Sudbury office time to sort it out." We have an agreement with Mr. Rourke that we will give them at least 48 hours before we phone it in.

Mr. Hamilton: How long has that been going on?

Mr. Martel: We have been doing it now for about six months.

Mr. Hamilton: Has it shown any results?

Mr. Martel: No. Because people are still coming to us.

Mr. Hamilton: I certainly agree that the caseload you reported to me today should not be in your office. We had a similar kind of reporting two or three years ago. I recall when I first came to the board the staffing in the Sudbury area office was six people. The caseload in your office was a lot lighter than that which you report to us today.

The last time I was in the Sudbury office I think I counted something like 30 bodies. I think the staffing for rehab and everybody else who works in and out of the Sudbury office is now somewhere around 30 people. I am absolutely astounded that the caseload has not been transferred from your office to the Sudbury area office because that is where it belongs.

Are you partly to blame because it is not transferred to the Sudbury office? Are you encouraging it to come into your office or are you encouraging it to go to the Sudbury office? If we have gone from five or six people in that office to 30 people and we are not doing the job we pay the dollars for the manpower to do in that office, then we have wasted our time and our energy.

Mr. Martel: We have met on a number of occasions. We have had Mr. Rourke out on another occasion where he spent the whole day going through my files again. There is a great mistrust of the board unfortunately. We worked out this agreement with Mr. Rourke that we would not touch it.

If they had been to the Sudbury office first, we would not even take information; but we would ask the worker to wait for 48 hours. That is the agreement we have with Rourke. At the end of 48 hours, usually the worker would be contacted so that we wouldn't have to get involved at all. We don't count that as showing up if the guy makes the contact but we don't take the information. We don't show that as a contact at all. We are trying to do that.

As for these other people, some of them simply hadn't gone to the office. I don't know how we can get them to go to the office because, as I say, the service I am getting out of the Sudbury office is first rate. I have no kick about the type of service I am getting, but they are coming to us.

Mr. Hamilton: My colleagues and I have got a complaint. If we have done everything humanly possible from a financial point of view and a body point of view to man the Sudbury office so that the caseload isn't in your office, something is wrong in your office or in the Sudbury office or in the head office in Toronto. Have we wasted our time and our money in manning the Sudbury office the way we have in the last three or four years? [4:00]

Mr. Martel: I think much of the problem stems right in what's happening with the files here at head office. Your man in Sudbury, your head man and his staff, are doing a good job but people just go to them when they're not getting paid and it breaks down.

Mr. Hamilton: All right, all right.

Mr. Martel: Now why should it break down?

Mr. Hamilton: Okay, let's get to the nitty gritty of the thing. Have you any concrete suggestions of how we get, with even the mistrust that you say exists—and I'll accept that there's some of that—get the caseload transferred from your office and all of your colleagues' offices in Sudbury to our office so that we can handle them?

Mr. Martel: I'm not sure how we're going to do it because I tried to meet with the USW this week and the only reason that we couldn't meet was that the minister's mediators were meeting with the bargaining team on Monday. We attempted to meet with them to see if there was a way, because I don't think the Steelworkers should be handling 100 cases a week either.

Mr. Hamilton: Of course not.

Mr. Martel: Surely we've got to somehow get them to go to the board office first and

if they are turned down there then they might come to us, because the 41 cases we handled were all resolved, and successfully.

Mr. Hamilton: Now then, let me ask you another question—

Mr. Bounsall: I also want answers to some—

Mr. Hamilton: Oh, I'm sorry, yes.

Mr. Van Horne: Speaking of nitty gritty, I'd like to ask a question.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute, I think in fairness, Mr. McClellan has indicated he wants to speak on this, Mr. Van Horne and then you, Dr. Bounsall.

Mr. Bounsall: Well this was to follow up directly to the question Doug had asked, then if anyone else wants to follow it directly too, fine. The function which is decentralized fully in the local office works well there. Voc rehab is fine in the local office because it's all there. The problem that's encountered—

Mr. Hamilton: Don't run out on me, Elie.

Mr. Martel: I just have to make a very important phone call.

Mr. Hamilton: Okay, come on back.

Mr. Van Horne: We can't get along without him.

Mr. Bounsall: He's picking up another case.

The problem with someone who has a problem with a claim, whether it's a delayed cheque or what have you, and they go to the local office, is the only thing that the local office can do is get back what they are told from Toronto, usually by the computer TWX or whatever it is, and that doesn't often tell them very much. So they go to the local office, and because the file isn't there and because they can only get back there whatever is told them either by the computer printout or if they make a call and the file can be found and information given over the phone, that's all right, but they can't usually get someone to get their hand on the file right away so they can tell them.

That's the problem. They don't have the files there, they have to rely only on what comes over the TWX, and unless they make a call to someone who will actually go to the file, open it up and be able to, from the file, tell them what the problem is, then they can't get the answer from the local office.

When you decentralize claims review to the local areas and have the files in the local areas, that's when you can use the local office.

Mr. Hamilton: I can't solve Elie's problems and wait for the decentralization of

claims. It's so much more an immediate problem than that and has to be solved as he says, quickly.

Mr. Bounsall: Here's my problem: I can make the phone call to Les Liversidge, my appointee, and Les can go to the file, open it up, tell me what the problem is and the recipient knows as soon as Les gets back to me. When they go to the local office, they do the computer terminal bit and back comes something which isn't the solution to the question they've asked.

Mr. Hamilton: I was coming to your proposition and that is where the members of Parliament are assigned a person in our office who gives them as you say, fairly good service I would think by and large, why can Elie and the people in the Sudbury office where this caseload is so heavy not take advantage of that service as you have done?

Mr. Bounsall: I'm sure Elie does that.

Mr. Hamilton: Yes.

Mr. Bounsall: We do. I'm sure the person who is assigned to us is who we call or who we write.

But somehow the local officer set up not to have a person like that for them or not to have a person who can go to the file right away. All they have to rely on immediately when the person walks in is what appears on that computer screen, or make a phone call. Maybe there's the weakness. When the local office phones to get more detailed information out of the claimant's file to answer the question, it doesn't get as good service as I get out of Les Liversidge, let's put it that way. In other words, through the local office, the claimant doesn't get the information about what the hell is going on and it's not the local office's fault at all.

Mr. Hamilton: I'm not blaming anybody, I'm looking for solutions. When you were out of the room, Mr. Bounsall said he could get fairly good service if he contacts his contact man in the Toronto office.

Mr. Martel: Yes, we did that for a long time but, with discussions, tried to shift it from the Toronto office here to the Sudbury local so we could deal directly with them that way. My assistant in the north now handles all the compensation claims I get so that there is a direct liaison. The only thing I deal with Toronto with now is the second group, the much more complex cases, because the files are all in Toronto and those I put in writing and write to Toronto for. But that's one of the problems.

Mr. Hamilton: Let me make you another proposition, Elie. If you had a contact man

in the Sudbury office the same as we have in the Toronto office, albeit the file is not there, and whenever anybody came into your office you sent him over to the contact man in the Sudbury office, would the effect from a service point of view not be the same to you? Then you could call him back and say two days later, "What did you do for that fellow?"

Mr. Martel: We do. We deal directly with Mr. Rorik, and he gives us good service. Those are for the ones, I don't want to say they're simple because they bog down somewhere, but those are usually the short-run type of problem where no payment has been made. For the other group we deal directly with Didiuk here in Toronto because he has to have the whole file to answer the questions we're raising. Those are the ones that have been rejected by the board and are somewhat more complex. So we put those in writing. The others we deal primarily with are the ones we think can be quickly handled; a payment hasn't been made or the cheque isn't there for some reason. Usually, it deals right away with money. So those we're dealing directly with in the Sudbury office.

We had to work that out to try to get the local office to be used, but we've gone one step further. When workers phone us we ask them if they've been to the board first. If they have we say, "Look, give the Sudbury office 48 hours to respond to you and if at the end of the 48 hours you don't have a response then get in touch with us because we're trying to get them to use the Sudbury office rather than come to us." But there's a group that simply won't go to the Sudbury office. I'm saying that if you just look at what Floyd, Bud and I are handling in conjunction with Hickey and Nitchie, it has to be almost 200 cases—let's say, about 175 cases a week.

Mr. Hamilton: I don't know how we're going to do it but I know in my bones what I have to do and that is to get them transferred from your office to our Sudbury office by some way.

Mr. Martel: Yes, and that's why we tried to make a deal on Monday to see if there was anything jointly we could do to try to get that working. What I'm saying to the Steelworkers local and Mine Mill is really, unless they're very complicated, we should somehow be getting those people directly to the board office. We shouldn't have to delve into those at all because that's what we've got at compensation. That's what the compensation board is there for, to serve the needs of the people who are coming to it. They won't go; it's that mistrust. Every time

something changes quickly, it builds it up. Let me give you an example.

Mr. Hamilton: I want to touch on another problem—I had it for many years—and I want you to tell me whether I'm wrong or not. For many years at the federation office on any given Monday morning you would see the same 15 or 20 people there every Monday morning; they were the chronic compensation cases. You got to know them by name and who they were. They had been through every conceivable mill, and there was just no way the board could or would help them. They were at the end of the rope, but they came to visit us every Monday morning and reported in. I'm sure they went down the street to the member of Parliament's office on Tuesday; that was part of their hobby. How many of those will you have in your office?

Mr. Martel: Not many. After a while we sort them out. We simply say to them, "You've got to get us some new medical information, otherwise we can't do a thing to help you. It's all based on medical information. If you want to sign a waiver, we'll write your doctor." We have two or three or four who are there all the time—you're like the godfather to them—but those aren't the ones I'm talking about.

The cases I've illustrated are the ones where we actually got involved. We talked to some of these and said there was nothing we could do unless they had medical evidence. The numbers I gave you are only cases where we made contact with the board in Toronto or the board in Sudbury. That isn't for the other guys; there might be a couple in there, but not really many.

Mr. Hamilton: I want to switch horses a little bit and deal with another aspect of your proposition at the outset; that is, the relevance of the local family doctor, particularly at the appeals level. I say this carefully, because in some instances we accept the family doctor from the time the worker hurts himself until he's at the end of the road; there is never any question in my mind about that claim.

But where you have the chronic claims and they come to fruition at the appeal board level, usually there is a stack of evidence about that high in the appeal board file—the fellow has been for x-rays; he's been to a hospital; he's been to the local family doctor; he's been to the chiropractor; he's been to somebody else—but maybe he has never been to an orthopaedic surgeon or the qualification that is required medically.

I find, with pretty great consistency, that the evidentiary value of the family doctor's report in that context is not much good. I'll tell you why. He doesn't—not always; I'm trying to be careful—give you a proper diagnosis; he gives you very little medical evidence. What he says, generally, is: "Dear Jack has been a good citizen of this community. He goes to church on Sunday. He's got five kids. They're having trouble getting enough groceries. He's got a pain in the back. Will you do something for him?" That's the evidentiary value of that evidence, against a report from an orthopaedic surgeon who has done x-rays, had him in hospital and so on.

Where there is anywhere close to equality of medical evidence, when you arrive at the appeals I, and I am sure my colleagues, will accept without question the family doctor's evidence. But in too many cases it has no medical evidentiary value at all when you're dealing with the totality of the evidence. That's the first point I want to make to you.

The other point is a general one that we'll come back to when we start to talk about appeals. There are a number of ways of dealing with appeals. You simply hear the evidence that is available and attainable the day you make your pitch at the board level and you make a decision on that evidence. Then, if you need new evidence, wherever it may come from or arise, you have another hearing and get on your way.

The way we operate now, as you know very well, is that we hear all the evidence; and if there are any gaps in the evidence—if we need another x-ray or another medical opinion, or if we need to have him seen in hospital—we say we'll wait and have this investigation done. And there is the root of a lot of our delay troubles. Even with the most expeditious service from the hospital or the doctors, we have great difficulty in meeting any time schedules and that is where we get into great difficulty.

If the day I heard your plea at an appeal I could simply make the decision on the evidence that was on the table, you would have no delay because the next day or the day after you could have your report and be on down the road, wherever it might be. But you wouldn't. Usually it is an endeavour to help get some evidence to help the man and we do that constantly.

Mr. Martel: There are several problems. I won't name the doctor, but I know there is a neurosurgeon in Sudbury of whose material the board is always dubious. I guess I was before the board last fall on seven or eight cases and seven were his. Here is a neuro-

surgeon giving evidence and somewhere along the line it is not being accepted. Nearly every one of those cases was ultimately reversed. I don't know how that happens.

I also get frustrated. As you know, I have been before you many times. I usually come with pretty good medical evidence, or I try to. I don't go all the way to the appeal route without something to substantiate why I am there. I can get that kind of information by writing and by asking the doctor rather specifically—the specialist—when I write, “Do you think there is a relationship?” Frequently, I get letters saying yes, and he identifies it and we present it. The question is, does the board do it in that fashion? When you are looking for medical evidence in an appeal investigation are you, in fact asking those types of questions?

I am sure doctors aren't distorting the medical evidence to give to me, out of the goodness of their hearts. They are doing it because this is their medical finding. They are using their medical ethics and that is what they are doing. If I can get that much evidence, my question is, why can't the board in its investigations, which would I am sure reduce many of the appeals heard presently? I guess it ties in with the other thing that changed, once you have had a decision by the review committee you have to go the appeal route anyway. I think that is crazy. Pardon me for saying so. I think the fact that when new medical evidence is submitted—we have to go the appeal route and cannot go back to the review committee is nuts. But we can't and that takes a lot of time—I think wasted time—on behalf of the claimant.

Mr. Hamilton: Hopefully now three weeks.

Mr. Martel: Hopefully. If you have new medical evidence why should it go to appeal?

Mr. Hamilton: I am not arguing with you on that point.

Mr. Martel: OK, go back to the other point. If I can find the medical evidence, why can't the board get it?

Mr. Hamilton: We do. I am not saying we do in all cases—we don't. The pursuit of medical evidence is a question Mr. Kerr and Dr. McCracken can answer. What do they do? If you want to ask that question of them, ask it.

Mr. Martel: Certainly, because I get frustrated when I can get that type of medical evidence—

Mr. Hamilton: Ask Bill Kerr or Dr. McCracken because they would both be involved in that kind of activity.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I would be involved in that activity from the adjudication of claims. In the claims adjudication branch, when they have a case which they feel does not come within the terms of the act and they have to recommend that it be rejected as not coming within the terms of the act, that claim automatically goes to the claims review branch of our division. There, a senior claims person looks at the file and has the authority to reverse the decision if it should be reversed, agree with the decision, or direct that further information be obtained. This review takes place before anybody on the outside is advised of the adverse decision.

Frequently, our senior review specialists will insist that the claims adjudicator obtain the records from the hospital, or make sure that all the medical reports from the doctors who have treated that man are on file, insofar as we know who treated that man. Sometimes they are wrong and we find out that a doctor treated that man whom we know nothing about at that point in time. At that point the review branch in reviewing the situation makes sure that all the pertinent medical information—and, indeed, all other medical information—is on file.

Frequently, they refer cases back to the adjudicator to make further inquiries. This causes delays. It probably opens us up to some criticism, too, because it takes more time to get further information but, just as Mr. Hamilton explained why they make their inquiries, we make further inquiries at that point to try and get information on which we can accept the claim.

Let's assume we have all the information on file and the claim cannot be accepted; the claims review branch then writes the individual a letter explaining why the claim cannot be accepted. At that point in time, all of the documentation is complete, including the diagnosis, as far as we know.

I have checked this out. I was a little bit concerned about people complaining of how long it takes in this kind of claim to adjudicate. We met some time last year with representatives from the Steelworkers and other unions and I explained what we are doing. I said: “We could make decisions much more quickly from the information we have on file, but maybe it wouldn't be the best decision in the world; we may reject a claim, whereas if we obtain all of the data and take a little more time to do it, we might be able to allow that claim rather than reject the claim.”

The union people said they felt that was a better approach, providing we didn't take too long to do it, of course. They did admit they

felt it is better to take a little more time in the initial adjudication and make the best decision that can be made.

So, as far as the claims services division is concerned, we do get all the reports that we are aware of from the people who have treated the man or the hospital where he has been a patient. Also, there are some cases where our senior review specialist will insist that the man be examined by a consultant on the outside prior to a decision, with the idea of trying to get information that will allow us to bring the claim into the terms of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I do think that in the claims services division our folks are doing quite a bit of work to make sure we have all the medical information on file at that point in time.

Dr. McCracken: First of all, I agree with Mr. Hamilton that in the vast majority of cases we obtain all the necessary hard clinical data from the treating physicians that we require, but there is a sizeable block of cases for which we do not get this. As Mr. Hamilton has pointed out, all too often, looking at the information sent, one can arrive at absolutely no decision, including a working diagnosis, and there certainly is no hard objective clinical information in the record or in the report and this creates real problems.

The other problem, of course, is that if the treating doctor disagrees with an opinion that might be expressed by one of the board physicians, all that he has to do is pick up the phone and phone that physician and discuss the matter with him and supply to him his hard objective clinical data. This indeed, will immediately be taken into consideration because in all probability it has been lacking up to that point.

This is, in essence, what Mr. Kerr's claims investigators attempt to do when they visit a doctor's office. As Mr. Kerr has mentioned it is not only the matter of the spin-off effect of the two royal commissions where many doctors are extremely apprehensive and don't want to tell anybody any data whatsoever about their patients which makes investigation extremely difficult, if not totally blocked. Over and above that, all too often now we are finding that a claims investigator will do his best to attempt to see a doctor for even two or three minutes to obtain some rather vital clinical information and be turned away, be told that the doctor can't see him or won't see him or hasn't got time to see him, and if he wants to get some information he will have to put it in writing and send it to the doctor's office. This, of course, creates delays that we have no control over, but delays I am very much concerned about.

There are problems and we know what the problems are. Again, the problems are in maintaining communications with the treating physicians and in getting the treating physicians to supply to us what they find when they examine the patient and their opinion. That is all we ask of them.

Mr. Martel: I find in so many cases—I have just listed the names of seven or eight doctors who are now contacting me out of sheer frustration with the board.

Dr. McCracken: They should contact us.

Mr. Martel: Maybe they should, but they are sending their files to me. I have doctors who send the whole file. They get permission from the worker to send the whole file and they say, "Send it back to me when you are done with it."

These are specialists who are sending me their files. I listed a number of doctors who have written me and, lo and behold, I've got a case where the doctor has written and said, "This man is being shafted". That is one problem.

The other matter I don't think we have discussed is the decision. You change a decision here; your medical people change it. Doug alluded to it. You people change it and I guess that is where some of the mistrust workers have about the board comes in. Their doctor is saying to them, "You are not ready to go back to work." They get a letter saying, "Our surgical consultant or our medical consultant says you are ready to go back to work, so therefore your benefits are reduced."

What do you think the worker thinks? He says, "My doctor says I am not ready to go back to work but the board doctor says I'm ready to go back to work. They are putting the screws to me." You can't blame him. That is why last night I was saying somehow we have to get something where it is not only the case, but it is perceived by the public to be the case. When he gets that type of letter, the worker naturally believes the board is putting it to him.

I don't know how we overcome that difficulty, but I think that is part of the mistrust people have about the board. They think the board is simply accepting the medical advice of their own people as opposed to the workers' own attending physicians. You try to convince the public, the workers who are injured that is not the case and I think that is the nub of some of the resentment they have and the mistrust that builds up in them. I don't see how it can be otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Starr: On the other hand, I have had the opportunity to review some of the

claimants who have come to see me and we usually have the file with us at the time. They vehemently maintain the doctor said they are unable to go to work. That is what the doctor told him verbally. Yet when we look at the doctor's report, the doctor says the man is available for modified work.

Mr. Martel: Modified?

Hon. Mr. Starr: That is light work. But he's been told he can't work at all. Or he can't go back.

Mr. Martel: Yes, I have seen that happen where he swears it up and down, but I am still saying—

Hon. Mr. Starr: The mistrust then is against us. They send misinformation.

Mr. Martel: There is a difference between what he is being told verbally and what the doctor is submitting as a medical report.

Mr. M. Davidson: If I could give you a prime example of what Elie is talking about, we had a case in our riding where a man fell from one roof to another during the course of his employment and landed on a peak on his stomach. Somehow that drove his whatever up and damaged his heart.

[4:30]

He was told constantly by his attending physician that he was not able to return to his job. He got a letter from the board, saying that the consulting surgeon or physician—or whoever it is you have down there—had made a decision that his benefits were to be cut off. He should return to work because he was capable. On the day he received the letter, the man was in the hospital, dying.

I can document that case for you—not right now, but I can get that information for you, if you like.

His wife received the letter from the board saying that somebody in Toronto had made a decision that he could go back to work and he was in the hospital, dying.

Dr. McCracken: Mr. Chairman, if I might just respond to both matters: The medical staff at the board do not have any crystal balls and they therefore do not reverse decisions or make decisions without the data in front of them. As Mr. Starr has pointed out, all too often, due—presumably due—to the fact that the attending physician does not want to alienate himself from his patient and possibly the patient's family—he tells the patient something totally different from what he tells us about the degree of recovery and whether or not the worker is ready to return to his employment or to modified employment. It is the medical information in the file upon which the medical staff at the

Workmen's Compensation Board make their decisions. If they can't make a decision as to what should or should not be done, then this is when they contact the treating doctor. They suggest to him that it would be an excellent idea to have the person seen by the appropriate specialist to try to resolve the problem.

This is the way it should be. This is the way it is in the majority of instances. But I can only assure you that the medical staff do not make recommendations to terminate benefits because, first of all, we have no control over the payment of compensation. That is strictly within the area of responsibility of Mr. Kerr and the claims adjudication staff, so we have no control over whether benefits will be continued, terminated, or whether they will be partial benefits.

Mr. McClellan: You can recommend your claims.

Dr. McCracken: No we don't.

Mr. Martel: You don't recommend that he should get paid but you recommend whether or not he is ready to resume work.

Dr. McCracken: On the basis of the data that is in the files.

Mr. Martel: Sure, but ultimately it has the same effect, Dr. McCracken. If you say the man is ready to resume work, it is automatic. Then it goes to Mr. Kerr and Mr. Kerr has no choice. If the medical staff says the man is ready to resume work, Mr. Kerr can't go on paying benefits.

Dr. McCracken: Well, I think probably, Mr. Kerr might challenge the statement that it's automatic, because it isn't.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I just thought for a moment that I might discuss your concern regarding delays in payments. You said you had quite a number who were in that category and they were eventually paid. I think Mr. Kerr tried to explain to you that eventually you come to a point where you can't get the report and necessary information and you say, "All right, let's pay it."

Last fall Dr. McCracken and I had the opportunity of visiting and speaking with five medical associations throughout Ontario and asking for their co-operation in this field. Dr. McCracken specifically told treating doctors this. If a person injured on a job comes in for treatment, then instead of just reporting to us that he will not be able to return to work or that he should be out of work, they should specifically state on any such report that: "In my opinion, this person should be away from his job for approximately eight weeks." Then we can make those payments

without any reports for the ensuing six weeks. Again, if a doctor reported to us: "I think now that he will be away for another three weeks," then, again, there's no delay. But that's where the problem lies.

Mr. Martel: I realize that.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We need that co-operation.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: May I just add a comment to that, Mr. Chairman? I'm glad Mr. Starr made that statement. Because it reminds me that following those meetings I took a leaf out of their book, so to speak. I guess it was about a month ago I wrote a letter to every doctor in the province, except obstetricians and those who obviously wouldn't be treating—

Mr. Bounsall: That's poor policy there, I might say.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I wrote a personal letter—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just interject for one moment. I have four copies of the Gibson report, one to file with the clerk and one for each of the parties.

I'm in your hands, Mr. Chairman, but I have an important meeting scheduled that I have to go to. I'll be here tomorrow night; if you wish me to put in some extra time, I'll be glad to, but it's a meeting with the president of the Ontario Federation of Labour.

Mr. McClellan: Will you be here tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Tomorrow afternoon and evening.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, may I continue with that statement, please? It's very brief.

A letter has gone to each doctor asking them to give us that kind of information so that we can authorize in advance compensation when the doctor can tell us that the patient is going to be off work for a certain period of time. In return for that, of course, we promise the doctor that we're not going to request unnecessary reports from him, because they seem to think we request unnecessary reports from time to time.

We're doing something for them and they're doing something for us, and the response to that letter has been very good so far.

Mr. Martel: I have one further question. Has the board ever considered that it might be part of the solution to the problem? My office is in a community of 20,000 people, but there's no board office; they have to go to the city of Sudbury. Have you ever con-

sidered the possibility of satellite offices such as the one in Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes, we have. We've established them in the Timmins, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, Kingston—

Mr. Martel: Valley East has 20,000 people. I've not thought about it until now, but I suspect many of my cases come from there simply because it's closer to come to my riding office than it is to drive into the city of Sudbury. There are 20,000 people in that valley.

Mr. Hamilton: Are you asking me about it?

Mr. Martel: You asked me for a suggestion, and I'm suggesting it might be a way if people didn't have to drive to the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Watson: This one problem suggests that you should resign and set up a satellite office.

Mr. Martel: No, no. You'd like to win that seat, but I'm not about to give it up yet.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: There are many other municipalities—cities or whatever you want to call them—throughout Ontario that probably have considerably in excess of 20,000 people, but there's no way, logistically, that you can set up a satellite office in every one of those areas. It just isn't feasible.

Mr. Martel: No, but you must have areas, Mr. McDonald, where the type of industry that's there—I suspect, if you were to go down through the London area, you would get a fair number of accidents. I'm not sure the incidence—

Mr. Watson: It's much safer living when we have to go to Windsor or London—

Mr. Martel: But I'm saying when you've got a work force that's primarily involved in mining—

Mr. J. F. McDonald: We don't have one in Oshawa.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Not enough pressure is put on for a satellite office there—and they have a lot more cases than you have.

Mr. Van Horne: Let me opt into this, because we've devoted considerable time to the north and, in deference to my sister, who lives in Sudbury, I continued without interrupting—that's the best reason I can offer.

Please check me if I'm wrong, but you mentioned you have other offices. I mentioned last evening some telephoning that we did to get some kind of perspective on the number of investigators that you have, the number of people on waiting lists for these investigators and the approximate waiting period.

The information that I have is as follows: Thunder Bay, one investigator, 35 on the

waiting list, waiting period approximately six weeks; North Bay, one, 24 on the list, four weeks; Timmins, one, 21 on the list, three to four weeks; St. Catharines, one, 27 on the list, four to five weeks; Kingston, one, 24 on the list, four weeks; Kitchener-Waterloo, two, 21 on the list, one to two weeks; Windsor, two, 55 on the list, four to five weeks; Hamilton, six, 51 on the list, one to two weeks; Sault Ste. Marie, one, nine on the list, one to two weeks; Sudbury, three, six on the list, two to three days.

That's the information we got as a result of the telephone survey we did yesterday. I don't know if it's accurate or not, but it's interesting when I compare that to London with two investigators, 60 on the waiting list and a waiting period of approximately five to six weeks.

Mr. Martel: They need a good member there.

Mr. Van Horne: That's not necessarily true in London North or London Centre; but in London South perhaps. Of course, the London office accommodates all three ridings.

I could go on with Ottawa and Toronto. The point to the question is this: First of all, are these right insofar as you can ascertain; is this roughly the picture that you have; and, if so, how come the discrepancy between Sudbury, which has the heavy industry—we are not questioning that—but how come the difference between Sudbury and London?

Mr. M. Davidson: And Windsor.

Mr. Van Horne: And Windsor.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to that question: the information that Mr. Van Horne has is correct; in fact, when your office contacted Al Breward, I think they gave you that information from head office. It is quite correct.

Mr. Van Horne: We also called to see if there were any changes removing what you had—not that we were questioning you, but things do change on a day-to-day basis. How accurate your information was we don't know: two, three, four days old? So we did spot check with other offices.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, there could be a discrepancy if you did that. Anyway, you are accurate. I don't think there is any point in making anything out of that, Mr. Van Horne, because I accept what you say. I have a copy of the information you have.

Now, the reason why Sudbury has such a small one at the present time compared with London is because there isn't, in some sense, not quite as much activity due to the strike; although in another regard it creates more

activity with the strike because there are more folks who want their claims reopened and things of this nature.

I am quite concerned about the investigation situation. I hope you were here a moment ago when I mentioned that I thought the claims investigation, as to field investigations, represent one very positive way of trying to attack the problem: that is, why does it take so long to make a decision in difficult, unadjudicated claims and with regard to difficult claims that are being reopened. We are addressing this problem at the present time. I also mentioned that there is a meeting with the board on April 6, at which time I wish to discuss this to see if we can improve it.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Chairman, on a related question. The problem that I run into on this thing—and I guess it is a matter of policy—is when you have one doctor who says he is completely disabled. Then, the other one says “partial.” Then you make a decision that the person is partially disabled. From a living standpoint, what is that person going to do, if there is no work available for him? I mean, the attitude is, “If I can't get a job, I am fully disabled.” What is your answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Well, he stays on compensation, of course, and I am sure that now—

Mr. Watson: But he is on half compensation.

Hon. Mr. Starr: No, if he is co-operating under section 41, he is on full compensation. That is providing he is co-operating with the vocational rehabilitation people in every respect and is actually endeavouring to find work. Our new reorganized employer group in vocational rehabilitation would be actively trying to get him a job.

Mr. Watson: What about the fellow on this back program? Is it you or your board who is, for instance, insisting on the back X-rays? Or is that a company policy? I have had occasion to discuss that.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I don't know. Dr. McCracken, could you enlarge on the back X-rays?

Dr. McCracken: Are you talking about pre-employment back X-rays?

Mr. Watson: Yes.

Dr. McCracken: The compensation board has nothing to do with that whatsoever.

Mr. Watson: Again, I realize you don't want to discuss specific cases but I have a fellow who is a tool and die maker and he went to get a job—he is fairly old—but found that he can't get a job. He says: “They have

found out that there's something wrong with my back. I have never known I had anything wrong with my back. I have never had anything. But they won't hire me because they suddenly found out it would be dangerous for me to be working and that's my trade."

I can appreciate the company's point of view in saying: "We don't want to have this person doing that if there is a danger." But then I appreciate his point of view when he says: "I have done it for 25 or 30 years and it has never hurt me; yet the X-rays show I have maybe been living dangerously all my life."

[4:45]

Dr. McCracken: As I mentioned, the compensation board has absolutely no control over the pre-employment medical examinations or hiring practices, as you can appreciate. However, I would say if I were hiring a person with a specialized trade, and that person was middle aged and X-ray examination showed degenerative disease or arthritis of the spine, and he had a good work record and he stated he had never been disabled due to back pain, despite the X-ray findings, I would think that person would be an excellent risk having gone all that length of time. In all probability, unless some very definite and severe accident occurred, he would probably finish out the rest of his work years still not having any problem. It merely points out the unreliability of using X-rays as a pre-employment tool.

Mr. Watson: You are telling me that the Workmen's Compensation Board has no influence or jurisdiction on that policy, that that is a company policy?

Dr. McCracken: That is correct.

Mr. Watson: There are always two sides to everything, and this fellow is blaming the workmen's compensation people.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Everybody blames us for everything.

Mr. Watson: I had no reason to doubt his story.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We are used to it.

Mr. Martel: I can see why you are so touchy.

Hon. Mr. Starr: If you got it every day as I do.

Mr. Watson: There may have been other reasons why he was turned down, but that was his reason.

Mr. Martel: There is a group that is starting to gather all of the cases where workers have been turned down and they intend to make a presentation to the government on

that. There are all kinds of people now being turned down, 21, 22, 23 years old.

There is a group in Timmins, your colleague might find it for you, who in fact are trying to put that data together to make a presentation to the government, to say that these people are simply being turfed out, there is something wrong.

Mr. Watson: But what is the other side of that? I am not trying to point a finger, but what is the other side of the guy who does show up and then he is injured? He is not allowed to sign a waiver of this, is he?

Mr. Martel: Dr. McCracken puts his finger on the real nub of the matter. Many people go through life with a back problem. It is there, but it never really bothers them. It shows up on an X-ray and they don't even know they have it.

Hon. Mr. Starr: The back starts deteriorating when you are born.

Mr. Martel: That is creating a very serious problem. I know in the mining industry we are now getting a lot of people turned down who have never been injured, but once they take that X-ray they are turving them out; before they get their 90 days in they are just being turfed out.

Mr. Watson: That is right. That is exactly what I am talking about. Who do I feel sorry for?

If the medical people are right, saying you have a problem, then you are probably doing the fellow a favour by saying he should not be at this job because his chances of getting hurt are great. On the other hand, if he has worked 25 years and hasn't hurt it yet, then why the heck can't he keep going? I talk out of both sides of my mouth on those things.

Mr. Martel: This is rather difficult, but—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, another point which may be of interest to you is that we encourage employers to hire people with pre-existing conditions, maybe not a disability but a pre-existing condition, by utilizing the second injury enhancement fund.

If that individual is injured at work and it is related to the previous condition, we have a system whereby we can give the employer some financial relief. In this way we encourage employers to hire people who do have a pre-existing condition.

Mr. Watson: What kind of system is that?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It is a formula which would take a little while to describe. If we have time we can go into it. I would be pleased to give you a copy of it; it describes it in detail for you.

We take a look at the kind of accident the man had—and this is talking about relief for the employer now, not what the man is going to get. It depends on the pre-existing condition.

Mr. Watson: In ballpark figures?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It is a percentage. The percentage goes anywhere from 25 per cent of the permanent disability award up to 90 per cent of the permanent disability award.

Mr. Watson: If a man is injured on the job now, and I assume there is a percentage of that charged back to that employer, say it is a pensionable thing or something, is that not—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, a percentage of it.

Mr. Watson: Can you give me any round figures as to what that percentage is? If I am working at a machine and I lose both my hands or something—I am completely disabled, or whatever it is—there is a fund set up; is that right?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If you had no pre-existing condition, the employer group bears the entire cost of that claim.

Mr. Watson: The employer group pays the entire cost of it?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: On a group liability basis, yes.

Mr. Watson: Are you telling me that, if there is a pre-existing condition and the employer hires somebody, then claims against that group are not as great?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: There is a portion of financial relief given when the accident involves the pre-existing condition; that's what I am saying in simple terms.

Mr. Watson: And there is no ballpark figure, because each pre-existing condition is different? Let's take the one that Elie and I were talking about; is that at a half or three quarters?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It varies. It is generally a half. It can go from 25 per cent to as much as 90 per cent, but it is generally 50 per cent financial relief.

Here is a little folder for you which gives you some questions and answers on it.

Mr. Van Horne: I would like to ask what the normal time lapse might be between investigation and decision. Is there a norm that you try to strive for? What are you looking at? A week?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Is there an average of normal time, Mr. Kerr?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: At present, the length of time that it takes to complete the local in-

vestigation, in my view, is not satisfactory. It varies, on average, from three to four weeks across the province. I think that should be reduced to 10 days for claims being handled in area offices and to seven days for claims being handled and investigated out of head office.

How long it takes to make the decision after that information comes back into the office depends upon several things. The investigation can be ordered by the claims adjudication branch, the claims review branch or the appeal system.

When the claim comes back, it may be necessary—from the information on file—to refer it to one of our own surgical consultants for a medical opinion. It is very difficult to put an average on it; I don't really have any figures, but I would suggest that if it had to be referred for further medical opinion of that nature it could take another couple of weeks.

On the other hand, if it is the type of claim where a medical is not involved, where it is a question as to whether the accident arose out of employment, the investigation notes would be complete, they would come back to the adjudicating person, who could make the decision within a matter of a couple of days.

Mr. Van Horne: Is it fair to suggest that there is a problem with what you called earlier—and you have used the term three or four times—certain checks and balances, or checks and controls? Is there a problem between the check and control that exists out in the regional office and the transmitting of that information, after it has been checked et cetera, to Toronto, where it goes through almost the same process again?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I don't think we have a problem with our checks and balances. The problem with the local investigations at the present time is that we have more than we can handle as quickly as we want to handle. That is the basic problem right there.

Transportation time for the claim to go from head office to an area office is just overnight; we use courier service, arranged by the administration resources division. When the claim comes back from the local office to Toronto, it is an overnight delivery. The transportation time of the actual file from head office to the area office and back is minimal. But the length of time it requires now for the investigation to be completed in the area office is not acceptable to me. It is taking too long at the present time because of work volume.

Mr. Van Horne: Let me go at it from a slightly different angle. Is it that the local

offices really haven't got very much local autonomy?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, it is not local autonomy; it is not enough staff to do the volume of work. This matter, as I pointed out before, is being discussed with the board next week, on April 6, so that we can come to a resolution of the problem.

Hon. Mr. Starr: The case load is too high for them to handle it, to move expeditiously.

Mr. Martel: The question you ought to be asking is, how many cases are there per case worker in your area as opposed to Toronto?

Mr. Van Horne: I've got the numbers here. I can take London and there are two investigators and a waiting list of 60 so they're each looking at—

Mr. Martel: Refine it more than that. How much do they average? What do they consider a normal workload for a case worker there as opposed to here?

Mr. Van Horne: Five a week?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I realize what Elie—

Mr. Watson: Your 48 hours makes that six weeks down at Chatham.

Mr. Martel: We're not talking about investigations. We're talking about where investigations are conducted.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I can add something to that. I understand what Mr. Martel is after.

The average number of claims that can be investigated during a five-day work week by one claims investigator is six claims, so we count on a production of six complete investigations by a claims investigator in one week. When he leaves on Monday morning from whatever office he's working, he takes more than that number with him because sometimes you get hung up on a claim. Maybe the man isn't available or a witness is on holiday or something of that nature. So, on an average, he'll produce six complete investigations a week. We know how many investigators we have so we can calculate what our production will be for a given period of time.

I guess I didn't answer your question, sir, about the autonomy.

Mr. Van Horne: That's right.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Under our present system of operating, where all the claims decisions are made in head office, I don't think autonomy comes into it. The system of localized, decentralized claims adjudication, as you know, is under study at the present time and, of course, there will be advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Van Horne: I have no more questions at this point in time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bounsall: May I just ask one question to follow up on what Doug Hamilton was asking? Perhaps I could ask it privately, but maybe it had better be on the record.

What happens when the local office phones in on whatever the problem may be? They've punched the screen and back comes, not the answer to the question asked but a blank screen or something. Presumably, then, on behalf of the claimant, the local office phones to ask why the cheque hasn't been paid or whatever the problem is. The questions that I have asked Les Liversidge are now being asked by the local office. What happens? Who receives that phone call and why is it that they seemingly don't get an answer back in the local office? Whoever they phone, is the case file not found and looked into and the details of whatever the problem is phoned back? Why doesn't the local office seem to be able to get as detailed an answer if they phone than a good assignee to one of us can?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think I understand your question.

First of all, the screen we have at head office and in the area offices only has limited information.

Mr. Bounsall: By and large that's often useless in terms of the question being asked.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, it does not tell you, for instance, why the claim has not been paid since March 20, or whatever the date is.

By the way, in our future system the screen will give us those answers, but it doesn't help us now so we'll just forget that.

When the person in the area office calls to head office they call through to the section which normally handles the claim and the telephone inquiry clerk gets the information. If the claim file is in its place in the filing cabinet, in other words not on somebody's desk being worked on, then it's available, but this is not always the case. There are occasions when the claim file could be out of its place in the filing cabinet, and quite legitimately so. It could be on the adjudicator's desk; it could be down in the payment preparation section where they're doing work on it to process payment; it could be on a medical advisor's desk, so it isn't readily available.

[5:00]

Mr. Bounsall: But that happens when I phone Les, too.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, that's true.

Mr. Bounsall: He finds the file.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, all right. I am coming to a very important point. You are dealing with Les. You are dealing with the counselling specialists and I must confess to you they get better service. We have such volume; we have got 40,000 active files. We have 40,000 active files at any one time. It is very difficult, and I know you are not going to like what I am going to say, but we can't give every call priority, and send somebody out and immediately grab the file.

Mr. Bounsall: That's the answer for Doug. That's the answer to what Doug Hamilton was asking. The local office can't in fact, because they don't get as good a service, get the answer for the person. A few days later, Doug, they come to our office.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, one thing we are doing now, and we are trying it out to see how it works, and that is trying to get—

Mr. Watson: You should switch these guys around.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: —a system whereby telephone calls come in from the area office and there will be a search for that file to try and locate it overnight. There is a great deal of advantage in locating files overnight so they can respond the next day, because the files are static, they are not moving around, because people aren't normally working after 4:30, 5:00, or 5:30, whatever it is. We think this will be a big assistance to us, and this is probably our best way of attacking the problem at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Possibly it may be practical to assign an individual, such as Les Liversidge, to each one of our area and satellite offices. They would, instead of contacting the specific section—where it may not be available and be somewhere else and you don't have this special privilege of finding the file—get the information faster. If we had someone specially assigned to that particular area office whom they would phone on all the claims, they would have the means of getting the file and the information much faster.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, that is interesting. I want to come back to another point, though. Les doesn't often get back to me the same day; it might take one day or two days. You have talked about this overnight search for the file. Do you have a routine, when some employees pick up all of these messages that have come in either from me or Les, or from an MPP to the contact, or from the local offices, who search overnight and match up the query with the file? Is this standard routine?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, the filing clerks do that, it is standard routine.

Mr. Hamilton: There is just no question that the file availability at the head office has improved tremendously in the last year.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Oh, yes, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Bounsall: Something's happening yes.

Mr. Hamilton: There is no reason why that same availability that is available to the fellow who serves you at the head office cannot be made available to the district offices. Why not? There is no other reason for a gap.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, perhaps, if I may, I would like to ask Mr. Sweeney, executive director of the administrative resources division, to address that since it is one of his many responsibilities.

Mr. Hamilton: If I haven't confused you, Sweeney will.

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: Actually, we have a staff of—I believe it is 10 girls right at the moment, and they are on a shift which starts at 1 o'clock in the afternoon and goes until 8 o'clock at night. Their purpose is to respond to all outstanding telephone inquiry slips for files. This includes requests from area offices and telephone calls that have come in on our switchboard system.

It is my opinion that what you are trying to get at here, Mr. Hamilton, is there is a difference. I honestly do not feel there is a difference in the service levels between what the counsellors get if it is put on a search and what a normal telephone inquiry gets. I don't believe there is a difference.

Mr. Bounsall: In terms of finding the file.

Mr. Hamilton: That's right.

Mr. Bounsall: In terms of the time.

Mr. Hamilton: What I am saying is we have heard an argument this afternoon to the contrary.

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: That's fine, but what I am saying is there is not a distinction. Eighty-seven per cent of all telephone inquiries received today are responded to today as far as file location is concerned. The evening shift responds only to those that could not be found or were received late in the day. Within 24 hours they all should have been serviced.

Mr. Hamilton: Is that available then to the area offices?

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: Yes. All telephone inquiries, regardless of their origination, are followed through on the telephone inquiry system.

Mr. Van Horne: Except for those you can't find.

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: Well, they are still put on the same search with the same girls who go through the locations to locate the files.

Mr. Van Horne: What does the terminology mean, "in dictation"? The file is in dictation?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That means that somebody has dictated a letter or a memorandum and it's in the typists' section. We have a centralized typing section.

Mr. Van Horne: I didn't want to get into this until tomorrow. But there is one case, a Mr. Glenn Snider—we started working with him on March 1 of this year—going through a whole lot of exercise in dictation, was one of the comments passed on to us—but on March 26 the file couldn't be found. Let me get into detail on that tomorrow. I'm sorry I have to leave now.

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: A point at this time though gentlemen is that there are certain priorities. I'm sure you would not wish a file pulled out when we were just arranging to process a payment through the computer, or where a letter was being dictated—these are the priorities—so that we would have to go into a second search on it. We'd find it, but we could not have it released to the inquirer who had perhaps a lower level priority than processing a payment against the claim.

So we do have these issues that we have to deal with as well. The mere fact that it was located—we may not have pulled it out of the system because of the urgency that was being placed on the file at the time.

Mr. Bounsall: Maybe this relates to Mr. Starr's suggestion. There's equal access in terms of finding the files for our inquirers and the local office inquirers. There may be a difference between what happens at that point. If Les is told the file is in dictation, he probably walks to dictation and doesn't remove the file but reads the letter that's being typed at the moment and then gets back to me. Does the inquirer searching for the local office do that and find out that information and report that back to the local office?

Mr. V. G. Sweeney: The purpose of the search is just to locate the file and pass it to the individual who requested the file, not to determine what state the file is in or to make any determination within it—only to locate it and deliver it within the priorities that have been established.

Mr. Bounsall: I think probably that's the difference in service.

Mr. Martel: I have just one point on this complicated problem involving the Inco strikers who were released from Downsview and who were reduced to 50 per cent or totally cut off. That was ultimately cleared up by the board. It decided they would pay them if the doctors and the board said they could resume light duty.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Temporarily. That's the key word in that sentence.

Mr. Martel: Yes. What happened to a bunch of them, as you know, they were reduced to 50 per cent. What I've been trying to find out for a couple of months on this, because I am sure there is going to be a whole series of appeals that I'd like to head off, is what the workers were advised at Downsview when they left. We have letters which said to the men, "Are you prepared to leave your employer?" That's in writing.

Hon. Mr. Starr: A letter written by our people?

Mr. Martel: Yes. That's the most concrete evidence we have. It was actually put in writing: are you prepared to quit? So the guy said, "I'm not going to quit I've got 29 years at Inco and I've got my seniority and my pension benefits and everything else." But once he realized he didn't have to quit, he's then prepared to go and look for a job because he knows he doesn't have to quit. He can take the job temporarily. I agree with that. He has to look for the temporary job; he just can't sit. What concerns me is what the whole group of them was really told.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: You obviously have a number of cases you are talking about. I think the best way to resolve the problem is for you to identify those cases to Mr. Kerr. A review of those cases can be arranged and a discussion with you to find out exactly what was told to those individuals, because not every individual is told exactly the same thing. It depends on the case. You know that.

Mr. Martel: What the worker decided he would do at the time was dependent on what he was told at Downsview.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: The advice he is given at Downsview is recorded on file. I think the best way to approach it is to look at those files.

Mr. Martel: Some of those, as you know, are presently with the minister because they were in writing.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Would you agree, Mr. Kerr?

Hon. Mr. Starr: What intrigues me is you said that one even had it in writing.

Mr. Martel: Yes, he was asked if he was prepared to leave his employer.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Which department was that issued by? Claims?

Mr. Martel: Claims department.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I would like to have that identified so that we can check it.

Mr. Martel: We can bring those letters to you. My concern is that I have a number of them and I am afraid they are going to want me to appeal them and I really don't want to go through the process.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You always have prepared a good precis.

Mr. Martel: I know, but they take so long.

Mr. Hamilton: We wouldn't have to go to Nova Scotia to get that evidence.

Mr. Martel: Hopefully not for that one. It would be a key matter to know what the workers were advised when they were leaving Downsview. That is the key to the whole thing. If they were told, "Look, you don't have to quit your job; it is a temporary job you have to look for," that's one thing. But we have cases where they were asked in writing, "Are you prepared to leave your employer?"

Hon. Mr. Starr: I am going to ask a question. Is the whole matter fairly well settled now? Are there any problems?

Mr. Martel: I am trying not to go to appeal.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Do you want to get the appeal for the period of time they were cut off to 50 per cent? Is that what your point is?

Mr. Martel: There are about 80 cases really where there were reductions.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I think there are two people who would have talked to them at the time they left the hospital and rehabilitation centre, both the claim adjudication personnel and the vocational rehabilitation counsellor. I think it could involve both areas and you would have to have a review of those cases. If you could provide the numbers, Mr. Kerr and Mr. Wisocky could arrange to review them and see what is going on or what has happened in those cases.

Mr. Wisocky: I am going to touch on claims and vocational rehabilitation policies. Mr. Kerr can supplement it or correct me if I am wrong. Prior to December 15, 1978, it was the policy of the board that if an employee was discharged from HRC as fit for light work and the company was on strike

so that naturally there was no light work available with the company, in that situation he was usually reduced to 50 per cent.

On December 15, 1978, the board issued a board minute which stated that in the Inco situation it will continue full compensation benefits as long as the Inco employee is willing to look for temporary work, as you have stated. As far as I know, that policy has been implemented. I personally have one counsellor up in Sudbury whose current caseload is something like 104 cases. Generally speaking, that is what we are doing.

At the time prior to the board minute, they were told what I just said. But since that time it is very clear as to what they are told.

Mr. Martel: That area you mentioned would be from when they were first released at Downsview to when that policy was altered. Those are the ones we have had problems with—if they decide to appeal.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may add to that, to carry on from where Mr. Wisocky has brought us, after that board decision was made, the claims adjudication branch reviewed all those cases that had been reduced to temporary partial disability of 50 per cent. Where there was some information to indicate the man was available for temporary work, then they were adjusted.

There were some who were already on temporary partial of 50 per cent before the strike occurred. We did not adjust those because the situation wouldn't change. If they weren't available for work before the strike, the situation would be the same after September 15.

Wherever we could find evidence that the man had made himself available for temporary employment in one way or the other, any kind of information we could get to support that, we did go back and adjust them. But not all of them were adjusted, Elie, because we just couldn't do it in every case.

Mr. Martel: I understand that. My only concern was knowing what they were told; what they were advised at Downsview at the time.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: As Mr. Wisocky said, after that board decision was made that question was no longer asked; but it was asked prior to that, as explained by Mr. Wisocky. I think right now we have about 107 or so who are receiving service and benefits.

About 104, Mr. Wisocky says.

Mr. Chairman: With that, the meeting will be adjourned until tomorrow afternoon.

The committee adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 29, 1979

Transmitting Estimates, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	365
Point of privilege re physicians opting out of OHIP, Mr. Cassidy	365
Point of privilege re Hotel Dieu Hospital, Mr. Cooke	365
Point of privilege re Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, Mr. Lawlor	365
Business corporations legislation, statement by Mr. Welch	366
Health services, statement by Mr. Timbrell	367
OMERS legislation, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller	368
Budget date, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller	368
Advisory committee on Confederation, statement by Mr. Wells	368
Kenora plane crash, statement by Mr. Auld	369
Health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Conway, Mr. Breaugh	370
Former minister's speech, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon	372
Health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Conway	375
Hydro uranium contracts, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent	377
Property taxation, questions of Mr. Maeck: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Charlton	377
Physicians' salaries, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	378
Rape case, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Stong	378
Tourism, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Eakins	379
Driver education, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Young	379
Membership of police commissions, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Worton	380
Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lawlor	380
Community service boards, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Bolan	381
Petition re mental health legislation, Mr. Lawlor	381
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Breaugh	381
Motion re discharge of bills, Mr. Welch, agreed to	382
Motion re business of the House, Mr. Welch, agreed to	382
Motion re schedule of committee meetings, Mr. Welch, agreed to	382
Municipal Niagara Hydro-Electric Service Act, Mr. Auld, first reading	382
York Municipal Hydro-Electric Service Amendment Act, Mr. Auld, first reading	382
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Amendment Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	382

Audit Amendment Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	383
Agricultural Development Repeal Amendment Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	383
Business Corporations Amendment Act, Mr. Drea, first reading	383
Tabling answers to questions 93 and 94 on notice paper, Mr. Welch	383
Third readings, Bills 2 and 7	383
Private members' public business re Kindergarten programs: Mr. Grande, Mr. Jones, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Watson, Mr. Nixon	383
Re Registration of lobbyists: Mr. Rotenberg, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Samis, Mr. Williams, Mr. Blundy, Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. McCaffrey	394
Resolution 4 concurred in	405
Business of the House, Mr. Welch	405
Royal assent to Bills 2, 7, 20, 74, 75, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor	405
Recess	406
Appendix A: Answers to questions on notice paper	406
Industrial incentives, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Laughren	406
Employer-sponsored training, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Cooke	406
Appendix B: Resources development committee (meetings of March 28 afternoon and evening) consideration of Workmen's Compensation Board annual report, 1977	408

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
 Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCaffrey, B. (Armourdale PC)
 McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
 McGuigan, J. (Kent-Elgin L)
 McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General, Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)

Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Villeneuve, O. F.; Chairman, Resources Development Committee (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Watson, A. N.; Vice-Chairman, Resources Development Committee (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

Assisting the Resources Development Committee:

From the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario:

Hamilton, D. F., Commissioner of Appeals
Kerr, W. R., Executive Director, Claims Division
McCracken, Dr. W. J., Executive Director, Medical Services Division
MacDonald, A. G., Vice-Chairman, Administration
McDonald, J. F., Secretary
Starr, Hon. M., Chairman
Sweeney, V. G., Executive Director, Administrative Resources Division
Weaver, E. T., Executive Director, Communications Division
Wisocky, J., Executive Director, Vocational Rehabilitation Services Division



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, March 29, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1979

The House resumed at 8:02 p.m.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. F. S. Miller moved that the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of civil servants and other necessary payments pending voting of supply for the period commencing April 1, 1979, and ending June 30, 1979, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I make the comment that we have changed the period to three months. It was intended to be three months; by some error it became six months. I have understood that in the past the House has not been generally willing to extend the period to six months. Rather than argue, we settled for June 30.

Mr. Peterson: The Treasurer is quite right, Mr. Speaker. We prefer shorter periods than sometimes has been demonstrated in the past; that is why we have a preference for three months. It gives us all a wonderful opportunity to go through this enlightened debate on a far more regular basis.

I am highly tempted to vote against this motion tonight, and I would, except for the fact that I have to make a speech at 8:30 to a very enlightened group, the High Park Liberal Association. If I had the time, I would definitely stay here, and we would fight this on its merits. However, the High Park Liberal Association has saved the Treasurer for at least another three months, depending, of course, on what he does in a couple of weeks.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Who is your speech writer? Jim Taylor?

Mr. Peterson: The honourable minister just made a noise. Does he have something worthwhile to contribute? Jimmy Taylor is writing my speeches, that's right.

In many ways this debate is irrelevant because we will soon be into a very major debate on the budgetary policies of this government, whatever they are—it's been impossible to decipher them for the past six or nine months since we've had the new Treasurer. Really, nobody knows what this charming little squirt is up to, for sure.

Mr. B. Newman: Not even the minister.

Mr. Peterson: We have seen some gratuitous handouts to various people with no particular strings attached—with no particular conditions that we understand.

Mr. Hennessy: It's only the start.

Mr. Peterson: There's been a sort of ad hockery brought to this whole process that to any intelligent observer is almost incomprehensible. I'm almost tempted to allow the supply to go through for civil servants because I know the good deputy minister Rendall has been working very hard to try to make this man appear at least a little bit legitimate. But I would almost be tempted to move an amendment deducting the government politicians' salaries from this and let the civil service be paid in the normal course of events.

Mr. Hennessy: He'd have a heart attack.

Mr. Peterson: I wish you'd stop the interjections over there, Mr. Speaker, because I have several things that are important to say.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Will you let us know when you start?

Mr. Peterson: Look at them: the two senior government ministers sitting there, the two diminutive ministers sitting there, looking for all the world like two cheeks of the same behind. Look at them.

If you accept my thesis, what does that make the Premier (Mr. Davis)? I guess you'd have to ask that. Look at them. They laugh at each other's jokes; they really enjoy each other, it's quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker: I think the honourable member really is getting a little carried away.

Mr. Hennessy: That's right.

Mr. Peterson: I've been provoked, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has nothing at all to do with supply.

Mr. Peterson: I have been provoked. You can see that. They're trying conscientiously to provoke me. A little bit like the Premier—

Hon. Mr. Walker: He sounds like the south end of a northbound horse.

Mr. Hennessy: It's a supply of BS.

Mr. Peterson: —sometimes I get provoked and I launch into little diatribes.

Anyway, I'm sorry my time is almost up because I do have to get into my car to go to High Park. We will support the motion now. The House will hear a great deal from us in a week or two or three, whenever the appropriate time is.

I can say to the Treasurer very seriously, we are looking forward with great expectations to his performance on April 10. He has not felt rigorously bound to the dictates of the previous budget, he has altered principles substantially. It is a very difficult government to keep up to because it keeps switching ministers as it gets into trouble. I hope the present minister is able to stay there for at least a brief period of time to implement whatever he feels should be implemented in the next two weeks.

It is going to be incumbent upon him to make a little bit of sense out of these vague policies he has been putting to us and to the business community in the last little while. I'm referring to these little series of grants given on what basis God only knows, because we don't understand them and I don't really think he understands them and I don't really think he knows the conditions of the pulp and paper grant situation because they don't understand—

Mr. Sweeney: You guys don't know very much, do you?

Mr. Peterson: —and they don't know if it's viable, and the government doesn't know if it's viable, and nobody knows frankly what's going on. The Treasurer has been a contributor to the crisis of confidence if there is one at all. I know he is going to say, "It was your friends in Ottawa."

Mr. Breithaupt: Their friends in Ottawa.

Mr. Peterson: The people will have a chance to judge that in the very near future.

I just want to say this has been a wonderful opportunity to consume eight minutes of legislative time, and let me compliment the minister on his Muskoka tartan—matching tie, jacket and boxer shorts. It's a very handsome outfit.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I too want to say, on behalf of our party, we're not going to oppose this motion before us here this evening. However, I'm not going out to speak at any Liberal rally tonight—

Mr. Peterson: They would never let you.

Mr. Swart: No, I would doubt very much if it's worth going the distance for the four or five people who will be there.

Mr. Ruston: Now the NDP have meetings in a phone booth.

Mr. Swart: Yes, but they're growing very rapidly.

Because I do not have to attend anything else this evening, but more particularly because when the budget speech comes up there probably will be two or more members on this side of the House who will want to speak in the budget debate, and therefore I may not be able to be worked in, I want to say a little about the issues involved in this resolution that we have before us this evening.

It is an all-encompassing resolution that we have, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you recognize. It authorizes the Treasurer to pay salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments; and that's just about all-inclusive.

We cannot let this resolution pass without questioning the voting of money to administer policies with which we wholeheartedly disagree. We disagree with the Treasurer's approach to the economy. We disagree with his restraint program, and certainly the application of it. The burden of this restraint program, which the government of Ontario instituted some three or three and a half years ago, is falling most heavily on those least able to pay, and I have no doubt that it was the deliberate intention of the government that this would be the case.

Shortly after I came into the House in the fall of 1975, there was a document tabled called the Special Program Review, the Maxwell Henderson report. I thought at that time, and I have come to be more and more convinced of it ever since, that that was the course the government was charting in the years ahead. Certainly the three years or three and a half years since that time have proved this to be the case.

Let me quote from this document in four places. It states in that document that the government should not at this time accept additional major responsibilities for public services but rather should explore the possibility of transferring back to the private sector some of the activities that it currently undertakes. That is a philosophical statement, and we all know, if we read between the lines, what that means; that some of the levelling process, some of the equality provided by the provincial government, shall be lessened.

They say the expenditures of the Ontario government as a percentage of the gross provincial product should decline. Of course, all of us in public life are anxious to see taxes go down, but I think we have to weigh that against the services that are provided to the

public and examine whether a decline as a percentage will create greater inequality among the citizens of this province; of course, this is exactly what has happened.

They went on to make it very clear that that was what they intended to happen in this program review, as they called it. They stated, for instance, with regard to university and college education, that the level of government support should be gradually adjusted over a period of several years so as to allow an increase in the proportion of university and college costs covered by tuition fees. Again, this simply means that those in the lower income brackets, as we know, will be less likely and will have less opportunity to attend university.

With regard to health care, they recommended exactly what is taking place at the present time. They said consideration should be given to phasing out surplus beds and expensive treatment facilities in some hospitals, particularly those adjacent to urban centres, and public hospitals should be authorized to increase substantially the daily charges for private and semi-private accommodation. Then they went on to say this: "There [should] be a thorough examination of public hospital operating costs, with particular concentration on ways of reducing the total paid hours of the hospital staff." Certainly we see that recommendation being followed today, with rather dire results for the people of this province.

[8:15]

They made the same kind of statements with regard to social security. The recommendation here is that the proportion of the provincial budget that is allocated to social security be lowered from its present level. We all know the advantage of social security is to the lower income groups, not the higher income groups; and by lowering the level of social security, of course, we are making the contrast between the wealthy in our society and the poor in our society that much greater.

Even with regard to municipal government and school board financing, they recommended that the province limit its support of school boards and local government generally to the available finances as defined in the Edmonton commitment. Implementation of this proposal will require modification of the existing open-ended cost-sharing formula; and then further recommendations with regard to the limitations of transfer payments to the various types of local government, whether they be school boards or whether they be municipalities or some other form.

Of course he even went on and made some even more radical, and I use that word advisedly, radical suggestions.

Mr. Wildman: Reactionary.

Mr. Swart: They said they should limit spending to programs that meet the needs of the whole population; that was one of the suggestions. Of course that would come out as those programs which serve only the needy in our society. They went on to say that medical insurance should be returned to the private sector, through PSI, Blue Cross and similar plans; at this time we see the very real possibility in Ontario.

They said they should recover the total cost of parks, day-care centres and similar facilities through user charges. Do not establish a provincial dental care plan or finance through the Ontario Lottery, and so on. It was about as reactionary a document as it would be possible to envisage at that time. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is being followed rather closely at the present time.

I say to the government they simply tried to make a virtue of a regressive income redistribution in the name of restraint. They have done it; and in some degree they have been successful in getting away with it, because they have sold it as restraint, the action of a government that wants to cut back expenditure. I will have a little bit more to say about that in the very near future.

I want to repeat and give some documentation to the fact that what it has done is to shift the burden more and more on to those in the lower income brackets.

We are all aware, I think, that the consumer price index in the last three years—and whether you take it from the end of 1975 to the end of 1978, or from March 1, 1979, to March 1, 1976, doesn't make much difference, the cost of living in Canada has gone up about 26 per cent, and of course in Ontario perhaps even a little higher. But because the cost of the essentials, whether it is food or whether it is heating—and incidentally oil and gas have gone up by about 150 per cent in those three years—the essentials have gone up much higher, much faster, than the average cost of living. And of course those on the lower income have to spend a higher percentage of their income, as we all know, on those essentials—food, heating, et cetera.

It should also be said that the cost really doesn't increase by percentages, it increases by dollars and cents. Those with lower incomes, if they get a six per cent or an eight per cent increase in wages, in dollars and cents it is proportionately much less, far less.

So those increases in cost, as you well know Mr. Speaker, hurt those with lower incomes more. Not only do they have a higher percentage of increase in their cost of living, but because they have a low income to start with they are hurt a great deal more by it.

I want everybody to keep in mind that there has been an increase in the cost of living of something like 26 per cent in our society.

What has happened to minimum wages in this province during that three-year period? They have gone up from \$2.65 to \$3 a hour.

Mr. Wildman: And they have made a virtue of keeping them down.

Mr. Swart: Yes. That is a 13 per cent increase in the minimum wage. I don't know what percentage of the population of this province is on minimum wage, but estimates have been made of about 20 per cent. Therefore, 20 per cent, if that is the case, or 10 per cent if it is only 10, have had their incomes go up by 13 per cent, while the cost of living has gone up by 27 per cent. Average wages and salaries, as I am sure most people here know, have gone up by about 31 per cent, which is just a little bit more than the cost of living, even although in the last year they have not gone up as rapidly as the cost of living. Those people on the minimum wage have seen more and more how low their standard of living has dropped.

What about those on general welfare? A family of four on general welfare back at the beginning of 1976 received something like \$460, plus \$20 per child for each one over the four. That has now gone up to \$530, plus \$25 per child, in a three-year period. That is an increase of 16 per cent compared to a 27 per cent increase in the cost of living. A single person on welfare has seen his allowance go up 14 per cent during that period compared to 27 per cent in the cost of living.

What about those on family benefits? A single woman with two children, ages five and 13—and this is averaging selective figures for 1976—was getting \$368 maximum three years ago. Now she is getting \$421 maximum. That is an increase of 15 per cent, while the cost of living has gone up 27 per cent and, in fact, more than that for those on lower incomes.

Mr. Cooke: The Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) should be listening to this.

Mr. Wildman: He is not interested.

Mr. Swart: During that same period of time, profits have gone up 41 per cent. I say there is something wrong with a system that permits that kind of thing to happen in our society. That isn't the only place where those

in the lower income groups have been hurt. Let's look at a few details on this. Let's examine what has happened with regard to OHIP premiums. In this three-year period, as members are well aware, there would have been an increase of over 100 per cent if it hadn't been for the fight that was put up by the two opposition parties. In fact, the increase in OHIP premiums was 72 per cent during this three-year period.

We now find the doctors who are opting out—and there are a great many of them—are charging something like 42 per cent more than they would receive from OHIP. Obviously, with this flat fee they may say that they themselves institute some sort of means test. I suggest a means test should be conducted on some sort of scientific basis and not by the seat of the pants, if I can paraphrase what the member for London North (Mr. Van Horne) had to say.

Even such things as provincial park fees have gone up something like 50 per cent in those years.

Mr. Wildman: They are not opening them as early either.

Mr. Swart: Automobile licences went up in 1977 by 40 per cent—perhaps a little more on the average than 40 per cent. Once again, these flat fees hit hardest those at the lower income level. Old age pensioners and those with lower incomes by and large drive their cars only a fraction of the distance in any year that those with the higher incomes do—somebody like myself—and yet they have to pay that additional flat fee to take their car out of the yard. I suggested there should be some graduated payment towards our road system and into government on this. They shouldn't have increased those flat fees in that manner. It would be much better to increase the gasoline tax than impose that high levy against them.

Perhaps the hardest cut of all has been against the property taxpayers, particularly those at the lower income level. Of course, back in 1973 or 1974 the commitment was given by the government of this province—I'm not going to dwell on it—called the Edmonton commitment, whereby the province was going to transfer to the local municipalities an increase of funds every year according to the increase in the amount of the general revenue the province received.

Mr. Wildman: Who eliminated that, Darcy Somebody?

Mr. Swart: Of course, they never lived up to that. Even while that commitment was still on the books, they never lived up to it. In 1974, there was a transfer increase made of

14.6 per cent; the actual increase in revenue that year was 19.5 per cent. In 1975, which was election year, the transfer increase was 24 per cent when the increase in revenues was 10.2 per cent. The year after the election, they took it back. They only gave a transfer increase of 7.7 per cent, while the revenue increased by 16.7 per cent. The following year the transfer increase was 7.2 per cent while revenue went up 10.7 per cent. Last year, the transfer increased by 5.3 per cent while revenue went up by 8.2 per cent.

The end result of this cutting back on the percentage of increase to municipalities has been that property taxes have increased, and increased quite dramatically. According to the government's own figures and the book which it published on this issue, they showed in the three years from 1974 to 1977 the actual mill rates in this province went up 43.5 per cent. That doesn't tell the whole story, because assessment increased somewhat because of people fixing up recreation rooms and so on. The government itself estimates that assessment, not from new assessment but upgrading of assessment, went up something like 1.2 per cent each year. So, in fact, the gross tax levy, on the average, to the property owners went up something like 47 per cent.

It shows up in the transfer for education. Whereas the province was paying something like 61 per cent of the cost of education in 1975, by 1978 that was down to 53 per cent. There was also a reduction in the transfer payments to municipalities as a percentage of the expenditures. That gross tax increase of 47 per cent in three years, or if we add last year to make it a four-year period, runs to about 57 per cent, which is bad enough in itself.

But the point I want to make here is that tax, because of a variety of factors which the government failed to correct, fell most heavily on those least able to pay. All of the studies that have been done across this nation show the property tax by itself is an extremely regressive tax. It falls most heavily on those in the lower income brackets. It is obvious why that is the case. Over the years, the provincial governments across this nation, including Ontario—I give them credit for it up until about 1974—were transferring enough moneys to the municipalities, an increased amount of moneys to municipalities, so the incidence of the property tax was being relatively reduced.

[8:30]

Then, at about the time this document came out, there was a dramatic change, and

they started to put more and more of it on the property tax. One of the methods the government had used to make the property tax less regressive, was the property tax credit related to income. A person who was the occupant of a house received a credit on his taxes or on a portion of rent which he paid related to tax. But since 1975 that has not been increased and the result is that once again the regressive nature of this tax has not only been maintained but it has increased very dramatically.

Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, and through you the minister—and I hope he will deal with this when he gets up—examples of what has happened. These figures are taken largely from his own documents.

A person who paid \$500 in taxes on property in 1974 and had an income of \$5,000, received a property tax credit of \$253. If he had \$7,500 income he would have received a property tax credit of \$205; a \$10,000 income a property tax credit of \$155.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Those are taxable incomes.

Mr. Swart: The increases in those provide that that same person now would be getting \$282 where he got \$253, \$246 where he got \$205, and \$198 where he got \$155. But what has happened to the taxes? The tax that was \$500 would now be \$717.50; that's the increase in three years, it went up from \$500 to \$717.50.

So the net tax that the person with a \$10,000 income paid went up from \$345 to \$519, an increase of 50 per cent. At \$7,500 income that property tax credit went up from \$295 to \$471; and in the \$5,000 range the net tax went up from \$247 to \$435. In three years the net property tax increased 75 per cent.

That's bad enough. That's the case of a person who wasn't an old age pensioner. But if he was an old age pensioner he would have got back, in 1975, \$110 additional tax credit; and that still is \$110 today. It means that that old age pensioner, in that tax bracket that I speak of, at \$10,000, has had an increase of 74 per cent in three years; if he's in the \$7,500 tax bracket it's 95 per cent; and if he's in the \$5,000 income bracket his tax increase in those three years was 137 per cent.

Mr. Wildman: Shameful.

Mr. Swart: That's the kind of a shift there's been for those least able to pay in our society.

Mr. Warner: Miserable, miserly Miller.

Mr. Swart: There's all kinds of evidence that the restraint program is hurting most the

low and the low middle income groups. I want to take this opportunity to call on the Treasurer, and through him his government, to utilize the staff to produce a restraint-impact study so we know where the burden of restraint is falling. I think that's a fair and reasonable request. We should know. The government should table documents to show us where the burden of restraint is falling; and it's not on those in the wealthy income bracket.

Mr. Warner: Show us who you are hammering.

Mr. Swart: We oppose the restraint program, as I've already said, on two grounds. First, because of its unfair application; I've already dwelt on that at some length. Second, because of the very principle of the restraint—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Could we deal with interim supply? I have my estimates on tonight.

Mr. Speaker: I was getting the impression that the member for Welland-Thorold was going pretty far afield, given the motion that is before the House.

Mr. Warner: But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, most interesting.

Mr. Swart: I'm just concluding, but you would realize that this resolution covers all phases of expenditures and, in fact, covers the whole program. We are opposed to the restraint program because all the emphasis has been put on restraint. That's the only economic policy the government has. It should be taking those steps towards an economic strategy for Ontario so we have full employment.

Last year's Treasurer—and I seldom quote from last year's Treasurer—pointed out in his budget report reassessing the scope for fiscal policy in Canada that if we employed only 68,000 more people the revenue to Ontario would increase by \$358 million. Think what we could do. We'd have \$1 billion more revenue in this province if we put approximately 200,000 people to work. I'm quoting from the Treasurer's own document. I know he's qualified it and tried to put other arguments to us that it wouldn't be valid, but that's what it says with regard to full employment.

Mr. Warner: We know what your economic strategy is: Supply rowboats to people on the Titanic.

Mr. Swart: As I have said, we're not going to oppose this motion we have before us, but it seems to us in this party that we have to take every opportunity we can at this time and from here on to show what is really happening in this province because of the re-

straint program. We break completely with what the Ontario government is doing. We think we can have full employment if we have the right policy, and we think we can have fair sharing.

I want to state as strongly as I can that at a time when we are in restraint and when there's less to go around that is all the more reason we should share it fairly rather than take it out of the pockets of those least able to pay.

Mr. Charlton: I'll just take a few moments to talk about a number of things that I see in this interim supply motion and in the overall picture of government spending which bothers me a little bit. I want to talk for a few moments about the present program of the Ministry of Revenue, and section 86, equalization.

Hon. F. S. Miller: On a point of order, that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear what he has to say.

Mr. Charlton: The program to which I'm referring is the program by which the Ministry of Revenue has opted out of its responsibility for which it's been spending taxpayers' money for the past 10 years, the program of providing property tax reform for this province, the entire province.

Mr. Speaker: With the greatest of respect, if you're going to get into the programs of a specific ministry of this government I think you are going a little far afield. We're talking about interim supply for the purposes of carrying on government from now until the end of June. If you want to be all-encompassing and make some general remarks about the fiscal policy, that's fine; but if you want to deal with a specific program, there's a proper time and a proper place for that and it isn't here.

Mr. Charlton: Let me try to make it as general as I can. What I was attempting to talk about was government spending. I wanted to use some examples of that.

Mr. Wildman: What about the Sault jail?

Mr. Charlton: What I wanted to talk about was a situation where we're here tonight voting interim supply, which includes all the salaries of the civil service and all of the other costs of government programs and so on.

In the example I wanted to cite we have spent 10 years' worth of money—nobody even knows how much—and we have accomplished absolutely nothing. The Ministry of Revenue has spent money. The Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs has spent money doing studies. We have

had the Blair commission. We have had a number of other examples of money spent, and we have had no results at all.

We are back to a situation now where the Premier says that the government is not trying to pass the responsibility for property tax reform back to the municipalities, and yet this province, although it has spent in now three different ministries and a couple of commissions and studies—

Mr. Speaker: You can't talk about money that has already been spent. We're talking about the money that will be spent.

Mr. Charlton: They're still spending it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No. We're talking about the money that will be spent. You're talking about the past.

Mr. Charlton: I am doing what has been done in the past to talk to this resolution to spend it again, Mr. Speaker. The situation has not changed since last year or the year before. The only thing that has changed is the government's willingness to move on with effective property tax reform. They are still spending the money. It is still a part of this motion of interim supply. It is still a part of the budget this year. The government is still spending all of the moneys and playing all of the games with that money that it spent in the last 10 years of playing. That is the whole point of what I am trying to raise this evening. It is the approach that this government, in terms of its restraint program—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Did you ever refuse to cash your own pay cheque when you worked there?

Mr. Charlton: At the point when I worked there, I say to the Treasurer, I do recall the program having been postponed indefinitely.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is only as good as the employees we have.

Mr. Wildman: That is about as cheap as the Treasurer's taste in clothes.

Mr. Charlton: That is a very cheap shot the minister just took at the civil servants who work in the Ministry of Revenue, because the civil servants have done an excellent job. The money they have received was paid for extremely well done work. The problem lies with the present minister, the prior minister, and many of the Ministers of Revenue. The problem is not the civil servants and the job they have done; the problem is the political games that have been played by the ministers across the way in the cabinet and in the government caucus.

The whole point of the discussion is that we are no further ahead now than we were

10 years ago, and we are progressing into probably another 10 years of expenditure for the same thing.

The problem in the municipalities is that the property taxes get worse every year; at the same time, as my colleague has mentioned, the government has gone through and is in the process of making cutbacks or reductions in the grants and transfers to municipalities. It is just not in the best interests of the people of this province. The taxpayers of this province have not been well served.

The whole program has left this province in a situation which I think is being quite aptly reflected in the press in the 13 municipalities where the government has opted out and the municipalities have taken action on their own.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member is being far too specific.

Mr. Charlton: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Walker: That comes in a later vote.

Mr. Charlton: The taxes the people have been forced to pay at the municipal level right across this province have reached proportions which are simply astronomical. The situation is reflected, I think, by the outcries of those who now are finding out what the average levels in this province really are because, for whatever reason they have been underassessed. They are being put in a situation now which results directly from the government's restraint program, which has forced property taxes so high that they are having to look at property tax levels that they just didn't know existed.

[8:45]

We are not going to vote against this motion of interim supply, because there are so many people involved in it, but I think it's important the government understand that the policies it has followed in a number of areas and the way it has used taxpayers' money to absolutely no avail or to no benefit of the taxpayers of this province, is just disgusting.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I really have no other comments to make.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES

On vote 2802, Social resources program; item 2, income maintenance:

Hon. Mr. Norton: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I will make just some brief opening remarks.

The supplementary estimates for which I am seeking approval from the committee at this point total some \$14.6 million, all of which is in the income maintenance provisions of the budget of our ministry. The explanation, in brief, for the supplementary estimates, relates to the six per cent rate increase which was approved for January of this year. That accounts for a substantial amount of the \$14.6 million. The increase in the cost of the drug benefit plan for the recipients under income maintenance programs in the province accounts for part of that as well. The third significant factor was the deficit which we experienced in general welfare assistance as of the end of the fiscal year.

I wanted to make those brief comments. Perhaps the honourable members opposite have some comments to which they would like me to respond later.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Chairman, there is no way we, in this party, will vote against the supplementary estimates before us this evening. Obviously, the people who are to benefit from them need our support at this time. Of course, we as a party do provide support to the minister in these supplementary estimates.

It is obvious to me that the matters of unemployment and inflation that are being felt by the people who are serving the recipients in the municipalities are such that these amounts for these benefits do have to increase; we recognize that.

The six per cent rate of increase to which the minister alluded a few moments ago was certainly long overdue and I am not going to go into the specifics of these supplementary estimates. We look forward to the opportunity, later on in debating these matters, to discuss the many matters which have come to our attention since we last did the estimates, and we will go into that in great detail at that time.

Right now I want to say to the minister that we certainly want to see the people who are in our lowest income brackets in the province, and particularly those people who are unable to help themselves, continue to receive the benefits we have been providing. As a matter of fact, when I look at how much it costs to live now, with the increases we have had in general household expenses, such as heat and light and municipal taxes, which have been referred to here tonight, I wonder how some of these people ever manage on the amount of money that is being provided to them.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the committee of our concurrence with the supplementary estimates. I want also to assure the minister that we are going to be ready to go after him in much more precise terms in the coming estimates.

Mr. McClellan: I have to confess that I am a little confused about the figures in the supplementary estimates before us. Perhaps I would be better served if I were to ask the minister to give us a little more explanation about the details of the \$14 million being voted.

My assumption is—and maybe the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that the bulk of the sum is not for increase in benefits granted, but rather for increase in the general welfare assistance caseload. That was certainly my interpretation of the figure which shows \$11 million of the \$14,600,000 being allocated for municipal allowances and benefits.

Could the minister indicate to us how far off his forecast of general welfare assistance caseload was during the estimates last fall? In the briefing book, the programs and resources summary, the minister anticipated that there would be a total of 140,000 beneficiaries on general welfare assistance for the 1978-1979 fiscal year. I would ask if he could give us an update, either in terms of beneficiaries or in terms of cases; that is the difference between the forecast and what the actual caseload appears to be, what the breakdown of the supplementary estimates is between moneys allocated for the increase on the benefit level and moneys allocated as a result of an increase in people on general welfare assistance?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will attempt to respond to the honourable member's questions.

The general breakdown between the portion of the \$14.6 million attributable to rate increase and what is attributable to deficits would be approximately this: About \$7.2 million of that is attributable to rate increase for the portion of the fiscal year between the timing of the increase and the end of March; about \$7.4 million is attributable to deficits.

I don't have in front of me, but expect shortly, the specific amount in terms of projections and actuals. I might point out that in the area of general welfare assistance in this past fiscal year, we have experienced a very significant increase in the number of individuals in receipt of the benefits.

The overall rate of increase last year, in terms of the number of cases—this is not the dollar figure but the number of cases—is about 11.6 per cent. That may well be attributable

to a number of factors, but we think the most significant one has been the continuing relatively high rate of unemployment.

The probability that there are more people now and during the course of the past year whose entitlement to benefits under the unemployment insurance scheme at the federal level expired and who therefore resorted to general welfare assistance for their maintenance for a short period of time.

I would point out, just so no false impressions are created, that even though there has been that significant increase—and I think a significant amount of it is attributable to the termination of unemployment insurance benefits—our average length of stay is still relatively low. In fact it fluctuates depending upon the time of year because of availability of employment in the winter as opposed to the summer and so on. It still would be in the range of four to six weeks and perhaps a little higher at times during the winter. These persons are not long-term recipients, generally speaking, of general welfare assistance, that is the employable individuals.

The member asked how far we were out in terms of projections. The 1978-79 estimate for general welfare assistance was \$166 million and the current requirement is \$177, \$178,000. Does that answer each of his questions?

Mr. McClellan: I'm interested in the number of cases and then the breakdown of beneficiaries. I don't want to belabour the point. If it's difficult for the officials to pull it together on the spot, maybe the minister could submit it to me at a more convenient time. I don't want to waste the time of the House with a statistical overview, but I'd be grateful to receive that material.

Anxious as I am to participate in this estimate, I was in midflight during the estimates of the Workmen's Compensation Board downstairs and I'm kind of anxious to get back to them; I would make a couple of observations, however.

We will pay the price of this government's failure to undertake any serious measures on job creation for the last two years; we will pay that price in increased welfare costs, as we are already seeing in the supplementary estimates.

We will pay the price of the federal government's vicious folly in cutting back on unemployment insurance benefits, as though cutting back on unemployment insurance is somehow going to get rid of unemployment. It simply will transfer the burden of unemployment costs on to the province and then down on to the municipalities and on to the property tax. I think probably the minister shares my view to some extent with

respect to the seeming obsession of the Liberal government in Ottawa to mutilate and destroy the unemployment insurance program at a time of astronomical unemployment.

Again, that will show up. It hasn't shown up yet, I suspect, as fully as it will over the next fiscal year when the full impact of the recent changes to the act begin to take place and people are cut off unemployment insurance and put on to the municipal welfare rolls.

The solution to each dilemma lies in the serious commitment on the part of government at both levels, though for now I direct my attention to the provincial government, to a serious program of job creation. We've gone through a winter with the worst unemployment, at least since the Diefenbaker years if not since the depression, with a complete absence of any serious winter works program that could have put people back to work. Yet we are prepared to spend scores of millions of dollars on general welfare assistance at a time of enormously high unemployment. That doesn't make any sense.

[9:00]

I don't know whether the government intends to go through this exercise year after year. In times of high unemployment, it seems to me that it is the height of folly. The government has moved, at least in the throne speech announcement, to speak to the need for work incentive programs. We are anxious to hear the details of work incentive programs. The minister knows we have been arguing for the past three years for a serious commitment on the part of the government—

Mr. J. Reed: Ask Gordon Walker.

Mr. McClellan: —to job creation and job placement and job training for social assistance recipients in this province. Let me say in passing, since the Minister of Correctional Services is in his chair, that we are not interested in work-fare. Thank you very much, we are not interested in slave labour.

Hon. Mr. Walker: You are not interested in work at all.

Mr. McClellan: We are not interested in your bully-boy approach to the problem. We are interested in changes to the legislation that will make it possible for social assistance recipients on family benefits to go back to work and to keep a generous portion of any earnings that they make. We are anxious for the legislation to be amended so that the current artificial restrictions on the number of hours that, for example, a single parent mother is entitled to work be removed altogether.

We are anxious that the earnings exemption of \$100 a month be raised. We are anxious that the earnings exemptions for children under the Family Benefits Act for single-parent mothers be raised, and I suggest at least as a minimum, to \$50 per child per month. We are anxious that the tax-back rate, the 75 per cent tax-back rate on single-parent mothers on family benefits allowance who are working part-time be revised drastically.

I am not able to produce the figure because I don't have the staff resources to be able to calculate the combination of tax-back rate and breakeven point that would be desirable. That is a job that requires technical people in the ministry.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I think the honourable member is straying somewhat and I wish he would return to the expenditures of the money under those supplementary estimates.

Mr. McClellan: I am pleased to see that you are paying attention, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. Reed: It is very hard, you know.

Mr. McClellan: I have made the point. Those are the kinds of things that need to be done if we are to provide employment opportunities for social assistance recipients that will permit them to return to work, either full time or part time, to raise their incomes to a level of adequacy through earnings which they are permitted to keep, rather than the present practice, frankly, of robbing social assistance recipients of their earnings, because that's what the legislation does now—

Mr. Warner: No wonder you are embarrassed.

Mr. McClellan: —and that the breakeven point and the tax-back rate be set at a point so that a person is able to work and still receive benefits to a level of real generosity, and by that I mean a level approaching \$10,000-\$12,000 a year.

In the meantime, we have supplementary estimates, Mr. Chairman, and you will be asking yourself what relevance does this have to the supplementary estimates. We have dollar amounts in the amount of \$7.2 million which represent, I suppose, the tag end of the latest six per cent rate increase. What marvellous generosity this government displays, a six per cent increase in a year when the consumer price index rose 12.1 per cent.

Mr. Kerrio: Give them 20 per cent.

Mr. McClellan: Social assistance recipients in this province are living in poverty.

Mr. Warner: The minister knows that.

Mr. McClellan: I don't have to repeat chapter and verse. We make the point every estimate; and every year the minister shrugs and smiles and confesses his charming, sincere concern, and does nothing. He does nothing to give real purchasing power to social assistance recipients who have no other source of income but this ministry. They can't eat concern.

There is no way that your rent allowances cover rents; there is no way that your food allowances cover food; there is no way that anybody can live up to any adequate or decent standard on the kinds of rates provided under the Family Benefits Act or under the General Welfare Assistance Act.

We will pursue this again in the estimates when we get there in a couple of weeks. I say in passing again tonight that you are cheap with respect to the amount of money you are prepared to allocate. You are causing real hardship. You are causing real hardship to families in this province. Because, Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that it is not possible to stretch the family benefits dollar in today's rental market. It is not possible to purchase adequate, nutritious meals for families on the miserly pittance provided under the Family Benefits Act. That is not an exaggeration; the rates are too low.

I hope that we will hear in the budget, as well as more work incentive measures, a measure of social justice with respect to the rates. I hope that there will be—

Mr. Chairman: Order. We are not on the budget debate.

Mr. Warner: Seven million dollars!

Mr. McClellan: We are on the estimates debate with respect to the rate increase. We are on an estimates debate with respect to the last increase of income maintenance.

Mr. Breithaupt: Fourteen million dollars.

Mr. Chairman: The income maintenance.

Mr. McClellan: I will be concluding shortly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Good.

Mr. Kerrio: Thank heaven for small mercies.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Well at least you haven't called for my resignation tonight yet.

Mr. Warner: The evening isn't over.

Mr. Wildman: We might get Walker.

Mr. McClellan: I would invite the minister to respond now as to whether or not he intends to raise the family benefits rates; even to restore lost purchasing power since the previous rate increase let alone to bring

them up to any adequate or decent standard of living.

Mr. Warner: It gets worse every year; it gets worse instead of better.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member opposite that I will not be recommending any rate increase out of the estimates that are before the committee at this point in time.

Mr. Warner: Of course not.

Hon. Mr. Norton: These are moneys that have already been expended in the past fiscal year and his question relates more clearly to estimates for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McClellan: Don't be so slavish to the agenda.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I don't know whether he wants me to continue to respond to the other matters he raised, or whether it was just that one specific response he was eliciting at this point. I would point out, just as a matter of interest—

Mr. McClellan: Make sure he doesn't stray out of order, though.

Mr. Warner: You never disappoint us.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —and this is not to try and suggest that the persons who are in receipt of assistance in this province, under either of the programs in force, are in any way living in the lap of luxury.

Mr. Wildman: Oh we wouldn't believe that, either.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would point out to you, though—

Mr. Warner: It's called poverty.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —that concepts of poverty are really relative in a very real sense—

Mr. Warner: Three hundred and fifty thousand in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —and I would suggest to you, in spite of the fact that I acknowledge there are persons living with considerable difficulty on their limited incomes—

Mr. Warner: In poverty; in poverty.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —they in fact, in real and relative terms for example, are doing better than persons who are gainfully employed in some of the medium-income groups in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Warner: In poverty; in poverty.

Mr. Wildman: Are you comparing them to southeast Asia?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I would also point out to you that when one considers the increase that was awarded in January, although this other item is not part of our estimates, if one takes into consideration the tax credit change which

the federal government made with respect to family allowance, which actually follows a pattern we had been recommending to them for some time in terms of tax credits as opposed to some of the other approaches that have been traditionally used, a family with two children in receipt of provincial benefits will have approximately a 13 per cent increase in their benefits—

Mr. McClellan: What period of time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: In this year.

Mr. Warner: Over what?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Over the level of benefits they received last year.

Mr. Warner: Doubling zero.

Hon. Mr. Norton: One has to look at the total income. I am obviously not suggesting this government is in any way trying to take credit for the tax credits, but it is also part of the income of those persons we seek to assist.

On the matter of work incentives I am very pleased the honourable member has, consistently, verbally been as supportive as he has of my efforts to get the support of other provincial governments—

Mr. McClellan: I see you weren't supporting my efforts.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —and also the federal government to seek the kind of flexibility that in my opinion is necessary under the Canada Assistance Plan so that we can introduce some truly realistic incentives for the persons who are on benefits to assist them to make that transition which too often is very risky and chancy if they have a young family for whom they have responsibility. I was hopeful I would have the response.

As I have told the honourable member before, I had discussions with the federal minister at the federal-provincial conference in the fall following an interprovincial ministers' conference where the other provinces endorsed our proposals. At the senior staff level, discussions have been taking place since January and I understand we are making significant progress. I had recently, at the senior staff level, requested that we receive a response early in April. With current developments at the federal level I am not sure I will get a response until after May 22. Perhaps good fortune will be on the side of the people of Ontario and this country and we will get a more responsive government following May 22. I am not suggesting—

Mr. Wildman: Cheering for Broadbent, are you?

Mr. Warner: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I won't name names, of course, but I could suggest one person I wouldn't mind seeing as—

Mr. Warner: Nobody knows who his last name is.

Mr. Breithaupt: George Hees.

Mr. Warner: Joe Who.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Coming back to the question of work incentives, just to wind up, I think that is an area in which we will make studies, given the opportunities. It is very difficult for us to go it alone without co-operation from the federal government.

Mr. McClellan: Quebec appears to be going it alone. I haven't seen all the details in the Quebec scheme but they seem to be willing to go it alone.

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I understand the scheme, and I am waiting for a complete analysis of it, that is an income supplement program more than a work incentive program. They are not totally unrelated, but that does not necessarily agree with what we are talking about in terms of the work incentive program.

Mr. Warner: Bring the study in.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You did ask, and I can give you very briefly, a breakdown of the recipients and the difference between forecast and actual numbers of recipients. It is still the current fiscal year, isn't it?

We anticipated among the employables on general welfare assistance at 26,792. In fact the forecast average—we don't yet have the figures for February and March—but it appears the actual figure will be 29,813. Among those who are unemployable the projection was 65,827, and it would appear that the actual number of cases will be about 69,267 in total. For the unemployables, the figures are 39,035 projected and 39,454 actuals. The previous figures of 65,827 and 69,267 were the totals for both.

[9:15]

Mr. J. Reed: I find it a little awkward tonight talking about supplementaries. I know I would be out of order talking about supplementaries in general; so I won't. I will not mention the other \$82 million of the total supplementaries of \$96,165,000, because I suppose that would be out of order; so I will have to confine my remarks to the ministry at hand.

This supplementary is an admission by government of miscalculation.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Oh no; we kept to our total spending.

Mr. J. Reed: Oh, it is not an admission of miscalculation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: We didn't change the totals.

Mr. J. Reed: This is something that the government planned at the beginning so it could keep it back to convince us that the budget really showed restraint and then bring on the supplementaries a little later to the tune of \$96,165,000; is that it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The total doesn't change. It is totally opposite to savings.

Mr. J. Reed: You know, you fellows have been miscalculating this way ever since I've been here.

Mr. Kerrio: And 30 years before that.

Mr. J. Reed: I'll just go back to the beginning of this decade. It seems that every time we have a budget, we are bombarded at the last moment with a supplementary—in this case—a supplementary for the Ministry of Community and Social Services to the tune of about \$14 million. I hope that's in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We are not talking about the last decade. We are talking about right now.

Mr. J. Reed: I don't deny for one minute the fact that we do need the money. As my colleague from Sarnia pointed out, there is no way we can deny the approval of that request for the \$14 million. But I deplore the fact that we are having to approve it at the end of the fiscal year, at a time when the money has been spent, when the train is pulling out of the station, and there is no way we can really change this. So let's call it what it is: a gross miscalculation.

I would ask the minister—because I can't ask all the ministers; that would be out of order—how much is he going to miscalculate or change for next year's budget? What is he going to bring in for next year's budget to convince us that it is a budget of restraint, to convince us that he is doing the best job for the taxpayers in Ontario, and then turn around in the early spring of 1980 and say, "Oops, we need another \$14 million or \$15 million"? Or maybe it will be an escalated \$14 million; maybe it will be \$20 million the next time. I do deplore that, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Chairman, I have often admired the honourable member opposite as he slid about on his most recent popular television commercial. I also admire the way he attempts to slide a few things into this discussion tonight which perhaps don't properly belong here. I won't respond;

I'm sure he has already heard the Treasurer indicate that, in spite of the fact that these are supplementary estimates, they are within the total projected year's spending.

I would also ask him, rhetorically, what he would consider a reasonable percentage error might be, especially when you are dealing in an area of human services? I know the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan), who has now disappeared, has frequently criticized us in some areas for some slight underspending in terms of our projections. The member opposite has expressed concern about some overspending. I point out there was no error in terms of projection with respect to the six per cent increase. That was not a question of error, that was something that was introduced part way through the year and accounts for almost half of the \$14.6 million. Even if you include that, if you take the whole of the \$14.6 million as a percentage error in our budget, it is approximately one per cent.

I really don't think you can seriously suggest that in the development of very complicated projections in an area of human services, where we don't know accurately, certainly, how many people are going to face greater hardship because of unemployment 12 months hence, there was an error.

Mr. Wildman: Neither does the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Our analysts, some of whom are here before me tonight, are extremely competent people, as is evidenced by the fact that they can estimate and project that closely.

Mr. Kerrio: Sure you didn't borrow it from Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Norton: In fact, if you removed the six per cent increase as part of the \$14.6 million figure, we are within about one half of one per cent on a budget of almost \$1.3 billion. That, I think, is very careful, accurate, competent planning on our part.

Mr. B. Newman: Very poor.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Very poor? Oh come on, Bernie. I ask you to show me anybody in the private sector anywhere, or any other area of government, where they do such a fine job of planning as we do in my ministry.

Mr. J. Reed: I would just like to ask the minister two questions. First of all, does he think we should, from now on include a factor within every ministry estimate as to some projected percentage of overrun every year? Do you think that would be a suitable thing? The next thing I would ask him is why are supplementaries consistent virtually every year? Why are we locked into this?

Perhaps I am a little out of order in singling out the Ministry of Community and Social Services on this, but I find at the end of every year after the money is spent, we are faced with this kind of necessity to approve money which is simply added to the provincial deficit.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that in many instances there probably is some leeway that is worked into the calculations, but regardless of how you approach it you certainly cannot possibly be accurate on all of the possible variables.

Let me give you an example of one thing which occurred in this past year. I cannot speak for other ministers and I am sure the Treasurer can give you more accurate figures on this than I—

Mr. Wildman: I doubt it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —but it had a massive impact upon us in the province of Ontario that was entirely unexpected and beyond our control. It started last summer following our Prime Minister's conversion on the road to Bonn; or on the road home from Bonn, wherever his conversion took place.

Mr. J. Reed: Whenever you get in trouble you blame it on the feds.

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, no; just let me give you an example of how complex the planning we engage in is. Among other things, a \$55 million block fund transfer, increased funding which we were planning for this year, suddenly disappeared. It was a unilateral decision. In addition to that, there were significant changes introduced in the unemployment insurance system, which has an impact directly upon the programs of my ministry.

In addition to that, there were a whole host of other things which I toss out as a figure, and the Treasurer may or may not wish to confirm this, but in total, by the time these changes at the federal level are fully matured it's going to cost in this province somewhere between \$400 million and \$500 million. We cannot take the blame for those kinds of things. I'm sure the changes in unemployment insurance benefits alone have accounted for a significant part of this. It may yet be too early to say. We don't know for sure, it's hard to know yet exactly what the impact of them has been. Undoubtedly, they will have an impact upon us, probably about as much as half of this difference.

Mr. Wildman: I have a short question. Can the minister explain if this increase is mostly caused by increase in caseloads, or by the problems he mentioned with the federal government or through miscalculation? I think he's going to say it's not miscalculation. If it

isn't one of those first two, is it the increase that he finally gave last summer? If he can answer that, then I would like to ask him a further question.

Hon. Mr. Norton: As I've already indicated, we would attribute about half of it, \$7.2 million, to the rate increase. It's very difficult to break down all the other factors in terms of dollar figures but I would point out that it's not all in those programs alone.

For example, the drug program accounts for \$1.6 million of it, and we can pretty clearly attribute that to factors such as inflation. In addition to that, additional drugs have been added to the list over the course of that period of time, which have had some effect upon it. There is an increased rate of usage; for whatever reason we can't be certain, but probably because more people are aware of the availability of the medication or more doctors are using prescribed medications for their patients. All those factors have contributed to a \$1.6 million increase.

Mr. Wildman: If that's correct, is the minister aware, in considering his rate increase and the total income allowances for people on assistance, whether it be family benefits or whatever, that in northern Ontario today the fuel allowances are completely inadequate and that his rate increase in their incomes doesn't deal at all with these increases in inflation and so on?

I don't care if this is in order or not, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make the point that in northern Ontario people are really in trouble in terms of their fuel allowance.

Mr. Chairman: That is not quite the point.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It's unfortunate the honourable member chose that example. I believe he is aware of the fact that we will pay the actual costs of fuel under our program. In fact, the figures he cites are the minimum. Within the past two years, we have introduced a more flexible billing system, a system which will allow the people to submit their bills almost on a monthly basis so that they can receive the additional fuel allowance. There is no reason, under those circumstances, why persons ought not to be receiving full reimbursement for their increased fuel costs.

Mr. Sweeney: I have two questions for the minister. First of all, the minister referred earlier to the \$11 million on municipal allowances and benefits. He also referred to his work incentive programs. I've brought this to his attention before and he keeps telling me it can't happen, but it happened in the city of Kitchener last week where a woman

who was working and who couldn't get municipal assistance for day care had to quit her job and go on welfare. That's the kind of thing that builds up this \$11 million.

On the second question, recently the city of Kitchener and the region of Waterloo, meeting with the social services department and also with the children's aid society have had serious conflicts and serious confrontations as to how much money they were going to approve. In both cases the social services administrator, particularly, indicated clearly that before the year was over he was going to need much more money than the municipality was going to approve. They just went through this charade year after year after year.

[9:30]

What kind of communication is there between your ministry and the local municipalities for dealing with this kind of situation where you both know that by the end of the year you're likely to have more cases and more need? Yet we have this tremendous public outcry, and it looks as if the social services department, the children's aid department, is asking for outrageous increases when year after year, just as you have indicated yourself, you've got to come back and say, "The need has gone up and we need more money." Isn't there some communication mechanism that we can get between you people and the municipalities and the public in those municipalities to prevent this kind of public confusion?

Mr. Wildman: That is the job for that member.

Hon. Mr. Norton: First of all, on the first point you've made relating to an individual who did not qualify for assistance with day care, I believe you said, or was unable to get it, it's difficult to respond to that without knowing something more about the specifics of the case.

Mr. Conway: It is happening.

Hon. Mr. Norton: You say it's happening, but all I'm saying is let's be more specific. There may be some reason for it. If you wish to give me the particulars of the case I'll certainly check into it and see what I can find out about it. But to answer it in the abstract is very difficult because I don't know why the persons might have been found not to be eligible if they were employed—a single mother I presume is what you're suggesting. I would have thought they would have had a high priority for a space for their child in the day-care program. Perhaps there were other factors of which I can't be

aware at this point. I don't know, but I would be quite happy to check into it for you.

As far as the children's aid society and the local—I wasn't sure whether you were referring to children's aid society budgets or the local social services budget of the municipality or both.

Mr. Sweeney: Social services, but children's aid faces the same problem.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Sure, certainly. All right. There are certain things that are almost impossible to project accurately. The children's aid societies know when we approve their budgets it does not take into consideration the full possible, or even maybe expected, caseload during the course of that year. Rather than saying to them, "You have this amount of money and that's it, regardless of whether the number of children in care goes up or goes down or whatever," we approve the level of estimates in their budget at the beginning of the year based upon the previous year's experience. Then whatever increase in caseload they do experience during the ensuing fiscal year we cover at the end of that fiscal year by way of supplementaries. I don't know of any easier way to do it.

Some of them will say, "Why don't you give us the money at the beginning of the year?" But we don't know what their caseload increase is going to be 12 months in advance; nor do they, and it's almost impossible. You don't have a regular curve that you can project upon. In fact there has been in the past few years an occasional decline. So it's not as accurately predictable as one might wish. We're dealing in human services. We're not dealing in building bridges or something like that.

The same thing applies to the experience of the municipal welfare budget. Again, it's almost impossible to know. They have the same difficulties in terms of projecting figures and caseloads as we would, but we agree and they know we will meet the cost of any increased caseload. It's not as if we're leaving them high and dry, without support, with that responsibility. It's just that there is no way at the end of one year to be able to project what the economic conditions are likely to be 12 months later—what the increase might be in the caseload.

I really think that is a reasonable way to approach it—to say to the children's aid societies, "We will meet those costs when we know what they are, but we don't know what they're going to be yet." Basically, we say the same thing to the municipalities with

respect to their general welfare assistance budget.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, I'm accepting the premise that both of these agencies cannot necessarily predict accurately. My concern is this. Since you have to do this sort of thing provincially each year, and since it seems that almost on an annual basis the municipal or regional social services department and children's aid society have the same problem, isn't there some way your ministry can communicate with the local regional government or the local municipal government and, through them, to the public—that is, explain that these things are almost inevitable? Can you not somehow avoid these annual confrontations and conflicts which end up with the local news media, the local public, the local municipal council and the local regional council calling these two agencies every name under the sun, and saying they're coming in with unrealistic budgets? Isn't there some way we can avoid that? We're creating a public climate.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I don't know whether the honourable member opposite is suggesting we should somehow try to eliminate the equivalent, at the municipal level, of the estimates debate when increased expenditures are being considered. I certainly would not suggest we do that at the provincial level. I don't think it's desirable at the local level. I don't think you can reasonably suggest that, after all these years, municipalities and children's aid societies don't know this is necessary. Surely they have some responsibility to communicate with their electorates, as we do with the people of this province.

To suggest there should not be some discussion, sometimes very controversial, about the expenditures of even the children's aid societies, and particularly those of the municipal governments—discussion that takes place at the times when they recognize increased expenditures—surely that is healthy in a democratic society. Surely it is just as healthy as it is for me to be accountable to you in this forum and in this type of discussion about my ministry's increased expenditures.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I didn't expect to get into the discussion. But I wanted to ask the minister whether or not this type of problem is prevalent in his ministry. This was brought to my attention concerning senior citizens and their old age pension and other supplementary cheques. They receive them a little too late, in some instances, to take advantage of discounts on utilities. Is this a problem with the Ministry of Community and Social Services?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm not aware that we have received particular complaints. I know that as a member representing a constituency I have received complaints, but again they are usually related to Gains cheques or old age security cheques. I'm not aware of any serious problems with regard to paying municipal utility rates relating to the timing of our cheques.

Occasionally there are complaints around Christmas but that doesn't relate to utility cheques; it relates to the availability of funds for the Christmas season.

I might just point out that I think the provincial Gains cheques go out in the middle of the month. That shouldn't be a problem. I should think they would have them well in advance of the end of the month. The old age security cheque goes out about the 25th of the month. But I would point out that we do not send out the old age Gains cheques; that is done through the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. B. Newman: I was just wondering whether you had a problem similar to the problem of these senior citizens with their old age pension cheques and Gains cheques?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Not that I'm aware of. There may be some individual cases.

Vote 2802 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF TREASURY AND ECONOMICS

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The next items are those of the Treasurer. Do you need the table and the supporting staff, Mr. Treasurer?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I probably need all the support I can get.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: That was a foolish question I asked. The items are found on page four.

On vote 1103A, economic policy program; item 1, economic policy:

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will give a brief statement on this. The supplementary estimates I have before the committee today relate to a portion of Ontario's share of the grant to the Ford Motor Company for the construction of the engine plant in Windsor.

It is estimated Ontario's share of the grant to Ford in the fiscal year 1978-79, just ending, will equal \$5.3 million. Of this amount, \$700,000 has been constrained from within my own ministry. The total spending by Ford on the engine plant for the period ending March 31, 1979, is expected to equal \$12.7 million. The federal government will pay \$7.4 million of this amount.

For the assistance of the honourable members I would like to review briefly the background of the decision to make the grant to the Ford Motor Company of Canada. In early 1978 the Ford Motor Company announced its intention to build a \$533 million engine plant in North America. A number of preferred site locations were mentioned but it was quickly established that the company would either build a new facility in Windsor or expand an existing facility in Lima, Ohio.

Mr. Grande: You were taken in by that.

Mr. Warner: They held you up for ransom. Corporate blackmail.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ohio was willing to offer assistance to Ford.

Mr. Warner: It's corporate blackmail.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If getting 7,000 jobs required blackmail, I will be blackmailed.

Mr. Warner: You know it is corporate blackmail.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not calling it anything at all.

Mr. Warner: No, just give them the money and let them run.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ohio was willing to offer assistance to Ford if Lima was chosen as the site for the new engine plant.

Mr. Warner: Nothing in return.

Hon. F. S. Miller: May I read, Mr. Chairman? In order for Ontario to receive this investment, some sort of assistance for Ford would be required. Ford indicated the cost disadvantage of locating a new facility in Canada totalled \$67 million US. As a result of discussions among the Ford Motor Company, the federal government and Ontario, Ford decided to locate its new engine plant in Ontario. It was agreed a grant of \$68 million would be made to Ford. The Ontario government would be responsible for \$28 million of this amount.

Mr. Warner: A mere pittance.

Mr. Grande: You wanted to give them \$30 million, didn't you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: This agreement was confirmed by an exchange of correspondence between the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) and the president of the Ford Motor Company of Canada in August of last year.

I would like to review for members the nature of the investment which Ford has undertaken and to review conditions prevailing in the auto industry within Ontario and particularly in the area of Windsor. This major investment by Ford is both timely and a much needed investment for the Windsor area. The engine plant is a parts facility

having economic characteristics that are highly favourable to the industrial development of Canada. The jobs this investment will produce are relatively high-skilled, providing higher income and a more stable job base. Moreover, the investment will make a positive contribution towards closing Canada's trade gap in auto parts with the United States. This deficit in 1978 was \$3 billion.

Mr. Cooke: You don't even have the skilled workers. You are blind.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is everybody's fault, just remember that.

Reflecting the problems of the auto industry, the economic climate in Windsor was poor. Unemployment was close to 10 per cent.

Mr. Cooke: Twelve.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is close to 10 per cent, well above the provincial average.

Mr. Warner: Yes, that is close, Frank.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There were prospects of a number of further layoffs in the auto industry. Bendix employment was down 150. Gulf and Western Bumper had long-term layoffs of 160. Ford had announced temporary layoffs of 1,500.

Mr. Cooke: And they have more.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Chrysler was moving one of its production facilities to Michigan. The depressed status of the Windsor economy made it important that every effort be made to get the Ford engine plant.

Investment by Ford will have significant impact. The new plant will represent a net direct addition to total employment in the area of 2,600 jobs. In addition, because the plant is a parts facility, it will require a substantial input from directly related feeder industries. The impact on this group could equal the 2,600 employment gain from the plant itself.

The Ministry of Industry and Tourism has estimated the additional economic activity generated from these workers and the income they bring into the area could raise the overall employment impact to between 7,500 and 8,000 workers.

[9:45]

Mr. Warner: Nothing in return. No equity.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Moreover, the new tax revenue that the Ford plant and its workers would generate for both Ontario and Canada could cover the public funding of the new plant in as little as 13 months.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the Ford decision—

Mr. Warner: You wanted to give away money.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the situation in Windsor is now much improved and investors are reacting to the renewed interest in this area.

Mr. Cooke: Unemployment is still 10 per cent.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The Monarch company, for example, has announced a \$65 million vegetable oil refinery for the area. Encast Incorporated of Switzerland is locating a \$9 million casting plant in Windsor. United Cop is spending \$21 million on a new deep water terminal on the Detroit River and, as a direct spinoff from the engine plant, Ford has announced a \$52 million new aluminum casting plant to be located next to the engine-plant site.

This grant provides real and direct benefits for the economy and for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Warner: Ford is laughing all the way to the bank. You guys were conned.

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on this particular supplementary estimate as it relates to my concern in the business world. I'm afraid this is a dangerous road that we're beginning to tread. I am somewhat disappointed that some of this same type of assistance isn't going to be made available to some of the smaller industries that, in fact, provide more of the job opportunities throughout Canada and Ontario than any other facet of government or industry.

Mr. Warner: It has to be an American corporate.

Mr. Kerrio: My background is free enterprise, truly free enterprise in the sense we don't get this kind of money available to us, we don't have the advantages of the multinationals in the arranging of prices. We don't have many of the advantages and I wonder if the government is going to make the same kind of commitment that we're making to these large corporations, to the very backbone of small business throughout the province. I hope that might be done. But if it is done, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you it should be done in the proper way of investing money which is on an equity basis. Those corporations, if they were truly the—

Mr. Samis: That's not the right thing, Vince.

Mr. Kerrio: —free enterpriser that needs help, would be most willing and prepared to buy back the equity the taxpayers of this province put up—

Mr. Samis: Do you support Petrocan, Vince?

Mr. Kerrio: —to finance the kind of program we're talking about here.

Mr. Wildman: You'd better rethink your position.

Mr. Samis: Are you a Petrocan man, Vince?

Mr. Kerrio: I don't know why those people over there are interjecting; I don't know what they know about business or free enterprise or working.

Mr. Warner: More than you do.

Mr. Samis: We pay taxes.

Mr. Kerrio: You people are takers, you have never given anything to this society—

Mr. Warner: A lot more than you do. You couldn't run a peanut stand.

Mr. Kerrio: —except a bunch of interjections on a subject you know nothing about.

Mr. Cooke: What did your leader say last July?

Mr. Kerrio: In any event, Mr. Chairman, we have very valid reasons for putting money into areas that will create jobs for the people of Ontario, but I submit to you that I'd like to see it done on an equity basis—and I don't mean stock purchase either. I mean an equity basis where a company, big or small, cannot take too much profit before the equity is repaid to the taxpayers of Ontario. I think that's a valid way to put up money in a very helpful manner.

Mr. Warner: We appreciate your support.

Mr. Kerrio: The other thing I have to mention, and I suppose the federal government could be criticized for this too—

Mr. Wildman: Really?

Mr. Kerrio: —is the fact that if we are somewhat comparable to the United States on about a 10 per cent basis in the use of automobiles and all the related trades, I think we're entitled to the manufacturing as it relates to the market in Canada. I can't believe that we should be entitled to a great deal more or a great deal less. If the government of Canada and the government of Ontario took the kind of stand they should take, I can't believe that Ford Motor Company and General Motors, which incidentally is making one of the best profit ratios of any of its plants in the world, and every other corporation with good management and good regulations wouldn't be building plants without this money.

Mr. Samis: Good free enterprise.

Mr. Kerrio: I would suggest, in winding up my remarks, that certainly I concur with what the government is doing in making moneys available to those people who need the money and in such a way that they are allowed to buy back the equity that the government would have in the corporation, and also with

the stipulation they would not be able to take any kind of profits out until the money is repaid.

Mr. di Santo: The position of the NDP caucus on the grants to Ford has been made known since last year—

Mr. Kerrio: Nationalize them. You've only got one way to go.

Mr. di Santo: —contrary to the position of the Liberal Party which has been fluctuating. I can understand the torture of the free enterpriser who all at once—

Mr. Kerrio: Certainly you don't. You have never been there, so how could you understand it?

Mr. di Santo: —finds himself in a position to give \$6 million to \$8 million to one of the largest multinational corporations even though he preaches small business every day. I understand that as well as I understand the position of the Treasurer who said that this grant was unorthodox.

Mr. Warner: He just gives the money away.

Mr. di Santo: I think he tried to reconcile his position with the position of the previous Treasurer who was opposed, and who in his speeches made it quite clear he was opposed to this kind of grant.

At this point, for the record I would like to correct the statement of the Treasurer which is inaccurate historically because it is true that Ford in its presentation said that initially it needed \$75 million and subsequently that it needed \$68 million. It isn't even true and the Treasurer knows it. He can check with his tax and fiscal policy branch that the comparison made by Ford was between an entirely new greenfield plant to be built in Ontario and an addition to the plant existing in Lima, Ohio. Therefore the cost differential was distorted in favour of Ford.

Apart from that, according to TEIGA calculations, the Ontario tax comparison is in our favour. But if our sales tax is higher, it certainly could not be as much as \$14 million higher than Ford mentioned in its presentation. The reason given by the Treasurer for the grant to Ford was that the government was motivated by the fact that unemployment was high in Windsor and that it would create 2,600 jobs. I don't think it's possible for the minister to rationalize that the new investments he mentioned in his statement, except for the aluminum plant and Ford, are a direct result of that grant because it just doesn't follow.

To give to Ford \$20 million from Ontario is not only unorthodox but it's a wrong way of choosing priorities because we know that

the problem of jobs in the manufacturing industry will not be solved by buying job by job. We know that even if we are creating 2,600 jobs in Windsor, in January 1979 we had an \$89.3 million deficit in the auto pact and if each job in Windsor costs \$190,000, in January we lost only 470 jobs as a result of the deficit in the auto pact.

This means in effect that the problem is much more complex and goes to the very concept of the auto pact, the way it is operated and the way it has been administered by both the federal and the provincial government. A very high responsibility falls on this government because we know 90 per cent of the automobile industry is in Ontario and we have more than 105,000 workers employed in it in this province.

We know that since 1971 we have had constantly a very huge deficit in the auto trade in general, but especially in parts and accessories. As the Treasurer mentioned, in 1978 we had \$3 billion deficit which, at the cost of \$190,000 per job, means a net loss of 15,600 jobs in the parts manufacturing sector for Ontario.

Mr. Grande: That is how you create jobs.

Mr. di Santo: How much does the government intend to spend in order to create 15,600 jobs? Where is the government going to beg jobs—from General Motors for another plant somewhere else in Ontario, from Chrysler and from American Motors?

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this government doesn't understand, even though they pretend to be free enterprisers, what a modern enterprise is. Above all, since 1975, they didn't understand, despite our suggestions and the suggestions of the auto workers—and there was a very long correspondence from the treasurer of the United Auto Workers on the dangers he saw inside the auto pact and how staggering the trade deficit was becoming for Canada.

I would also like to make a final point, because we want to come to the supplementary estimates for Health. Despite the optimism of this government, we know that the auto pact will work against the best interests of Canada. There won't be a balance in the trade between Canada and the United States, because the four big companies are practically dictating to Canada the policy that they want, especially in the parts sector which is crucial to the manufacturing sector of Canada.

Not only that, but there is another aspect that is really frightening. That is that despite what the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) has been saying recently—as

recently as March 15, 1979—last year in Canada, we had in a vital sector, research and development, spent only \$8 million. According to the calculations of the Science Council of Canada, \$230 million went to the United States from Canada. For this reason we think that to give one grant to a company doesn't solve the problem of our economy.

We also know from a study made in Canada by Data Resources of Canada that the calculation of the deficit is in the range of \$10 billion in 10 years. That's without calculating the \$60 billion in investments that the four major automobile companies have decided on in the next years, in order to change their cars to models that consume less oil.

Last spring, the former Treasurer, Darcy McKeough, published a paper which called for a fair share of the North American market for Canada. I don't think one of the ways he lists to achieve that goal is legitimate. Because, if we are one-tenth of the North American market we should retain one-tenth of the \$60 billion investment if the auto pact is to work in the best interests of Canada and the United States. I don't think we solve that problem, which is a very crucial problem—the problem of the major investment which will revolutionize the automobile industry in the next few years. We think that creating 2,000 jobs is good electorally, it is good demagoguery, but it doesn't solve the economic problems of this province. For this reason, we oppose that grant, even though we cannot vote against the supplementary estimates at this time.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I think we spent some time on this—I believe the date was in June, if I remember correctly. At that time we had quite a discussion on it. I think, no doubt, we supported it at that time and I am willing to stand up and support it here today.

I suppose we would all like to figure out some way to have that money back in the government coffers as soon as possible. No doubt it will remain with that industry because of the amount of employment it will bring to the district.

The strange thing about all this, I suppose, is what this much money, in grants of \$28 million from Ontario and \$40 million from the federal government, would have meant to the parts industry. They claim they need more money for investment to build more parts in Canada. I think the Reisman report on the auto pact claims that the auto parts industry is not doing as much expansion in Canada as it could do, although the parts

manufacturers disagree with that to some extent.

The interesting part about this, Mr. Chairman, is that the members to our left, of course, have been adamantly opposed to this, to some extent. They are opposed to it in a way, but yet when the sod-breaking ceremony went on down there and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) represented the Premier (Mr. Davis) who couldn't be there—

Mr. Cooke: It was a free lunch at Ford.

Mr. Ruston: —and the Prime Minister of Canada was there with the shovel—

Mr. Wildman: You have been around with a shovel for some time.

Mr. Ruston: —and Mr. Bennett, the president of Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited, it was interesting that the members for Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Cooke) and Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bounsall) were following the Prime Minister around closely, hoping they would get a glimpse of the camera. There was the CBC cameraman going around; there was the member for Windsor-Sandwich—he is only five foot five or something—just checking around the Prime Minister, trying to get his face in the picture, you know. It was amazing.

And who was in the front row? Well, I thought maybe a Liberal—I might get a chance to get up there some place—but oh no, the member for Windsor-Riverside was right in the front row. Do you want it a little louder, Mr. Chairman? Right in the front row. He wanted to get his hand on that silver shovel.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Point of order, Mr. Chairman: I don't mind his commenting about the NDP, but talking about short people is not fair.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I agree with the Treasurer.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Minister, I have no objection to short people. My wife is only five foot two, so I can't talk against anybody who is short.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: And she is the boss.

Mr. Ruston: And she is the boss, yes.

Mr. Warner: Somebody should be.

Mr. Ruston: But, you know, in the debate in June, not one of the Windsor members spoke on that. The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) did, but not one of the members from the third party. They didn't want to get up and speak against their leader and then go down and help to break the sod. It's strange what goes on there.

Mr. Chairman: I don't want to take up any more of the time of the House.

Mr. Grande: You made your contribution.

Mr. Cooke: I find those comments very interesting. Ford paid for the lunch and I couldn't—the plant is being built in my riding.

Mr. Ruston: There's no such thing as a free lunch.

Mr. Cooke: The member for Essex North really didn't talk about the issue, and this is a very important issue in Ontario. It is very important to Windsor. Instead, he decided to spend his time talking about how I sat in the front row at the sod-turning of the Ford plant. It is a waste of his time and it shows what his understanding of this very important issue is.

Mr. Gaunt: It shows how you fellows act when you are not home.

Mr. Cooke: I want the members of this Legislature to understand, I know the people of Windsor-Riverside understand, that we in Windsor—my colleague from Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bounsall) and myself—very much appreciate the jobs that will be created in my riding. There is no doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Say it again.

Mr. Cooke: But we don't think the end justifies the means; and in this case we disagree with the means by which that plant is there.

Mr. Warner: Your corporate giveaway program.

Mr. Cooke: The Treasurer tonight referred to the health of the auto industry—

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Windsor-Riverside has the floor.

Mr. Cooke: The Treasurer referred to the health of the industry in Windsor; and he mentioned a plant, Gulf and Western, which is established also in my riding. I would like to point out to the Treasurer—if the Treasurer will listen—that Gulf and Western, which produces bumpers for Chrysler in Windsor, has gone down from 400 employees just a few years ago to below 100 at present—something like 85 as of the last layoffs that took place two weeks ago.

One of the reasons the number of employees at that plant has decreased is because Chrysler is sourcing those parts not from Windsor where they are available, but from Detroit. That's how the auto pact works. Chrysler's Mr. Hurly, when he decided to close down—I shouldn't say Mr. Hurly decided, we all know those decisions are made in Detroit—but when Chrysler decided to

close down the truck plant in Windsor a year ago and eliminate 750 jobs, Ted Bounsall and I went and talked to the president of Chrysler Canada. He told us the problem with the auto parts sector was that if more companies were established and they could source more of the parts from Canada, they would; but there are just no more manufacturers.

Here is a case where Gulf and Western can produce the bumpers, but the latest contract from Chrysler in Windsor went to a Detroit firm rather than a Windsor firm. Of course, we know the federal government does nothing under the auto pact. As far as the provincial government is concerned, I have written to the Minister of Industry and Tourism and the letter I got back from him said, "That's just a problem of the nature of a foreign-owned economy."

Mr. Wildman: What is he doing about it?

Mr. Cooke: He is not doing anything about it, and I guess we can't expect him to do anything about it. From the government's past record we know what to expect.

Another parts manufacturer in my riding, Champion Spark Plug, which produces, obviously, spark plugs, has had layoffs this year; it had layoffs last year, and is expecting more layoffs in the future. Why are they expecting layoffs? Because the parent company in Toledo will not allow that plant to export any of its products outside Canada. It is only allowed to supply our own economy, our own market.

I again wrote the Minister of Industry and Tourism regarding that problem, and again he answered, "That's the nature of a branch-plant economy."

What is your government doing about the problems of a branch-plant economy? Nothing at all.

What was your government willing to do when Chrysler decided to eliminate 750 jobs by moving the truck plant from Windsor to Detroit? Nothing. You said, "There is nothing we can do about it, because the plant was 62 years old." You knew as well as we did they were moving the production to a plant in Detroit, the age of which is the same, 62 years.

The Treasurer might remember that 25 years ago in Windsor the Ford Motor Company made another very major move, but that time they eliminated 5,000 jobs from Windsor. They moved those jobs and put 5,000 of our people out of work. Maybe the next time the Treasurer is in Windsor he will let me know, and I will take him on a tour of the Drouillard Road area that happens to form part of my riding. That happens to be

the area that has the highest crime rate and is the most rundown area of our whole city. I suggest to him that the time that area started to decline was when Ford moved out and that is what we see from a multinational corporation that has no particular allegiance to any community or any country. They simply moved out of Windsor, picked up and left, and destroyed a very significant area of my riding and of the city of Windsor.

Mr. Warner: They pillage and you reward them for it.

Mr. Cooke: Let's take a look at the grant and let's take a look at the guarantees that the provincial government got from Ford.

Were there any guarantees that the contracts for construction of that plant would go to Canadian firms? No. I believe there were five companies that bid for the contract and out of those five two were foreign owned.

Were there any guarantees that the skilled tradesmen that would be required for that plant would be Canadians or people from Ontario? No, there was no guarantee of that. In fact the case is that by 1982 in Windsor we are going to need approximately 1,300 skilled tradesmen. We have a requirement for 300 right now. The facts are that the needs are not going to be met. They can't be met. The people from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the industrial training branch, confirmed that to me when I talked to them.

So what is going to happen? It is already beginning to happen. The Ford Motor Company certainly will get their skilled tradesmen. They will put an ad in the papers and the skilled tradesmen from the small tool and die shops in Windsor and other areas will move to Ford because the salary rates are higher and the small tool and die companies will go out of our country and ask the federal government to loosen up the immigration rules so they can import workers. The Treasurer may say that won't happen, but the facts are that the small tool and die companies have already approached the federal MPs in our area and the mayor of our city to see if that could be accomplished.

The results from the establishment of this plant have not all been positive, let me tell you, in Windsor.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My father was an immigrant. I don't mind that.

Mr. Cooke: Well, I think the reason for spending \$68 million on the Ford plant was not to import people to fill the jobs. The purpose was to create the 2,800 jobs for people in Ontario and Canada.

Mr. Warner: You will do whatever the Americans tell you to do.

Mr. Cooke: Let's take a look at some of the things that have happened in Windsor since this plant was announced. The price of housing has gone up 25 per cent since August of last year.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It was depressed.

Mr. Cooke: The market might have been depressed but now if you want to bring our housing prices up to the price of housing in Toronto so that no one can afford a single-family dwelling—if that's what you want to see done then again another city will be faced with the people from low-income families and middle-income families who will just never be able to afford a single-family dwelling. The cost of housing has gone up 25 per cent since August of last year.

What is your government willing to do now to come in and make sure that lots are put on at a reasonable cost so that ordinary people, working people who move in to fill these jobs, can afford housing?

I would like to know from the Treasurer tonight what the actual cost of establishing that plant in Windsor is. We know there was a \$68 million grant. What about the other money—the money that has to be put in to speed up the construction of the expressway—millions of dollars to supply the other services that had to go in? I would suspect that the cost of that plant, with all the services taken into consideration, is well over \$100 million. A lot of the initial money is going to have to come from the mill rate, local property taxes, and we will not see the benefits of increased revenue for the city until well into the future. It is certainly not going to happen until 1982 or thereabouts.

The Treasurer thinks that the government of Ontario has done something that's very popular all across Ontario and I would suspect that he thinks it is very popular in Windsor. I might indicate to the Treasurer that in my last Queen's Park report one of the questions in the questionnaire was, "Do you favour government grants to companies in order to create jobs, i.e. Ford?" Well, I got 600 replies and 47 per cent of the people that replied agreed and 46 per cent were opposed. The people in Windsor and the people in Windsor-Riverside are very divided on whether the proper means was used to get this plant.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It was 75 per cent in favour in my riding.

Mr. Cooke: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Treasurer and the members of the Legislature that many

people in Windsor laugh at the provincial government, and the federal government and even some of the contractors and people who are going to be supplying machines to Ford are laughing, because Ford were already beginning negotiations with some of the machine companies before the government ever gave the grant.

[10:15]

We knew that plant was coming into Windsor, and I suspect if the provincial government and the federal government had really pushed Ford to the wall that plant would be built. Ford has owned that property for many years and it would have been there anyway.

Mr. Warner: The government was taken, you know it.

Mr. Cooke: Instead, \$68 million has been given to Ford. Now in Windsor we're having—as we are all across the province of Ontario—hospital cutbacks, beds cut back. People are phoning my constituency office and saying: "If we can afford to give \$68 million to Ford, why can we only afford to give one per cent to the children's aid society as an increase in Windsor?" That's what it is, because you're penalizing them for over-expenditures last year.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is a little different.

Mr. Cooke: You know the process that's used with children's aid societies.

Mr. Warner: You have to do what Ford tells you.

Mr. Cooke: In the past, the provincial government has picked up the deficit. This year, because of your restraint program—you've used a different procedure.

People of Windsor call my constituency office and ask: "Why should people have to wait in line and stay overnight in emergency rooms in hospitals when you give \$68 million to Ford Motor Company, a company that's made \$.5 billion profit in the last four years?"

I could go on and on and on, because this whole issue is very upsetting to me.

Mr. Kerrio: Please don't.

Mr. Cooke: I do want to conclude by saying we in Windsor are very pleased we're going to get 2,800 jobs, but we don't think the end justifies the means.

Mr. Kerrio: You can't have it both ways.

Mr. B. Newman: Coming from the city of Windsor I certainly have a responsibility to make a few comments concerning the \$68 million that is being given by the two levels of government to the establishment of the Ford Motor Company plant in the community.

I don't agree with giving money to buy any type of industry, but at this time it looked as if our backs were against the wall and we either had to do this or we may have lost it. I say "may," because I don't think that Ford Motor Company would have gone anywhere in the province of Ontario or even in any of the US states. Their production from this plant was essentially for the US, and common sense would say it would be better to be manufacturing those motors or engines and shipping them approximately 15 or 20 miles to the Dearborn plant, or maybe 35 miles to a Flat Rock plant, rather than bringing them in from Ohio, which is possibly three or four times the distance.

I think the plant would have been established in the city of Windsor rather than in the state of Ohio, in spite of the incentives Ohio may have offered to the plant. We, in Windsor, appreciate the plant coming in. Even though we don't appreciate buying a plant, we think that in this instance we didn't really have a choice, and the government didn't think it had a choice.

But does the minister realize that General Motors is spending \$435 million on updating their transmission plant without one cent from the provincial and/or federal government? There's a \$435 million addition going on that plant and I think it's going to create about 1,700 jobs in the Windsor area.

One of the things that disturbs me is we're always talking about dollar balance of trade and saying if we export \$3 billion worth of products from Canada we should balance it off by importing approximately the same from the US. Instead of looking at the dollar point of view, I would rather see us look at the job point of view. If our products are made by providing, let's say 100 million job hours for a whole year, then we should be importing from that other jurisdiction the same amount we sell to them. If we consume 10 per cent of the automotive manufacturing in the North American continent, then we should be exporting 10 per cent.

Instead of in dollars and cents, we should have more of a balance in jobs. I know one can't strictly have it as jobs because some jobs don't balance off as easily as we think they do. When it comes to parts manufacturing, I understand that parts manufacturing is highly automated, so it may not create as many jobs as the assembly. But when we talk to our American friends, we should not only ask for jobs for the assembling of cars and manufacturing of parts, we should also ask for the jobs that are involved in research and development.

That's a thing we're forgetting about. We're allowing all of that to be done in the United States, whereas we should be having our share of it. All I ask for is our fair share, I don't necessarily say in Ontario, which would be the logical place, but at least in Canada, preferably in Ontario.

This issue has been debated earlier this year, or sometime last year. I don't intend to make any more comments on this, other than to say we appreciate the fact that the Ford Motor Company is setting up there.

Mr. Warner: You have a new position now.

Mr. B. Newman: I don't think it's going to create the number of jobs that you mention. I hope it does, I hope it creates a lot more.

Mr. Cooke: Mark MacGuigan says it's going to produce 16,000 jobs.

Mr. B. Newman: But it is causing one problem that has not probably been mentioned by any of the previous speakers. We are getting a lot of people coming into the community thinking that the jobs are going to be there tomorrow. We know that the jobs won't be available up until the time the plant has been completed and has been in operation.

As far as the E. C. Row Expressway is concerned, actually I was on city council at the time we had planned that. That was supposed to have been completed, if I am not mistaken, some six or seven years ago. It is now probably going to be completed, or almost completed, as a result of a need for this E. C. Row Expressway because the products from the Ford plant are essentially going to use the E. C. Row Expressway to Huron Church Road and across the Ambassador Bridge to the US—not all of the products but some of the products.

That's the complete content of my remarks; I hope the minister makes some reply concerning them.

Mr. Warner: On today's position.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'd like briefly to respond to most of the speakers. I will begin by saying that I don't think the previous Treasurer, nor myself, basically believe in giving money to corporations.

Mr. Warner: But you did.

Mr. di Santo: That's what you do.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains, as I've said, that the problem is not just Canada-US, it has become worldwide.

Mr. Warner: They're lined up at the door.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was reading last week in the London Times about the dealings going on currently in Europe between Italy,

Spain, France, Germany and now even eastern communist countries—

Mr. Samis: Darcy McKeough couldn't stomach it and left.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —to try to get a major plant from Ford over there. It makes our money look like peanuts.

Mr. Samis: That doesn't make it right.

Mr. Wildman: Multinational pirates.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I've looked at the letter the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) wrote to the Prime Minister of Canada which was read into the record here, which said in effect: "For goodness' sake, don't let Ontario blow this one. Make sure you give them money and Ontario gives them money." I looked at some of the comments from members of the NDP from Windsor around the time the Ford deal started to be discussed, stating that we had to do something like grants, giveaways or whatever it was.

Mr. Samis: Let's hear it again.

Mr. Warner: An NDP member never said that.

Mr. Grande: Go on and quote them.

Mr. Warner: That's not true and you know it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: "Would the minister consider making an analysis of what parts may well be produced in this area and think of giving whatever loan incentives may be necessary to encourage the manufacturers in Ontario to move into those proven areas?"

Mr. Wildman: That's not a grant or a giveaway.

Mr. Warner: Loans? You wouldn't know the difference between a loan and a giveaway.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That was the member of the NDP for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bounsall).

Mr. Lawlor: You think you can blind us with your jacket, don't you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm going to finish, with some luck. I've tried to remain calm and quiet. Obviously small business is the part we want to see grow in Canada. Obviously small business has to be the focus of my employment development fund. Those are the people we have to see grow to become big.

Mr. Lawlor: Taking partisan advantage. Talk about giveaways. You'd sell the province down the river to whatever multinational came along.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There's no use pretending a small business can become a manufac-

turer of automobiles. Even the big companies are having trouble.

Mr. Lawlor: You can't even look serious, or you shouldn't.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Chrysler is having trouble surviving. American Motors is having trouble surviving. Ford, in spite of the profits referred to, has had some troubles.

Mr. Warner: Give them some more money.

Mr. Lawlor: They are all terrifyingly in debt. Everybody is in debt to them.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You talked about equity. Basically equity is something socialists believe the state should have. I'm not totally opposed. There are days and times when equity is justified.

Mr. Lawlor: Equity.

Mr. Warner: To people. Only to people.

Mr. Lawlor: When you come to that, talking relates—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Please, my friend. Your poems may be great but your interjections are lousy. Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Mr. Lawlor: Isn't it funny what perceptions we have?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ah, perceptions, projections, perpetuations.

Mr. B. Newman: He's going to write another book.

Mr. Eakins: Will this cut back on Ontario Development Corporation funding?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I won't comment on that because that will be properly a budgetary item.

Mr. Lawlor: You'd sell your province down the river.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My friend from Lakeshore, we'll miss you. We'll miss you.

Mr. Lawlor: With your atavistic throwback, your antediluvian—

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not an atavist. I came from England.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Grande: Top that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The real return to a capitalistic government is the employment opportunities offered in the country—

Mr. Samis: Capitalist. Return to Darcy now.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the return to the state in its legal involvement, the collection of taxes from employed people, the collection

of taxes from corporations that are making profits—

Mr. Warner: Everyone chokes on that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the general wealth generated by having a parts producer of this nature in Canada, basically exporting to the States, buying many of its supplies from Canadian companies.

Mr. Warner: Just keep giving them money, handing out money.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Remember, the independent parts manufacturers in Canada are basically Canadian companies. These people will be given a basic incentive by having a major parts components plant here.

Mr. Warner: You were conned.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's the parts side we are in deficit on. It has been said many times: \$3.2 billion deficit in parts; \$2 billion surplus on the production or assembly of automobiles.

Mr. Warner: You were conned. They took you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would only suggest that if you got a 46-43 split on your return, it really wasn't characteristic of the southwestern Ontario reaction.

Mr. Warner: Don't ever wander down the midway at the CNE.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have no idea what other reactions people got, but we also did some checking. I can tell you that anything I heard from members said 60 to 70 per cent of the people in southwestern Ontario were firmly in favour.

Mr. di Santo: Bravo. Bravo.

Mr. Grande: That's 130 per cent. How did you get that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was in Chatham during the election campaign down there, and I tell you, the fellows from International Harvester understood there were jobs being created and that they were profiting.

Mr. Wildman: There was one guy in Chatham who didn't agree with it though.

Mr. di Santo: Darcy McKeough.

Mr. Wildman: Right.

Mr. Warner: Tell us what Darcy said.

Mr. Samis: The member for Chatham-Kent.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We have in our agreement the fact that Ford must shop and buy Canadian, providing Canadian components

are available and competitive in quality, performance and price in that plant.

Mr. Warner: Don't ever wander down the midway. They'll pick your pockets.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You know, if I listened to the arguments of the member for Windsor-Riverside, really, we should go down and implore plants to close so housing would drop out of sight, so there would be no need to build any roads, so that in fact we could have a nice return, but we had to do nothing and nothing had to be invested by any municipality in the services that are required for industry.

Mr. Cooke: Get serious.

Mr. Samis: Straight face.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Read what you said tomorrow, and if you weren't telling me that in fact every municipality—

Mr. Warner: Go back to Santa's Village.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —that is lucky enough to have an industry come in faces certain requirements for infrastructure—

Mr. Cooke: Now get in there and build some housing and get your Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett) to do his job.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —and I'll tell you that most of them are just delighted to have the problem of providing infrastructure so there will be jobs for the citizens in that community. Windsor is no different.

Mr. Warner: You look better in Santa's Village.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My colleague on my left just gave \$3.3 million extra to the city of Windsor.

Mr. Cooke: What about the \$50 million we lost, Mr. Treasurer?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No one can ever say we chose Windsor and assisted it because a lot of our own party members were there.

Mr. Cooke: And you will never ever, remember.

Hon. F. S. Miller: This party showed it was willing to help a community in Ontario because we represent all of the people in Ontario, not just those communities where people elect our members.

Vote 1103A agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the committee of supply reported certain resolutions.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

APPENDIX

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1979

The committee met at 3:51 p.m.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1977,
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: I'm going to call the meeting to order. The Liberal members are on their way, I understand. Mr. McClellan is the first to speak.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to spend a few minutes on a section of the act, section 42(5). Let me say, first, that I feel that section 42(5) is one of the most important sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act because it provides the financial underpinning to the rehabilitation service. It provides an opportunity for the wage-loss supplement. It gives a measurement of financial security to an injured worker who has to go back to modified employment, to a person who can't go back to his old job, and therefore it's an enormously important part of the act.

I say in passing that we're pleased to note that over some recent period of time the granting of awards under section 42(5) has been much more common and has been expedited. I want to congratulate the board for making much more use of section 42(5) and to continue to make even more use of it in the future, because rehabilitation, as Mr. Laughren pointed out when he was giving his remarks yesterday, is absolutely top priority with us. When we get to rehabilitation I want to say more about the rehabilitation program, but let me just deal now with section 42(5).

First, I'd like somebody at the board to explain to me, in simple language for my benefit, how a benefit is calculated. I'm assuming a maximum benefit, a total benefit under 42(5). What is it that the Workmen's Compensation Board provides to an injured worker under section 42(5) and how is it calculated?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'm going to ask Mr. Kerr to answer that.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Thank you. As indicated the purpose of section 42(5) is to supplement a permanent disability award which has been granted under section 42(1). It's recognized that the permanent disability award under section 42(1) is for the clinical physical disability, but there are some cases where the

nature of the disability, in accordance with the wording of section 42(5), creates an impairment of earning capacity which is significantly greater than is usual for the nature and degree of his injury. That's where section 42(5) comes into play. When we have a case in that category we have the authority to provide a supplementary award, supplementary to the clinical pension, but it's not to exceed what the person would have received had he been 100 per cent permanently totally disabled.

Mr. McClellan: That is to say the award cannot exceed—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's the total of the two, the total of his clinical pension plus his monthly supplement, cannot exceed what he would have received had he been permanently totally disabled. That's the limitation.

Mr. McClellan: When you're sitting down to calculate somebody's entitlement under section 42(5), and here we're assuming somebody is receiving the maximum possible entitlement, how do you calculate it in relation to old and new earnings? Could you explain to me the formula you use in calculating a maximum entitlement under section 42(5)?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I suppose, to do that, I should indicate how we calculate the pension for the clinical disability under section 42(1), since that is the starting or base point.

Let's take, as an example, somebody who is earning the maximum under the act: \$16,200 a year. That works out to earnings of \$311.54 a week. So if we take his earnings basis as \$311.54 a week, from that we take 75 per cent of that amount—the same as we would if he was temporarily disabled—and we apply the percentage of permanent disability. Let's say, for example, he is 50 per cent clinically disabled.

Mr. McClellan: You don't have to elaborate on that.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: So, whatever that works out to be—in actual fact, it would work out to \$506.25 a month in the example I gave you. So, that is his clinical—

Mr. McClellan: Fifty per cent?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Fifty per cent. So, in the example I give you his clinical disability would produce a monthly pension of \$506.25.

Now, section 42(5) can be applied, under the circumstances described, and he could receive another \$506.25 a month. This would

be equivalent to 100 per cent permanent total disability.

Mr. McClellan: This is assuming that he is not working?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, sir.

Mr. McClellan: What if he is working?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If he is working, we take into account his earnings; so that his earnings, plus his permanent disability pension and his supplement, would not exceed \$1,012.50 per month.

Mr. McClellan: This is the point where I am having trouble. You say that when he is back at work his earnings, plus his permanent partial disability, plus his wage loss supplement under section 42(5), may not exceed his total disability?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes. In the application of 42(5), we have regard for income related to the disability. Obviously, he has been placed by the vocational rehabilitation division—or through the efforts of his employer—in suitable employment. He can't go back to his former employment, but he is capable of earning a certain level of income. Therefore, that income is considered when determining the amount of the 42(5) supplement.

Mr. McClellan: I have clarified that in my mind. Now, tell me how you go about calculating the entitlement under 42(5), if a man is working. What kind of formula do you use? Tell me how you go about calculating it if a man is back at work.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think I just described that to you.

Mr. McClellan: There are a number of ways you can do it and, depending on how you do it, you end up with a larger or a smaller supplement under 22(5).

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Section 42(5).

Mr. McClellan: Section 42(5). I am having trouble with that number.

I understand that you take the average of his pre-accident weekly earnings, his earnings base before the accident, and—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That is correct. We do that for all—

Mr. McClellan: —subtract that from current weekly earnings and then make up 75 per cent of the shortfall. Is that an accurate statement of how you would go about it?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, that's for temporary partial disability. When the man is temporarily partially disabled and goes back to modified employment he is paid 75 per cent of his wage loss during the period of temporary partial disability. We are now talking about temporary permanent disability. You

are quite right in saying that when we are calculating these things for the basis we take the man's earnings for the 12 months prior to the accident, when considering the permanent disability award and the supplement.

[4:00]

Mr. McClellan: The formula you gave me—current earnings plus permanent partial disability plus supplement under 42(5)—can only add up to a maximum of total disability entitlements. That's the formula, is it?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Permanent total disability, yes.

Mr. McClellan: Yes. Where is your authority in the act to add in earnings in calculating the amount of supplement under 42(5)? As I read the act, it says: "The board may supplement the amount awarded for permanent partial disability for such period as the board may fix, provided that the total sum of such supplement and award shall not exceed in any case the like proportion of 75 per cent of his average weekly earnings during the 12 months immediately preceding the accident."

I don't see why you have authority under the act to limit the amount of the 42(5) supplement in combination with the PPD award by an adding in of current earnings. Do you understand the point I am making?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I understand your point. The wording as you read it says the board "may" supplement the amount awarded; then it states the maximum that can be paid. Although it does not refer specifically to earnings that the man is capable of earning after the accident, the approach is that he is capable of earning a certain amount and he has been rehabilitated to that level at that time. One should have regard for his capability to earn and then make this additional supplement on a temporary basis until his earnings come up to his pre-accident level.

The way I read the act it doesn't say we have to ignore it—it's permissive.

Mr. McClellan: My problem is that the act doesn't talk about earnings at all. The act talks about a significant impairment of earning capacity. In the case of workers who were injured years ago and have a relatively low earnings base—say someone who was working in construction in the early 1950s or 1960s, before construction wages approached the kinds of adequate levels they do today, and who sustained an injury in the late 1950s or 1960s—they cannot be adequately compensated for the significant impairment of earning capacity under the way the board is interpreting the act at the present time.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Perhaps I could carry on a little further and just relate how we interpret part of this section: "impairment of earning capacity of the employee is significantly greater than is usual for the nature and degree of his injury." Perhaps if I explained that it may become a little more clear as to how we apply it.

"In determining whether or not the impairment of earning capacity is significantly greater than is usual for the nature and degree of the injury, the evaluation is to be based on the injured person's ability to perform the pre-accident job or a particular post-accident occupation. In making this determination, consideration must be given to the whole-person concept. Under the provisions of section 42(5) regard must be had to the particular occupation affected by the presence of the residual permanent disability and whether the disability by itself or combined with such other factors as education, ability to communicate; age and co-existing non-compensable physical or psychological conditions; availability of employment and physical requirements at the pre-accident job; preclude the employee from returning to his pre-accident occupation. Earning capacity"—and that's important—"is interpreted to mean the ability to earn as usually demonstrated by the amount earned during the 12 months immediately preceding the accident, or such lesser period as he has been employed." And it's expressed in terms of dollars.

Mr. McClellan: That's the directive—the policy manual you're reading from, I take it?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's an excerpt from it, yes. It's in a public policy manual.

Relating that, if the person is able to earn something, then we know there has been a significant change in his ability to earn. He hasn't been able to go back to his pre-accident job, that's why he's making less money on this new job that has been obtained or provided for him. So we do know that he has a certain level of earning capacity and we're trying to supplement the rest of that loss in earning capacity in accordance with 42(5).

Mr. McClellan: Yes, but you've imposed a limitation, you see. You've imposed a limitation through what I assume is a decision of the corporate board in passing that policy directive. The limitation is that you will not provide wage loss supplement in excess of an injured worker's entitlement to permanent total disability. That is a correct statement, I assume?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. McClellan: You have imposed a restriction on the amount of wage loss supplement that you are prepared to pay; and the restriction is that you will in no circumstances pay a wage loss supplement that is in excess of an injured worker's entitlement to permanent total disability.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's what the act says.

Mr. McClellan: No, that's not what the act says. The act says that the total sum of the supplement and award shall not exceed 75 per cent of the average weekly earnings. It doesn't say that you—this is difficult ground but it's important, because it represents significant dollar losses to injured workers who are on wage loss supplement. If an injured worker has a very low entitlement under your formula of restricting his income, his total income package, to earnings plus permanent partial disability, plus supplement under 42(5), the whole package being no more than his entitlement to permanent total disability benefits, then that is different from what it says in the act. The act says that you can give income solely from the Workmen's Compensation Board, disregarding his current earnings altogether, of 75 per cent of his average weekly earnings.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think we have to take section 42 as a whole and also have regard for the total intent of the act. If we go back for a moment to temporary partial disability, when a man returns to work to temporary partial disability, and let's say he is 50 per cent temporary partially disabled, we do not give him 50 per cent compensation and disregard his earnings. We have regard for his earnings.

So I think the act is based on two concepts. One is that we compare his present earnings with the pre-accident earnings; that is inherent all the way through the act. Secondly, that we have regard for his ability to earn, such as in return to modified employment.

Mr. McClellan: What you're telling me is how you have chosen to interpret the act. What you're saying to me is how the corporate board has chosen to interpret, through the equivalent of regulation, what the meaning of impairment of earning capacity is. I'm saying to you that the act is open to an entirely different interpretation. That's why I'm pleased the minister is here.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: What you're saying in essence is—

Mr. McClellan: Let me just try to summarize it. The alternative interpretation is the Workmen's Compensation Board could have the flexibility, according to the circum-

stance of the individual case, to disregard an injured worker's current earnings if his earnings base was exceptionally low and award him 75 per cent of his pre-accident weekly earnings as a combination permanent pension and supplement under section 42(5). There's certainly nothing in the act that prevents you from doing that; in fact, that's the way the act reads, but the board has chosen to calculate in current earnings. I know that imposes a significant hardship on workers who were injured a relatively long time ago, workers who, if they had been able to stay on the job, would have been able to take advantage of improvements in wages as a result of collective bargaining in their trade, or patterns of more adequate wages and salaries in their trade, but because they were injured, they couldn't. They're locked into a low wage level.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes. I recognize the point you're making.

Mr. McClellan: The other point I want to make is that this matter has been before the courts, and there is a decision in the Ontario divisional court with respect to precisely this matter. Mr. Justice Osler ruled in the Gianoukakis case, the case of Mr. Ted Gianoukakis, and the Workmen's Compensation Board, May 23, 1978.

It is my understanding Mr. Justice Osler ruled that there was nothing in the act that required the Workmen's Compensation Board to calculate in the current earning factor. The act did not limit you. Is that a correct understanding of that case?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I don't have his statement here, but I believe he asked the board to rehear it and have regard to significant impairment of earning capacity.

Mr. McClellan: I'm not asking about the disposition of the Gianoukakis case. I'm asking about the ruling of the Ontario divisional court.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may comment on that, I remember reading that. I don't have a copy here either.

Mr. McClellan: I have a copy of it here.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I'm not sure, but I believe that was a comment he made, but he was making a ruling on something else. He wasn't ruling on that particular item, but he did make a comment in his statement. I believe he was making a ruling on another matter.

Mr. McClellan: Let me read what he said, quoting from page seven of his decision: "In neither case is it stated that present earnings are to be taken into account when

fixing the ceiling. There can be no more justification for reading section 42(5) as though it read 'such supplement and award and present earnings shall not exceed in any case the like proportion of 75 per cent, than there would be for reading section 42(1) as though it read 'the compensation shall be a weekly or other periodical payment not exceeding with existing earnings the like proportion of 75 per cent of his average weekly earnings.'"

Mr. Hamilton: I don't want to get too deeply involved in the legality of the matter—and I'll leave it with Bill Kerr and the other people—but the courts were not dealing with that specific issue you raise. That comment would be in the judgement, but the judgement and the particular matter the court was dealing with was did the appeal board panel ask themselves the question in the first part of the act? The ruling of the court was we had no right to proceed to deal with what we dealt with in relation to calculations of the various incomes until we had asked the first question, was the earning capacity of the employee significantly greater than is usual for the nature and degree of the injury? And he said in the judgement—and I haven't the exact wording—that we must first address ourselves to the first question before we could proceed to make any calculations, and then we had to rehear the matter.

[4:15]

Mr. McClellan: I am not interested, as I said, in the disposition of the Gianoukakis case; I am interested in the board's interpretation of the act in the light of a comment of the Ontario divisional court which stated that the only dollar limit under section 42(5) was pension and supplement not to exceed 75 per cent of average weekly earnings. That is the only limitation under 42(5).

You have imposed an additional limitation. The board, by policy and practice, has imposed an additional limitation. You calculate in current earnings. The point I am trying to make is that you shouldn't do that because there are cases in which it causes hardship, hardship which impedes the rehabilitation process.

The point of the supplement in the first place is to provide a cushion of economic security so that an injured worker doesn't have to experience the whole range of psychological and emotional stress that results from the loss of earning capacity, but can have that set of stresses dealt with so that he can return to productive employment in society.

That is why it is there. That is why we support it.

I want to say to you that you are making a mistake in limiting yourselves, in taking away a measure of flexibility. It is all discretionary anyway. You are doing yourselves and the act and the injured workers a disservice by imposing that artificial restriction. You should have the flexibility to make decisions on cases around the merits of the case.

I can go through my files—I won't do it now but will subsequent to the session—and give you some illustrations of situations of injured workers who were injured a long while ago and would be materially benefited if you would pay them benefits equal to 75 per cent of their pre-accident earnings on top of their current low wages.

Mr. Hamilton: I hear you loud and clear. I understand exactly what you are saying. Bill Kerr understands exactly what you are saying. The only reason I came to the microphone was that you were leaving the impression, with me at least, that the court ruled on this specific issue. The court order which you read from had nothing at all to do with the issue that you raised; it had to do with an entirely different issue.

You were reading some words out of that judgement which had nothing at all to do with the court order. That's all I'm saying. That case was not dealing with the point that you raised. That is all. I understand your point. I look at it and I appreciate what you are saying, but you get no comfort out of that court order in regard to this case. That is all.

Mr. McClellan: I did get comfort out of the court case. Back to the point: why doesn't the board do what I am suggesting it do? I am sure you considered this. I assume you have made a deliberate decision not to follow the literal wording of the act. I would like to know why. All I am asking you to do is follow the act.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, if I may, just from a claims services point of view, explain why we recommended it to the board, perhaps that would be a starting point.

Mr. McClellan: Yes.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We recommended that we do consider whatever earnings he is capable of earning because we are taking a look at his impairment of earning capacity. From what I understand, you are suggesting that we pay him the equivalent of 100 per cent total permanent disability pension and disregard the fact that he is capable of earning money following his accident.

Mr. McClellan: What if the man is working at a place like the Rehabilitation Foundation for the Disabled? He is working in a sheltered workshop that doesn't even pay the minimum wage.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think when we get around to vocational rehabilitation, sir, you will find that there are different arrangements for that kind of situation. We are talking about a man who has been placed in industry for gainful employment. That isn't part of a retraining program or job acclimatization, or whatever one wants to call it.

Mr. McClellan: What if the man is working at the minimum wage?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, in the example you have cited, I would like to think that the amendments have been applied and that if he is receiving a supplement from us, of course, the amendments apply to the supplement. Now, perhaps that doesn't completely answer the problem or the situation.

Mr. McClellan: A 20 per cent award to a man who was a casual labourer in 1959-1962; what are you able to do for him under the existing provisions?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: He has already had the benefit of the escalation of his pension; his pension itself could exceed his original earnings, in some cases.

Mr. McClellan: We would hope that all of the benefits paid under the act reflect fully at least, the basic cost-of-living increases. I am saying to you that a legitimate interpretation of impairment of earning capacity must take into account what a man would have been able to earn if he had stayed in the trade; if he had taken advantage of increases in wages or salaries over the years. I don't think your formula—the way you are interpreting the section—permits you the flexibility to do that.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I see your point. The way we read the act is that we are obliged to consider the current earnings that the man is capable of earning and compare that with the earnings prior to the accident. That goes back to your section for temporary partial disability. As I said a little earlier, it is that way throughout the act: that we compare the man's present earnings—

Mr. McClellan: The act doesn't require you to do that; the act is very clear. The only limitation in the act is that the supplement, plus the award, may not exceed 75 per cent of average weekly earnings before the accident. That is the only dollar limitation in the act. Anything else you choose to do is a

matter of policy; it is a matter of interpretation of the act; but it is not in the act. There is no limitation around this in the act and you understand that.

Let me ask you, and I don't want to beat this point to death—I think I have made it; I think it is a valid point—I would like to ask the corporate board, I know the minister will pursue it, to look at this again and give itself the necessary flexibility. That is all we are asking for.

As I said, again, it is discretionary anyway. It is an important tool for—

Mr. Hamilton: There is no question about the ceiling.

Mr. McClellan: Well, I see the act as the act reads. I am not getting into the appropriateness of the wording of the act. That is an entirely different argument. All I am saying is, as the act reads now, you have the power to give an injured worker a supplement, plus an award of 75 per cent of his average weekly earnings before the accident; and you should at least have the flexibility to do that. There is absolutely no reason not to do that.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. McClellan, before I say anything about the points you have made, about the validity of your argument, may I say this: As I see it in my own mind, it would have to be a very strict segregation of those who would be eligible and those who would not be. In other words, I think the guidelines would have to be set as to who would be eligible for it. Having said that, in view of your presentation here, I think we will have to take a good hard look at the whole situation and get our legal advisers to see that we are not overstepping any bounds in trying to implement something such as you have put forward today.

Mr. McClellan: Okay, I appreciate that and I'll look forward to a report back. I invite you to take comfort, the same comfort, that I took from Mr. Justice Osler, while you are reviewing it—

Hon. Mr. Starr: We are all comforted.

Mr. McClellan: —with your legal people because I'm absolutely convinced there are no legal barriers to your providing more generous benefits under section 42(5).

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions that I would like to raise. What is the policy of the board with regard to expenses for doctors, chiropractors or any other practitioner who comes to testify before the appeal board?

This morning one of our assistants spoke to a Mrs. Irwin, I believe her name is, in the appeals administration, and she was told

that it would be up to the appeal board to decide at the time of the hearing whether they would hear the testimony of the chiropractor. If they decide to hear the testimony then his expenses would be paid. If, on the other hand, they decide that the testimony of the chiropractor is not necessary, she was told that his expenses would not be paid. This chiropractor has to travel all the way from Sudbury in order to give testimony before the board. What is the policy regarding that?

Mr. Hamilton: I don't know if there's any hard-bound policy or not in the context of the question that you've raised, but it would seem to me that if any advocate brings a proper witness, whether he be a chiropractor or whatever he may be, and he's there at the invitation of the advocate to make an appearance, we would hear him and the minute that he would be heard he would be paid his fees. I don't see any problem.

Mr. M. Davidson: Then would you explain to me why we would be told this? Can you explain to me why the woman who made the inquiry would be told this, that it would be up to the appeal board to decide whether his evidence would be presented and if he was allowed to present his testimony his expenses would be paid? If, on the other hand, the board decided his testimony was not necessary to the case, his expenses would not be paid. That was this morning. That was a phone call to Mrs. Irwin. I don't know who Mrs. Irwin is.

Mr. Hamilton: I don't know what she would tell you or why she would tell you that, but I'm simply giving you the practical experience at the appeals level. If any advocate brought in witnesses to a hearing and said the witnesses were important and necessary to the presentation of his case we'd hear those witnesses. I don't think it makes any difference whether he's a chiropractor or an orthopaedist or a plant superintendent or a fellow worker or whatever, if an advocate says that that witness is necessary to the presentation of his case he'd be heard, and when he's heard there is a schedule of fees which are paid. That's simple to me; there's no problem that I can see in this.

Mr. M. Davidson: I'm sure, though, Doug, that when this type of inquiry is made and that kind of an answer is given, you see the difficulty that the chiropractor is faced with in the sense of coming down. He's not sure whether his testimony is going to be required, at least from the information that was received, and he's told that if his information is not required his expenses will

not be paid. I understand what you are telling me, but what I am trying to find out is why would that kind of information be coming out of the appeals branch on an inquiry such as that?

Mr. Hamilton: I don't know.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I'm sure that now you've brought this matter up, Doug will investigate to see why that answer was given to you. I don't think we can answer that.

Mr. M. Davidson: I understand that.

Mr. Hamilton: Very rarely, but occasionally, you have people who bring witnesses who really have nothing germane to contribute to the case in question. As you proceed with the hearing, you realize that a certain witness has nothing to do with the case at all and you don't call him. If you don't call them then they normally don't get paid as witnesses because we do pay for all witnesses.

When you graduate from that to professional witnesses, I think you're in the hands of the advocate. If the advocate makes a statement to the panel that, "Yes, he is required and necessary to his case," I just can't for the life of me see a panel not hearing the witness, whether they agreed with his evidence, or whether it was bad evidence, or whether it was germane evidence.

But he may be in difficulty if he brings a chiropractor to give psychiatric evidence or orthopaedic evidence. Then I would think the advocate would be told he is ill-advised to do this again in the future and he might not be paid. But I just don't see any difficulty with this problem.

Mr. M. Davidson: If it is necessary I can give you the claim number and maybe you can check up on it if you would do that. The number is 10933896. I thank you for that, but I wanted you to be aware that sometimes this type of information is provided on an inquiry and it does cause some confusion among the people who are trying to put together a proper case to bring before the appeal court. As I say, this chiropractor was a little bit concerned that he may come all the way from Sudbury to Toronto and suddenly somebody will say, "Well, we really don't need your evidence," and as a result of that the trip would be more or less at his own expense.

I don't know who to direct this to, but I imagine it is probably Mr. Kerr. Where a claim has been established but an employer comes before the board and protests the establishment of the claim and the board feels the claim should be allowed, is it

normal practice that you then call the employer and explain and discuss the pending decision?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: When I answer this, of course, we should recognize that this claim we are talking about is in the claims services division and not in the appeals system; it is the initial decision in the claims services division.

We talked yesterday about some employers who rather routinely express an opinion that the claim shouldn't be allowed or the claim should be investigated. I said at that time that we do not automatically send that claim out to the field investigator to have it investigated; we evaluate the circumstances and the information we have. On some occasions when an employer has said he didn't think the claim should be allowed for some reason or other, and we didn't agree with that, he has asked for a local investigation although we felt the claim should be allowed. We don't write the employer and give him an opportunity to make a further submission, but the claims adjudicator will call the employer on the telephone and tell him we don't think this claim should be investigated, we have enough information to indicate to us the claim is compensable and therefore we are going to allow the claim.

In most cases the employer says, "Fine, as long as you are satisfied it is a compensable claim, go ahead." If they say, "We still don't think this is a compensable claim," we say, "We are convinced this is a compensable claim; we feel it should be allowed. You have the right to appeal or object to the decision." And we go ahead and process the payment.

That telephone call does not delay the handling of the claim. It would delay the handling of the claim if we wrote a letter and asked the employer for a submission, which we do not do, but we do contact him by telephone.

Mr. M. Davidson: There is a bit of a problem there, however, because that telephone call gives the employer, you might say, one more shot at the dog to try to convince somebody that that claim should not be accepted and there is no comparable procedure for a claimant to get a phone call when the case is denied. He's not phoned and told, "I'm sorry, your case is denied," which would allow the claimant the same opportunity to get one more kick at the dog.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We haven't had a problem in that regard. Frankly, if we found that sort of thing developing we couldn't stand for that because you're quite right,

we're not in the process of giving people a second kick at the dog. I am sure the employer, if that happened, would have to have some pretty resounding information. Another thing we do not accept from an employer is hearsay evidence. Sometimes we're advised that they have been told so and so, and so and so. We just don't accept that. So we're very careful because we get no medals for delaying the adjudication of claims and we watch that very carefully.

Mr. M. Davidson: Maybe you can explain something else to me. I have a situation where approximately a year ago a claimant was granted a claim by the board and he was off work for approximately three weeks. I am talking about a year ago when he got three weeks' pay from the board. Last week he received a letter to the effect that the company had protested the claim and some kind of an investigation had taken place over this great long period of time. They had now reversed their decision and the adjudicator would be in touch with him for repayment of the moneys received. At no time during that period was that claimant aware that that investigation was going on.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Without knowledge of the case I really can't comment on that.

Mr. M. Davidson: I don't have it here with me. I'll get the claim number.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I'll be happy to take a look at that and give you an explanation of what happened.

Mr. M. Davidson: It will be before the board again because we're appealing it.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Was this decision made by the appeal board?

Mr. M. Davidson: The claims review branch.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: The claims review branch. We have no knowledge of that now but I would be happy to look at it for you.

Mr. M. Davidson: I know it happened because I read the letter from the board.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I don't doubt that it happened but I just say I can't respond without looking at it.

Mr. M. Davidson: What I am trying to suggest to you is, surely that is not proper procedure. If, in fact, there is an investigation taking place as to whether or not that claim should have been allowed, surely the claimant should be made aware of that, surely he should have knowledge of the fact that an investigation is taking place.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, our routine is that when a claim is referred for investigation a

letter is sent to that individual, so when you give me the claim number I'll check that out too.

Mr. M. Davidson: Fine.

Can you tell us the approximate caseload for each of the adjudicators you have at the present time?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We feel the recommended caseload for claims adjudicators varies, depending upon what level they're working at. For instance, for adjudicators who are working on initial adjudication, the allowance of the claim, we feel their caseload should be in the area of 170 claims. Then we have three levels of degree of complexity of what we call the continuing claims after they're allowed, the ongoing claims which go on for months and months and perhaps longer. The junior continuing adjudicator who usually handles the shorter-term claims after they have been allowed has around 250 claims. They're not too complex. The person who handles the intermediate continuing adjudication, a little more complex, has 245. The senior person who handles the really long-term continuing claims has a caseload of 230.

Mr. Wildman: That would make Elie Martel senior senior.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: There's a difference between handling inquiries and adjudication, but I won't argue over that. Until January of this year we were never down to these recommended caseloads. The board had authorized us to increase our staff during the past couple of years and it takes time to hire and train people. By January of this year we reached the stage where we had reduced the caseloads to this level, approximately. They do go up and down a bit.

The caseloads are reviewed by a Mr. Darnbrough, the director of the claims adjudication branch, and his senior staff on a regular basis and adjusted to try to keep them in balance. As our staff increase their skills they'll have more ease in handling claims and they should be able to handle them more quickly and in a bigger volume.

We're concerned about volume. We feel we have it at a proper level at this time. The number of accidents reported so far this year has increased a little bit and we hope that's not a trend for the rest of the year.

Mr. M. Davidson: But you're satisfied at the moment that with the staff you have you're able to meet the figures you just gave us.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: There are certain areas where I'm not satisfied, and we're reviewing

them and taking action in that regard. But I think in the overall picture I'm satisfied.

Mr. Wildman: Could I interject for a moment? I may have missed it. Did you say how many claims adjudicators you have on staff in total?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, I didn't. We have different categories of claims adjudicators and I have the figures here for you. The total of the adjudicators who do not have any supervisory or semi-supervisory function is 230. This includes our adjudicators in the primary adjudication section, the adjudicators in the extended disability section, the pension adjudicators, the adjudicators in the industrial disease section, and we have adjudicators in the no-lost-time claims section. Although there's no lost time, those claims have to be adjudicated. We have a small group of adjudicators at the hospital and rehabilitation centre. We have 230 adjudicators at the present time. That does not include supervisory staff or what we call co-ordinators.

Mr. M. Davidson: Has there been a greater percentage of denials of claims recently?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No. I have figures on that. It's been pretty consistent, although it varies up and down a little bit. For instance, let's go back to 1975. In 1975, for all claims—which includes lost-time and no-lost-time claims—seven per cent; in 1976, eight per cent; in 1977, 7.2 per cent; 1978, 7.6 per cent. There's a little variation there, but it runs in that area.

Mr. M. Davidson: It's been fairly consistent.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes. As a matter of interest, I have contacts with my counterparts in other compensation boards across Canada. Last year I was discussing this with people from the two other large compensation boards out west and we're about comparable in this regard. I think that's an indicator.

Mr. M. Davidson: I think that's all for the moment.

[4:45]

Mr. McGuigan: Having had some experience personally with back problems, I realize this is one of the most difficult areas in the work of the compensation board. But there was a case recently in my riding where a man had injured his back in an industrial accident but was rehabilitated, was able to return to work and some time later he hurt his back again, allegedly helping to push a car out of the snow. That claim was denied both in the first instance and then on the appeals.

I wonder what your policy is there. It is quite possible that on occasion you forget about your back. Perhaps you compulsively do something you are not supposed to do. I find myself, having hurt my back—not too seriously but enough that I have to guard myself so I don't do those things—that occasionally I forget about it. What is a man supposed to do in that situation? Live in a cocoon the rest of his life?

Hon. Mr. Starr: If his original accident was compensable, no doubt if it is a permanent injury he would be receiving a monthly pension from us. This would entitle him to the assistance of vocational rehabilitation or any other service we might be able to render to help him.

Mr. McGuigan: His appeal for compensation was lost.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You are talking about an appeal which occurred as a recurrence of the old injury, not at his work but rather outside of his job?

Mr. McGuigan: The board alleged that. I don't know whether it was proved or not.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It would be difficult to discuss a case, sir, without seeing what the circumstances were in the files. Possibly, as a general principle in a case such as you outline, Mr. Kerr might be able to tell you how the adjudicators would go about adjudicating that claim.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Your concern is the second injury where he was pushing the car?

Mr. McGuigan: Yes.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Normally we wouldn't be in a position to accept the disability on the injury as a result of pushing the car, assuming he wasn't pushing the car for the purpose of his employment. Obviously in the claims services division we did not accept it. From what you have said it was appealed and the appeal section did not accept it either.

The rationale for that would be that the accident was a non-occupational accident. Had he been pushing that car at work as part of his job, that would be a different situation because it is a work injury. But from the circumstances you have given, the second injury was as a result of an accident which was not a work injury and the act only enables us to compensate for work injuries.

Mr. McGuigan: Don't you think it quite possible the second accident was related to the first?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In that instance did you not say the first accident was not accepted either?

Mr. McGuigan: It was accepted.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Here again I can only speak in generalities; we don't know from what is said what the conditions were of that first accident. It may have been a simple sprain—a very temporary thing.

Mr. McGuigan: No, it was an injury to the vertebrae.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We really don't know and we have to take a look at the total picture—what the original injury was for which we were responsible and paid compensation, his condition from that time until this unfortunate incident, which did not happen at work, took place, and the diagnosis at the time of the second injury.

When we are talking in generalities it is pretty difficult but we would be happy, in that instance—I know it is in the appeal system but I am sure the registrar of appeals, or myself, if you let us know the claim number, can provide you with full details on that.

Mr. McGuigan: I would be happy to do that, thank you.

Mr. Wildman: I apologize for not being here earlier but I was up north trying to mediate a dispute between a township council and MTC. This occurs from time to time in my riding.

I wonder if before I go on to dealing specifically with the matters under claims I could have a response to a couple of questions I asked last night in regard to the problem of light duty, for instance, in small communities in northern Ontario where you may have one store, one restaurant or one motel. It gets a bit funny after the fifth time going to ask the guy at the motel if he has a position for this guy to sweep the floor. What happens to this guy? Does he have to move in order to be able to qualify for vocational rehab and assistance on that basis, if there aren't any rehab facilities in the area and nothing for light duty?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think I will give Mr. Wisocky an opportunity to explain it to you.

Mr. Wisocky: I guess I can only answer you in general terms in the sense that I have to have more specifics to be able to answer—

Mr. Wildman: I am asking you a general question.

Mr. Wisocky: Okay. If a person is fit for light work I assume he has further entitlement under his claim and I assume the case has been referred to vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. Wildman: That's right.

Mr. Wisocky: Okay. As far as vocational rehabilitation is concerned, I think we are trying to be very realistic about the situation.

If you are talking of a small town, the counsellor also has some knowledge as to what job opportunities may be available there and also the extent to which a person should look for work. But in the final analysis I think it is reality that takes over. In other words, the man has to make a pretty basic decision, "What do I do for myself? Either I stay here, or maybe I will ask the board to consider relocation."

We don't relocate too many people and that is a choice that a man has to make. In terms of the act, I think claims will consider benefits for the degree of disability for, I suppose, up to a pension level. It is hard to say on a general basis, but that is, generally speaking, the way we handle it.

Mr. Wildman: Okay. Can I add a couple of things then? I am thinking of a particular case and I use it as an example.

A person has lived all his life in a town, owns his home, doesn't have to pay a mortgage, has worked in timber operations all his life, perhaps doesn't have a great facility with English. Is it really feasible to suggest relocating him into southern Ontario, let's say, or a large centre in northern Ontario?

Mr. Wisocky: That depends on the man, but I think in that case our responsibility would be to work with the accident employer as much as possible to see if it can take him back in some capacity. If that is not possible, then we look elsewhere in the community. But in the final analysis if nothing is available I think our hands are tied. We don't want to force the man to relocate if he doesn't want to.

Mr. Wildman: Well, you see, that's the catch 22 he is in. You are saying to him, "We are not going to force you to move, but we are not going to pay you or help you if you don't move."

Mr. Wisocky: But he is being paid; I assume he is being paid some form of compensation.

Mr. Wildman: Yes, that's true. But everyone knows what he can live on and he has got a partial disability and he can't live on it. So I don't think you can really say you are not forcing him to move.

Mr. Wisocky: The decision is entirely up to the man. We will explain as best as possible what the options are. We will even go to the extent of trying to get him other benefits from other social agencies if that is applicable and so forth. But in the final analysis what do you do with a man who is unemployed because of the general labour market? Does that man have to make a decision on

his own in that situation? He worked for the sawmill and there is a general layoff and he is off work, he is on UIC benefits and there is no job. What does the man do in that situation? I realize it is very sad—

Mr. Wildman: I will tell you what he does if there is a general layoff, because that has happened in my riding, too. The whole town comes to its MPP and MP and says, "What the hell are you going to get the provincial government and the federal government to do about this?" You can't do that when you are one guy and everybody else is working.

Mr. Wisocky: This is why we try to assist in every way possible, but we have our limitations and there is reality.

Mr. Wildman: All right, I will leave that. I just want to point out I was talking about a particular case there, using it as an example, but it is not an unusual case in northern Ontario. The board is aware of the fact there is very little light duty available in many small towns in the north.

Mr. Wisocky: I fully agree with you, Mr. Wildman. This is why we have one employment specialist working out of the Sudbury area at the present time. He started last August and in the year 1978 he was able to find 111 jobs, a few in the Sault area. We hope we can add another employment specialist principally for the Sault area, and we will try to help to find jobs. There are few jobs but if we can help to find some and get some people back I think it's better than nothing.

Hon. Mr. Starr: If you'd care to be helpful to this person by giving the claim number to Mr. Wisocky, we probably could review this case.

Mr. Wildman: I'll do that later; that would be helpful. But I'm talking about the general problem.

I want to point out that my riding isn't just in the Sault area; it extends to 260 miles north and 90 miles east of Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Wisocky: I used the word "area" very loosely.

Mr. Wildman: All right, I want to follow up a question I raised last night regarding surgical consultants. I asked whether it would be conceivable or likely that a gynaecologist might have given some advice to the board on a back claim. I want to point out that apparently it did occur; and I have the permission of a woman to use her name here. Luckily, this person appealed, it has gone through the appeal and it has been accepted now. The claim number is C-7812411, and

her name is Helen Shankland. The doctor who was used as a surgical consultant was a Dr. Hopper. He's a general surgeon but his specialty is gynaecology, I understand.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Maybe Dr. McCracken would like to make a comment on that.

Dr. McCracken: Dr. Hopper is the senior surgical consultant on permanent staff with the Workmen's Compensation Board. There are three other surgical consultants. Dr. Hopper's primary training and his qualification is a fellowship with the Royal College of Surgeons in general surgery. He also has a second degree, which is a British degree in obstetrics and gynaecology.

At the time Dr. Hopper took his training, similar to myself, general surgeons were trained as traumatic surgeons and were trained to do orthopaedic surgery; at that time there were very few orthopaedic surgeons, and general surgeons were responsible for carrying out the vast majority of all traumatic injuries and orthopaedic procedures.

Dr. Hopper received that training in the area of trauma and orthopaedics. It is his fellowship to the Royal College of Surgeons in general surgery that is the degree that would apply for his work with the board. The other degree is an additional degree indicating that he carries his expertise beyond the field of trauma and general surgery.

Mr. Wildman: Don't misunderstand me. I'm not casting aspersions on his expertise.

Dr. McCracken: Well, that's the explanation.

Mr. Wildman: All I am saying is, when you have a report from an orthopaedic surgeon—for instance, from someone of the stature of Dr. Bateman—which suggests that a claim should be accepted, and it is disputed by another doctor who is a general surgeon with some training in orthopaedics, it seems somewhat strange to me.

Dr. McCracken: No, not really. Bear in mind, aside from Dr. Hopper's prior training in his clinical experience, the period of time that he has been with the board. He was in private practice for a period of 29 years. He has been with the board seven and a half years.

[5:00]

During the majority of that seven and a half years he has spent eight to 10 hours per day, five days per week, evaluating reports from orthopaedic surgeons, neurosurgeons—all the surgical specialties. He has been required to develop the expertise to carry out these evaluations, whereas Dr. Bateman, at the very outside, would probably spend in

his practice, I would estimate, possibly no more than half an hour to one hour per day doing a similar type of specialized work.

In other words, what I am saying is that Dr. Hopper, similar to the other three surgical consultants, is trained to carry out this evaluation, which requires the development of an expertise that is usually not found in surgeons who are outside in general practice.

Mr. Wildman: When a surgeon with the reputation of Dr. Bateman states, "The history of her injury and the present findings indicate the present indisposition should be related to her previous accident," I wonder, frankly, why that claim wasn't allowed without going to appeal.

Dr. McCracken: I couldn't comment on that, obviously, unless I were to look at the entire claim. I understand from what you say the claim is now in the appeal system.

Mr. Wildman: No. It has been approved after appeal. It has been accepted.

Dr. McCracken: What this represents is indeed a divergence of medical opinion. This is not restricted to board operations. It is extremely common, especially and particularly in very senior specialist groups, that there continues to be a difference of medical opinions on any number of issues in any number of cases, because of the complexity of those particular cases.

If you have a simple illness or injury, you can expect there will be no divergence of opinion. If you get a complicated case, indeed you can expect there well might be.

Mr. Wildman: Which is what it is all about right here today. As has been said many times in this committee hearing this year and at other times in the past, if you get hit on the head with a sledgehammer, you usually get your claim accepted; but if you strain your back, then you have problems.

Dr. McCracken: Not necessarily so. But I certainly agree with you that back disabilities are one of the problems we deal with; in that area we expect we will get the complicated, obscure, complex cases, as I mentioned yesterday, I believe.

Mr. Wildman: I am still confused about this, but I will go on to claims. I have here a very well-written and detailed letter from a gentleman who lives in Sault Ste. Marie and who has been on compensation. He was severely burned. Finally, he has gone back to work in a lower job class. He is being paid differential, but he points out that he is still losing money.

He describes the increases which have taken place in the various job classes in his

local over the last few years. He has dropped from job class 20 to job class seven. He points out that in a very short time from now his job class seven pay will catch up to what his job class 20 pay was at the time he was injured, and he is not going to get any compensation any more. So he is not being compensated for the very severe burns he received. I am not sure if he is right on this and I would like some clarification, but apparently he can't claim disfigurement for burning of the legs whereas a woman could.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may comment, the act is pretty specific on that. Under section 42(6), the act is specific that we can make an award for burns, and I believe the wording is "around the face and neck." Let's just take a look at the exact words. They're "face and head," so we have no authority really to make an award for any disfigurement except in that area of the body because the act is specific and it applies to both men and women.

I can recall a case of a woman who was seriously burned on her legs and there were scars, but unfortunately in that instance we couldn't make an award for disfigurement because of the wording of the act. It is very specific.

Mr. Wildman: Okay. Then I accept that and obviously we should be looking at changing the act, but this person is unable to stand in the cold for very long, and he can't stand up for very long. He has got to live with this the rest of his life. In this case, he can get a lighter-duty job. It is an easier job, and he is able to do some work. His local has been successful in negotiating decent increases over the years, but eventually he is not going to be compensated for the continuing problems he faces for the rest of his life.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I guess there are two points there. One, I gather you are suggesting we should have regard for how much he would have been making had he been able to carry on his former job, which is related to what the previous member discussed.

Mr. Wildman: Exactly.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: With respect, I mention there are places in the act, if you take the act as a whole, where it says we have to base compensation on the earnings prior to the accident. In section 41, temporary partial disability, it refers to it again. I don't wish to open up that argument, but I just want to mention that.

Mr. Wildman: No, I understand.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: So, as of now, our policy is, as the claims services division reads the act, we are limited in that area. I really don't think I can be helpful to you in a case.

Mr. Wildman: This guy is getting what he should according to the act and the policy.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: What I was going to suggest was, if there was any doubt in that regard we would be pleased to review it to make sure he is because I want to make sure he gets everything to which he is entitled.

Mr. Wildman: Oh, no, he makes that quite clear in his letter. He is getting what the board says he should.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Is the issue just the one you have mentioned?

Mr. Wildman: Exactly, and since you raise that, I have another individual who makes a case. I am not going to raise an individual case here. This is just a man who is very vociferous on behalf of other injured workers in his area. He was injured in 1949 when he fell about three storeys on to a cement floor. He is getting total disability now and he has been collecting disability of various types, depending on his condition, over the years since 1949. Think of 75 per cent of what he made in 1949. Luckily for him, he belongs to a large industrial union that has negotiated extra benefits. He is collecting extra benefits, but if he didn't—

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I think one thing you should keep in mind is the provision of the minimum under section 43, which is \$509, and is probably above his earnings at the time of the accident.

Mr. Wildman: I know. He has had those adjustments, but it is nowhere near 75 per cent of what his job class is making today, nowhere near it, and he makes that very clear every time I meet him.

I have one other major thing I would like to raise with the chairman and also with the ministry and that is the whole controversy that has been surrounding the board and local 2251 in regard to the scarfers at Algoma Steel. Let's, so we don't fuzz the issue, make quite clear at the beginning that we all realize that scarfers at Algoma Steel have, various ones on an individual basis, had back claims accepted by the board. Excuse me, that is elbow and sometimes shoulder claims, but not back claims, so let's not talk about elbows and shoulders.

Hon. Mr. Starr: And wrists.

Mr. Wildman: That's right. I would also like to make it clear I would accept perhaps

that originally the local may not have advised the individual employees who filed for back injuries they felt were related to scarfing to do so in a manner that fell under the right category under the act. I'll accept that. But that's all in the past. That, I hope, has now been straightened out. In the future, if there are any more back claims from Algoma Steel, people will be advised by the local to make the claim in the correct manner, which may or may not lead to its being accepted, but it may have a better chance of being accepted.

That still leaves us with a large number, in the range of 14 claims, that have not been dealt with in that manner, many of whom are retired now. I'd like to know what's really going on.

First off, I had some correspondence with the chairman. We argued with each other in the press. We got a little vitriolic, on both sides perhaps, last spring. Then I said I'd better cool it. I went to the local and said: "Obviously Mr. Starr is so mad at me he's not going to deal with me on it."

Hon. Mr. Starr: I was just trying to point out the facts.

Mr. Wildman: You missed the facts a couple of times.

Mr. Martel: Don't be vitriolic.

Mr. Wildman: I won't go into that. It will make me too angry. For one thing, a couple of times your Adamson fellow ignored things that I had said and talked about other things. Anyway, that's under the bridge.

The local then made some changes at their own executive level. They got a new fellow working on it. They arranged to meet with you and other members of your staff in December. Quite coincidentally, there was a by-election on in Sault Ste. Marie. I want to emphasize "coincidentally." The reaction they got when they arrived at the meeting indicated some people didn't think it was coincidental, but it was, and I don't understand why anyone at the board would be concerned about whether or not there was a by-election in Sault Ste. Marie at the time.

At any rate, they came and they met and they arranged for some people at the board, medical people, to come and look at the scarfing operation in Algoma Steel. They came up, I believe, in January and they toured with the members of the executive of the local and went and looked at the scarfing operation. They said they would go back and look at the whole thing and would be in touch with them.

They also informed the local executive that they would review the 14 outstanding

claims. On February 2, I think it was, they were called down to a meeting in Toronto. They went down. They found when they arrived, first off, that the board people who were there were unaware there were 14 claims; there were now nine as far as the board was concerned. Therefore, they hadn't reviewed all the claims.

They were also informed by one of the medical people that scarfing was no more difficult—I understand this was the term used—than typing. The work wasn't any harder on a person than a typist's work. The reaction of the local president to that is that that probably is true if the typist has to hold the typewriter on one hand and type with the other. Basically, they were told that all these outstanding claimants would have to file new claims and go through the whole process all over again; that they weren't going to deal with it.

[5:15]

The fly in this whole thing is that back claims related to scarfing have been accepted at Stelco. The board knows it; the executive at Algoma knows it, and I know it. As a matter of fact, in my correspondence to you I pointed to a couple of claims numbers from Stelco. At that meeting in February the health and safety rep mentioned a claim number from Stelco at which point he was asked how he got it. I think he told the board it wasn't any of their business.

The fact is over a number of years a number of back claims related to scarfing have been accepted at Stelco. It seems to me that what is good enough for Stelco is good enough for Algoma. I would like to know the reason this hasn't been dealt with in a more judicious and fair manner.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I think in order to clarify the whole situation it is necessary to begin with the medical people who made this policy decision from a medical standpoint and then with the adjudication people.

I'm going to ask Dr. McCracken to relate to us the incidences from a medical standpoint.

Dr. McCracken: First of all, the request was made that scarfing operations at Algoma be looked at, and one of our medical consultants went to Sault Ste. Marie with a representative from the claims services division. Mr. Kerr can speak to that. They observed the scarfing operations at Algoma. They had been asked to observe the operations at Algoma and they had been told before they left what the situation was in relation to scarfing operations at Stelco so they

would have some idea if there was any major difference in the two operations that would be of significance from a medical standpoint, on my part, and from a claims adjudicator standpoint so far as Mr. Kerr was concerned, with regard to the mechanism of the work and interpretation of the act.

They did this, and the report that came back discussed the operations they had seen, reviewed and made notes on with the operations that had been reviewed previously at Stelco by one of our other medical staff who is currently now the director of the medical branch. In essence they concluded the two operations were most comparable. There were certain minor differences but from a medical standpoint they felt this didn't make any difference, they were comparable enough, and that the minor differences they did observe would not be of significance. That is about as much as I can tell you from a medical standpoint except to say that they had also concluded there was nothing specific or characteristic in the scarfing operations to lead them to believe that back disability would be considered as an industrial disease peculiar to and arising out of the scarfing operations. In other words, they said a scarfer could injure his back just the same as any other person in Algoma can injure his back.

Mr. Wildman: Right.

Dr. McCracken: They were not able to demonstrate that there was anything peculiar about the scarfing operations.

The only other thing I would like to say is that when the union representatives came down to Toronto to discuss the matter, during the course of discussion—and I wasn't present at that meeting but it was reported to me afterwards—the director of the medical branch made the statement that typists or secretaries could do something in the course of their work that could result in a back strain that would be considered by the board as a compensable injury; similarly, a scarfer could do something in the course of his work, some unusual event, that could give rise to a back strain.

In so far as I can determine, this comment was unfortunately misinterpreted to mean that a scarfer's work was the same as a typist's work. That was not the intent of it at all and I would like to get that matter straight here and now.

Mr. Wildman: I would hope that is the case.

Dr. McCracken: It is.

Mr. Wildman: Scarfers do a rather strenuous job.

I want to follow up on one thing you said. That's the whole crux of the problem when you start talking about scarfing claims as industrial disease claims. That's what the problem is. It's the crux of the whole problem because that's the way the claims were made before and the board's opinion is that there's nothing specific to scarfing that would make it qualify as a possible industrial disease.

Dr. McCracken: That is correct.

Mr. Wildman: What has happened at Stelco is that those guys down there have had close contact with the board and good cooperation, I think, in this particular instance. They have realized that in order to be able to get anywhere on a scarfer's claim, even if the claim may relate to an ongoing problem, they have to identify a specific incident. They identify specific incidents and make claims on that basis.

Dr. McCracken: Mr. Kerr can speak to that. From a medical standpoint, I would hope and expect that the incident would indeed be a valid incident from a medical standpoint.

Mr. Wildman: I am sure it is. I'm not questioning that, but the point is these 14 claimants may have had specific incidents, but they can't identify them now because they were years ago. What happens to them because they didn't know that was the way they should have made the claims in the first place? I blame the local for not advising them correctly, but that's the case. That's the way it is.

Dr. McCracken: I think Mr. Kerr should speak to the way in which claims should be filed because that is in his purview.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I appreciate what you're saying, Mr. Wildman, but it is true in the Stelco situation those claims were not accepted as being a condition that is peculiar to or characteristic of—

Mr. Wildman: I know that.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: —I'm just explaining it to you, sir—scarfing operations. You're right about those claims that were accepted by Stelco. They were related and reported to us and we established a causal relationship with something that happened on the job, immediate onset of pain, immediate reporting and immediate attention by medical people. That's the way we adjudicate any back case. The claims accepted at Stelco were not accepted in the category that you feel they should be.

Mr. Wildman: You are misunderstanding me again. I'm willing to play your game if you want, but I want to deal with those 14 people. So you tell me how I am able to find the specific incident that caused their problems and I'll do it, but I don't know how to do it.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It is very difficult now. I see your problem.

Mr. Wildman: So what do we do for these guys? Do we say: "Too bad. It's unfortunate you didn't know how to do it in the first place. The first time you felt a pang of pain you should have reported it, but you didn't do that"? Maybe that was 1956.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Of course, that isn't quite enough. We can't accept a claim just because the condition comes on during the course of employment. We must establish a causal relationship. Just because a person is working and feels a pain, that doesn't necessarily mean the condition is compensable. We must relate the disability to something at work that caused it.

Mr. Wildman: There is the fact that they bend over and have a very high pressure hose they have to use. When they bent over, they felt a terrible pain. That's how you're going to get claims from now on and that's how you get them from Stelco.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It's up to the individuals to report the claims as they occur. I'm glad to hear that you're not casting any aspersions on Stelco.

Mr. Wildman: No, I'm not.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: They are reporting it as it occurs.

Mr. Wildman: Exactly. I have admitted that the Algoma local probably didn't advise these fellows correctly originally. They will now. They have finally learned with discussion through all of this hassle with the board the way they have to deal with these claims. They may not appreciate my expressing it on those terms. The fact is that if there are any more back claims at Algoma in the future they will be filed in that manner.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I appreciate your concern. I suppose what you're saying to me is how do you appeal these decisions when things occurred so long ago.

Mr. Wildman: Yes.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: All I can suggest is that anything you can get you submit, anything you can get that would tend to support it.

Mr. Wildman: They've all gone through long ago.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: All right.

Mr. Wildman: There are two other things I want to remark on. I want to know why on earth the board didn't advise the local and say, "Look, you can't make claims for scarfing on this basis" in a general sense, and say, "The only way a scarfing claim will be accepted is as any other claim might be accepted at Algoma for a specific incident." Why wasn't that made clear to the local when they were filing all these claims under so-called scarfers' disease?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If I may comment on that, we've had claims representatives up there dealing with the local for years. They've had seminars; they're fully aware of the definition of accident which includes disablement arising out of employment. I suggest to you they are aware of the requirements of the act.

Mr. Wildman: That wasn't my question. I was talking specifically about scarfing. I want to know why there wasn't consultation when all of this hassle started between me and Mr. Starr. It didn't just come out of a vacuum.

Mr. Johnson: Easy now, control yourself.

Mr. Wildman: I want to know why there wasn't a meeting between the board and the local where they would say; "Look, we're having a problem here, let's solve it."

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I guess I can't answer your question because I didn't come on the scene until the investigation was completed at Sault Ste. Marie. That's when I became involved directly in this. I'll just check with my colleagues to see if they have any information on it.

I'm advised that the union asked for the investigation and the investigation was carried out at their request.

Mr. Wildman: In December. I was writing to Mr. Starr in May and June and February.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I'm sorry, I can't answer your question.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Actually all the claims had been submitted and they had been rejected when Mr. Wildman started to correspond with me, or we started a tiff going. It wasn't until December that they were assembled and a meeting was held and it was played from there.

What you're talking about, Mr. Wildman, is that when these claims were coming in systematically or otherwise—one by one, or two by two or whatever—I think you feel that someone in the claims adjudication should have said: "Well, we know what the circumstances are; they should be told how it should be done."

Mr. Wildman: That's right. I don't know when the dates were, but let's say there was a claim back in 1962 from a scarfer with a back problem. The claim was made on the basis of an industrial disease, something that had arisen out of and in the course of the employment, but there was no specific incident identified. Of course it was rejected. Why didn't the claims people or someone at the board get in touch with the local and say: "Look, you'd better check to find out how these things are happening and how these claims are going to have to be made from now on, if there are any legitimate claims"? I'm not saying they are all legitimate; some of them may not be.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I think one thing Mr. Kerr mentioned earlier is that there are 230 adjudicators and there are many claims coming in from Algoma. I would question very much how many of those claims from Algoma were handled by any particular adjudicator. You are talking about 14 claims out of approximately 400,000 in a year.

Mr. Wildman: There are more claims than that. The 14 are the ones that are back ones that are—

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Okay, there are 14 claims over a period of years which were denied. I would suggest to you the probability exists that there was no commonality among the adjudicators who handled that claim. When the advice was sent to the union, the union would be more aware of a common problem than the board would be.

Mr. Bounsall: Can I ask a supplementary at this point? I'd like to refer to the computer program you're going to put into place, hopefully no later than two years from now, which will cross-reference groups and have cross-referencing by companies of claims that come in. Would that be programmed to pick up a similar claim like scarfing that's coming in from a particular company so you don't have the problem with 14 or more claims spread over 14 different claims adjudicators?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No, I think our program in the future will do it by disability but I don't think we'd have it programmed to do it by occupation such as scarfers, miners, truck drivers or what have you. We will be doing it by disability. But the whole thing we're missing is that when these claims were put in—and I'm not familiar with what years they were submitted to us—they were submitted as a condition.

[5:30]

No one put in a claim for industrial disease. Nobody said, "I have an industrial

back disease as the result of employment. They applied in the normal way: "I've got a back disability." The claim was adjudicated in the normal way as we would for any other back, sir. So I don't really think it would be identified as a so-called industrial disease at that time. It was just a back claim.

Mr. Wildman: Okay. I'll accept that. If I can come back to the other thing, the one time you finally got all of those claims together and you got somebody raising them all at once was when I wrote to Mr. Starr. At that time there wasn't any attempt, as far as I can see, to get together and solve the problem with the local—the problem that had been identified by me—not by me, it was raised by the executive with me. It seemed to me, and I don't think I'm being unfair here, the main concern was to beat this thing in the press.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I'm not involved in that in any way and I can make no comment, Mr. Wildman, I'm not aware of anything of that nature.

Mr. Wildman: Is it not true that Dr. Dowd of the Workmen's Compensation Board carried out a study of scarfing at Stelco in 1968?

Dr. McCracken: Yes. As I mentioned before, Dr. Dowd was the physician who, in conjunction with members of the claims staff, took a look at and evaluated the scarfing operations at Stelco; that's right.

Mr. Wildman: What were his conclusions?

Dr. McCracken: His conclusions were the same as the current ones; namely that he was unable to identify any specific characteristic of scarfing operations that would lead him to conclude we had identified a causal relationship between the operation of scarfing and back disease.

Mr. Wildman: Then am I right in assuming that led to consultations between the local 1005 executive and the board as to how they should deal with future scarfing claims, since Dr. Dowd had concluded there wasn't anything specific related only to scarfing that would lead to a particular kind of back disorder?

Dr. McCracken: I'm not aware of any consultations. That, presumably, would be consultations that might have taken place with some claims personnel. I don't know whether Mr. Kerr is aware of anything.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I have no knowledge of that at this time.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Dr. McCracken was not with us at that time nor was I.

Mr. Wildman: I may be wrong in that but I think that's what occurred.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I wasn't in my present position at that time, Mr. Wildman, so I don't know anything about it.

Mr. Wildman: I just wish it had occurred at Algoma as well at the same time. It seems to me that if there was a conclusion from Dr. Dowd's study in Stelco in 1968, since scarfing takes place in other steel works as well, it might have been useful to spread that information around a bit.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Mr. Wildman, are you aware of whether or not there was any consultation between the unions at that point in time, between local 1005 and management?

Mr. Wildman: No, it wasn't until later when they started getting a lot of scarfing claims at Algoma.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: You asked a question of Mr. Kerr as to whether there was any consultation between the union and the board at that time as to how the claim should be filed. There was not, to my knowledge, and I did work with them around that time.

Mr. Wildman: I still haven't been able to come to any conclusion and, obviously, the board isn't going to be able to do anything or isn't willing to do anything about the back claims that have been denied in the past. I'm sure the claims in the future will be filed in a more acceptable manner to the board. Some of them may be accepted and some of them may not be—but at least 14 guys are out in the cold.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: You can hardly expect us at this point, Mr. Wildman, to accept an accident history some 20-odd years ago which wasn't reported at that time.

Mr. Wildman: No, wait a minute. These were all reported and denied.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Not as accidents, sir.

Mr. Wildman: I pass.

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Chairman, the point I left yesterday and suggested I would come back to on claims relates to a specific. I would like to note the name of Glenn Snider, case number C-11921118. The reason I raised this specifically is because I have dwelt on the waiting period in London. I understand—I haven't been corrected, so I have to assume this is correct—that there is a five-week waiting period. But, in the case of this gentleman, he was injured on October 12, and reported the injury that day. He has been off work since January 19, 1979,

and has been dealing with, I understand, the compensation office directly since February 6 and indirectly prior to that. He was told within this past week that for a variety of reasons because the file was unlocated—it was “in dictation”—once it was located, he would have to wait in line, as it were.

For example, on March 15 he and we were informed that there were 47 investigations ahead of him at that point in time. On March 26 we were told the file couldn't be found and at that point there were now 60 investigations ahead of him. When it was found he would fall in line.

My secretary tells me this afternoon that there is some indication this might be speeded up. But you can imagine the frustration of that person. You can imagine our consternation. We tried to accommodate him by calling the people we were supposed to call, then have this delay of practically one month, and then find out, at that point in time, that there is still considerable waiting yet ahead of us. I would like the specifics investigated. I understand someone is moving on it more quickly now.

Secondly, when we are told there is a waiting list of five weeks, we have to consider the five or six weeks the person has already waited. In other words, are these figures and dates and times of waiting really accurate? I would submit, in this case, that they are not.

Hon. Mr. Starr: You are talking about a recurrence?

Mr. Van Horne: No, this is a new one. I don't wish to debate it because time is running out on us and I understand we will be called to vote within another seven minutes or so. Let me leave that specific case with you and leave this question about the accuracy of this waiting period.

Secondly, assuming I am relatively accurate, what can be done about it? Not just for London, the area I represent and the area for which I must speak, but also for Thunder Bay, which has a six-week waiting period, and St. Catharines and Windsor? Those four stand out in the table of local office communities that were described to me and to my secretary, and through the resultant information we obtained.

I would submit it is incumbent upon you to look at these four communities and try to speed things up, or else see why there is that greater time gap for them.

Mr. Chairman: There is time enough for Mr. Kerr to make a comment.

Mr. Van Horne: I have a second point I want to make, if I may, and then let him

respond until time runs out. In this instance, my understanding is that the person involved has been dealing with his family doctor. His family doctor has recommended therapy, aside from having given this gentleman whatever treatment he could himself. The claimant, Mr. Snider, understands that Highland Institute in London, which has a fine reputation, will not undertake the recommended treatment because there is a question about payment because of varying opinions within OHIP and, I gather, within WCB.

The question, then, is this: Is it common practice for someone to step in and say, “I am sorry, until we have investigated this ourselves we are going to interfere with or change the recommended treatment that your family physician has ordered”?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I would like to respond to Mr. Van Horne. The figures you have on the delays in adjudication in the local area are correct. You are also correct in saying that there has been a time lapse before the claim has been sent for the local investigation in the community. So the figures you have are correct, but there is also other time involved.

Mr. Van Horne: I would like to know who is at fault there because in this instance we know of a man who is relying on his neighbours and is on welfare until things are sorted out.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I can't say anybody is at fault because in this instance the accident occurred in October 1978 and apparently he didn't cease work until January 1979.

Mr. Van Horne: That is correct, even though he had treatment in between those dates.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I suspect there is some problem we are having in relating his present disability to the October date. I am only speculating because I don't know the claim. Obviously they have tried to resolve this by correspondence but it hasn't worked out. That is why they have asked for a local investigation.

Mr. Van Horne: If I may interject, I have been told the accident was reported on that day of October 12, 1978.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That is good; I am glad it was reported then. You were also talking about Thunder Bay.

Mr. Van Horne: The other four communities. Thunder Bay has a six-week waiting period; St. Catharines, four to five and Windsor, four to five.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: What Mr. Stewart, the director of the claims information and coun-

selling services branch, who is here today, has been trying to do to clean up these is to shift the investigators around the province from areas where we can afford to move them to an area where the caseload is high. He has done that for Thunder Bay. The people are up there now. He is making arrangements for extra claims investigators to go to London next week. That's probably why your office was advised that there is a chance it will be done earlier. He is shifting people, which has been our pattern for the last little while, to send some people to London to try to clean up that backlog.

Mr. Van Horne: What is a little while? A month?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: How long have you been shifting people around, Mr. Stewart?

Mr. Stewart: We have been doing it since last September.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Since September 1978, Mr. Stewart has been consistently shifting his investigators around to try to keep things in balance.

Mr. Bounsall: When are they going to St. Catharines and Windsor to clear up the long backlog?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Stewart hasn't booked that yet. I mentioned to you yesterday—and I make no bones about it—that we have a problem in this area which we intend to resolve.

Mr. Bounsall: Is that a staff problem?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Bounsall: That is the meeting on April 6?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That is right.

Mr. Bounsall: Just as a very quick supplementary, do you have staff in this area who recognize that their job is to act as a floater, to move from community to community as the backlog exists? Do you have such a category, the floating worker who goes to different areas?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: No.

Mr. Bounsall: Part of his or her job would be to move to the different area offices as the need requires.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: The answer to your question is that we do not have a floating group. In the job description when people are hired, they realize and accept the fact that they can be moved from one office to another on a temporary basis, but we do not have a floating group from a pool from which we can draw.

Mr. Sweeney: I would like to know what the board's present procedure is with respect

to people who have an identified previous back problem—whatever you call it—but who aggravate that problem with a specific accident at work and then at some later date further aggravate it, but not necessarily through a specific accident. The difficulty when I appear before the appeal board is trying to convince them that a lot of us live with some kind of a back problem and, as long as it isn't aggravated by a specific accident, we continue to live with it and continue to do our job. But once it has been aggravated, it is that much more easily aggravated at a later date, and the second, third or fourth aggravation may not be related to a specific accident.

[5:45]

I have had great difficulty getting any kind of consistency with these kinds of problems and I suspect I am not unusual there.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Mr. Sweeney, I guess it is unfortunate you weren't here earlier because I think Mr. McGuigan started on this particular problem and Mr. Kerr responded to it in part. Perhaps Mr. Kerr could add to what he suggested before with the additional factor you have brought in of continued aggravation.

Mr. Sweeney: It is the second and third time of the problem. We usually get acceptance the first time because there is a specific incident at work.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: This is a problem area and obviously it is a problem because the cases have also gone to the appeals system.

I suppose the thing we look for in adjudication, in trying to determine whether the second and third episodes are the results of the original disability, is a continuity of symptoms from the time of the last recurrence and whether or not he has had trouble and has had to go to his doctor and have treatment. We also take a look at what precipitated the current episode or the current problem, and put it all together and try to come to a conclusion with the help of medical advice as to whether or not his present condition, this second or third time, is a result of the original condition for which we assumed responsibility.

I don't think my answer is very conclusive or helpful because each one varies in its problem. Dr. McCracken might have something to add from the medical point of view about the problems of trying to determine whether the second or third episode is the result of the original condition in a back case. Determining these things is a real problem area for us. If the episode happens as a

result of an incident at work, we are in a good position because it was another work accident. We can accept it as either a new claim or as an aggravation, a recurrence. If it is something that has occurred as a result of a second accident that is not in employment, that's unfortunate, but it is one we can't accept because it is a non-occupational accident.

When we have the case of a man with a permanent disability who has a recurrence from time to time, if the medical evidence indicates to us, yes, this is a flare-up, if you want to call it that, we can accept it. I don't like to use the word "exacerbation," but if it is a flare-up of his condition and it is related to the compensable permanent disability, yes, we can accept that. There are shades of grey areas that are very difficult to determine.

Mr. Sweeney: May I interject for just a second? The problem also occurs when we get an orthopaedic surgeon in the community who says; "Yes, the guy has had a history of back problems but he has lived with them"—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes.

Mr. Sweeney: —but the kinds of recurrences that are happening now, in his medical judgement, relate back to the aggravation. He feels there is no good reason medically for him to have the kinds of recurrences based upon his history prior to the aggravation. Then we speak to your people and they say, "Oh, no, the record shows there is that previous back history." From that point on he simply assumes that whatever happens of a subsequent nature is due to the previous disposition and we have this mix in the middle.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It is pretty difficult if the man has a pre-existing condition prior to his work injury and we accept the claim on an aggravation basis. It is very difficult at times to determine whether this subsequent second, third or fourth episode is a result of the accident for which we accepted responsibility on an aggravation basis of the pre-existing condition, or is the condition really the result of the pre-existing condition. I appreciate what you are saying but it is very difficult at times to make those determinations.

Mr. Sweeney: Are you telling me there is no common practice or procedure to deal with this?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think each one has to be dealt with from the information on file that you can get to relate the current condition to the portion the board has accepted as a responsibility. When you add the pre-existing condition, that makes it even a little

bit worse, depending upon his condition prior to the accident for which we accepted responsibility.

Mr. Chairman: I think we will have to adjourn until 8 o'clock sharp, because there's a vote in the House.

The committee recessed at 5:49 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. McClellan: While we are waiting for Mr. Sweeney to digest his dinner, I would just pick up a point on another section of the legislation, if I may, Mr. Chairman, and it is section 21 of the act, which reads:

"An employee who claims compensation or to whom compensation is payable under this part shall, if so required by the employer, submit himself for examination by a legally qualified medical practitioner provided and paid for by the employer."

I would like to know under what circumstances this section is invoked. Is it applied as it reads, that wherever a company requests that a worker report to the company doctor for examination that worker is obliged to report to the company doctor for examination?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Mr. Kerr, would you like to comment on that?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Section 21(2) states clearly that an employee shall not be required to submit himself for examination otherwise than in accordance with the regulations. I think we have to take that into consideration when we are considering section 21.

Mr. McClellan: That is precisely why I am raising it. I am raising it for information firstly, to see if there is a problem. I would like to know what are the regulations and what are the qualifications on 21(1)?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I would be glad to explain that. This section has been in the act since the original act in 1915. There never have been regulations promulgated under this section. I suppose the reason for it, looking back in retrospect, is that from our point of view it hasn't really become a problem in this sense.

When an employer feels that a person should be examined because the length of disability is becoming prolonged, we tell the employer that our procedure is: "Contact us and we will take a look at the case and have it reviewed by our medical branch to see if any further action is required." If we are of the opinion that the man is still disabled and everything is going along nicely, we just say

that no further action is required, we are quite satisfied that everything is in order.

Mr. McClellan: Can you give me an unqualified assurance that in the past—I will pick a figure out of the hat, five years—no injured worker has been required as a condition of processing his application for compensation to report to a company doctor, in the words of the act to a medical practitioner provided and paid for by the employer? Can you give me that unqualified assurance?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In so far as we are concerned section 21(1) is inoperative. We feel there is nothing in our act that obligates a man to do that. There are some employers who do have their employees examined. We know of some employers who have that as a condition of employment. This is beyond the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Act, I might say, because there is nothing in the act that says the man has to. But if he wishes to do so voluntarily, or as a condition of employment or it happens to be in the union contract—and I don't know if it is in union contracts—then that is something beyond our purview. There is nothing in our act that forces a workman to be examined under section 21 because there are no regulations, and therefore we consider section 21(1) inoperative.

Mr. McClellan: Can I stop you at this point and just ask a question?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, sir.

Mr. McClellan: You say that there are some companies where it is a condition of employment that an injured worker is required to report to the company doctor in any accident claim?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Not just for accident claims, but for sickness too. It is an overall condition, regardless of the reason. How that would stand up legally, I don't know. It is what I have heard at a meeting I attended and it has nothing to do with us. Whether that stands up legally that is beyond us, but they also applied that in that instance for insurance purposes and other reasons not associated with accidents.

May I explain why we prefer to work on the basis we do? If there is any reason for a man to be examined, we would prefer that our medical branch bring a man in for examination or arrange for a more senior medical examination because we don't wish to pit the injured person against the employer, or vice versa pit the employer against the injured person.

Mr. McClellan: Precisely the problem with this section is that it entrenches the

adversarial system in the act; that is why I am raising it, because that is the procedure that is used in civil litigation.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: As I have just said, it is in the act, but it is inoperative and has never been operative since the day it was put in the act in 1915.

Mr. McClellan: You are saying that an employer has never invoked this section in the history of the act.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: They have asked us about it and we have said it is inoperative. There is nothing in the act that makes it mandatory under the Workmen's Compensation Act for a man to be forced to undergo such an examination.

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you just take it out of the act?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I believe that is in one of our recommendations to the board for changes in the act.

Hon. Mr. Starr: There are a number of things, Mr. McClellan, which for house-keeping purposes should be amended or eliminated. We have never had an opportunity in the past few years because the only amendments that were brought forward were amendments having to do with remuneration ceilings et cetera.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe I should ask you to provide for the committee a package of legislative amendments that the corporate board feels need to go forward.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I suppose if we do put forward an amendment for the minister's decision and eventual amendment to the act, the committee studying the act would then have the opportunity of going clause by clause and studying these amendments or deletions.

Mr. McClellan: In other words, no.

An hon. member: You read that in there, didn't you?

Mr. McClellan: The thing I find interesting is that the act has been amended on numerous occasions since 1915 and yet this section has never been taken out, and this is the section that is absolutely explicit that the procedure is an adversarial procedure.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It was only in 1974 when the act was amended that certain house-keeping amendments were made. There are a great many others that have to be made and one of these days I'm hopeful that the minister would bring the act before the House, before the Legislature and before a committee of the House to study it clause by clause.

Mr. McClellan: A final comment: I am taking this particular concern from the brief presented to the royal commission on the confidentiality of health records by the United Steelworkers of America. They have a concern about this provision remaining in the act, precisely because, as they say in their brief, this kind of a section has no place in a no-fault, non-adversarial system and it ought to be removed.

I accept what Mr. Kerr is saying, that it's never invoked; and I hope it never will be, until such time as we get it out of the act.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any more discussion under claims? If not, we go to rehabilitation.

Mr. McClellan: I have some comments about the vocational rehabilitation program. I spoke last year and the year before about the way vocational rehabilitation is recorded in the annual report. I remain utterly dissatisfied with the reporting format for the board as a whole. We don't have the kind of basic statistical information about what you're doing, which I would think you would want to share with the Legislature and with the public.

[8:15]

Most of the other ministries not only provide a pretty comprehensive overview of what they're doing but they also provide the Legislature with briefing books and briefing material. I have a copy here of the Community and Social Services briefing book which provides statistical breakdowns on each one of their programs. It tells us exactly how many people are being served by each program. It shows the cost of each program, the staffing of each program, the categories of people that are being served by each program. We had to fight to get that.

Elie Martel battled for many years and finally had this blue book produced in Community and Social Services. It remains the model, as far as I'm concerned, but other ministries now provide similar material. I would like to ask the board when it's going to get around to giving us the kind of briefing material that will permit us to do our job in the estimates without having to waste an awful lot of time asking you nuts and bolts questions.

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think it's an excellent suggestion on your part. We'll have a look to see what the basis of this report is. I'm sure we've got many records that we're pretty proud of that we could incorporate into our annual report, and I want to say without you even having to struggle.

Mr. McClellan: I make an issue out of it because I've made an issue out of it in previous years. I don't know if Dr. McCracken recalls or not, but we got into some discussion last year about the numbers of people who were being served by vocational rehab and we had an enormously difficult time trying to understand the size of the caseload and what was happening to the vocational rehabilitation caseload on a year to year basis.

I asked in the estimates last year if we could have the figures from 1975 to 1978. I asked Dr. McCracken for those figures but I still don't have them and I still don't have a way of understanding, in the absence of this statistical material, what's happening to the 28,934 cases that are cited in the annual report as having been dealt with.

The only figure I have with all the reports is, "During 1977 28,934 cases were dealt with." I don't know what that means. It's particularly difficult to know what it means, because the figure for 1977, as of the estimates last year, in March 1978, was 23,072. I don't even know which is the accurate figure for 1977, whether it's 23,072, as I was told in March, or whether it's 28,934, as I'm told in the annual report on page—I don't have the same copy that you have; I have the cheapo copy, you have the deluxe edition—it's on page 15 in my copy, under improved vocational rehabilitation services.

Maybe we could start by asking John Wisocky if he could give us a kind of a quick statistical overview of the 28,000 cases that were "dealt with," to use the board's phrase.

Mr. Wisocky: The 28,000 includes all the activities for the vocational rehabilitation branch at the time and encompasses many areas. I agree with you that there may have been confusion in past years about statistics, and for that reason, starting in mid-1977 we have re-formatted statistics and broken them down into specific areas and specific figures so that people can understand it. We have referrals to board staff where people are primarily in need of suitable work. We have referrals to social workers, to our counsellors at the hospital and rehabilitation centre and to our service controllers. We have specific figures for training assessment and figures for jobs found and utilized. We have interviews in various settings and so forth. I have all the specific figures and I can run over those if you like.

Mr. McClellan: You could start by helping me to understand where the figure 23,072 comes from, which was given to me as the vocational rehabilitation caseload for 1977.

Mr. Wisocky: I have 28,934. That encompassed all the referrals for the year 1977 to the vocational rehabilitation branch at the time. It included the patients we saw at the hospital and rehabilitation centre, all the training and assessment programs and referrals for specialized services, for instance to the community resources person at Downsview. That is a person who helps people where there may be no further entitlement under the act, but where we feel we have a responsibility to make sure that a person gets everything he is entitled to from other agencies. It includes referrals to unemployment specialists, commutations, figures on those going to the rehabilitation specialists, interviews and figures going to the rehabilitation service controller and so forth.

Mr. McClellan: I am not able to pursue what I wanted to pursue because when we had left off last year we had a total caseload of 23,072 of which 4,800 had returned to employment and 328 had been considered as not rehabilitable. That 328 figure is still with us in the annual report this year, but then 17,000 were referred on to different parts of the program. What I had hoped to be able to do was to find out what had happened to the 17,000 who had been referred on, that is carried over from one year to the next on the program.

What I want to understand is very simple, namely, how many people who are being serviced by vocational rehabilitation are getting back to work, where are they getting jobs, what kind of jobs are they getting, what kind of money are they making and how long are they staying at those jobs. The bottom line is jobs and job placement in terms of employment.

I don't want to pursue it now because we are operating on a different set of statistics. Somehow the statistics have changed from last year to this year. I don't want to make an issue out of that at all, but I would ask you if you could provide as quickly as possible a statistical overview of the vocational rehab operation. I will repeat the request I made last year, if it is possible and if your data system is still operating on the same basis. Could you provide it from 1975 up until the end of 1978 so that we can have a sense of what is happening from year to year, in particular how many folks are getting placed back in jobs?

I have a concern that a certain amount of evaporation is taking place in your caseload from year to year. I don't know whether you can account for that, but those folks have to be accounted for.

Let me ask another question that relates to last year's estimates. What is the policy now, Mr. Starr, on job searches? What is the policy of the Workmen's Compensation Board with respect to the annual requirement that an injured worker receives supplement on the basis that he is available and looking for modified employment? What is the requirement with respect to job search?

Hon. Mr. Starr: It is quite relaxed at the present moment due to economic conditions, as you know. I think probably this matter can be explained to you more succinctly by John Wisocky.

Mr. Wisocky: Is the question the policy about job searches? I guess each case is handled on its own merits. I do remember last year there was some comment in some areas that some counsellors were insisting a person do 15 searches per day and produce lists. I want to assure this committee that has never been official board policy but it has been a practice with some other social agency—I believe it is the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Maybe the habit was picked up by some of our junior staff, but that has been corrected. We have issued directives to the effect that each case has to be handled on its own merits and depending on a man's capabilities, depending on the geographical conditions and depending on the rehabilitation plan that is agreed upon between the injured employee and the counsellor, that is the action they take.

In other words, if the counsellor and the man agree they should look for a specific type of work, they may also agree on a method, number of contacts and so forth. All we ask of the injured employee is to remember where he may have gone so the details can be reviewed with a counsellor if necessary. The reason for that is the counsellor may know a particular firm and be able to intercede and assist the man in a particular area. There is no official policy about job search lists, it just depends on conditions.

Mr. McClellan: Normally, for example in the case of an injured construction worker in the Toronto area, you wouldn't be requiring him in 1979 to be trying to fill in a job search list with a quota of job contacts per day?

Mr. Wisocky: No.

Mr. McClellan: Rather you would be doing what I suspect you think makes much more sense, that is to say trying to help the injured worker through a program of identifying job placements and referring the in-

jured worker to those job placements in a very positive kind of way.

Mr. Wisocky: Yes, you have put it very well.

Mr. McClellan: I think we have made some progress, Mr. Chairman, over the past year. The minister may want—well I am sure he wouldn't want to look at the Hansard for last year when we had the most incredibly stupid and acrimonious debate on precisely this topic. I just want to say I am pleased to see some progress taking place. I know from my own caseload that nothing is more damaging psychologically to a disabled worker, particularly an unskilled worker, than to have to go pounding the pavement in a totally futile search for employment when there is no employment to be had.

That leads me to a couple of comments about the vocational rehabilitation program. I had the opportunity last week to have a very useful and excellent conversation with Mr. Wisocky and Mr. Brownell. It was enormously helpful to me to understand what they are doing, and I think more important what they want to do in terms of developing a full and comprehensive vocational and rehabilitation program within the Workmen's Compensation Board. I wish them well in their endeavours. I think the training on the job program is a sound program, it is a good program. The only thing wrong is that it is too small, it is too limited.

[8:30]

I am concerned lest the same thing happen within the Workmen's Compensation Board as happened within the Ministry of Community and Social Services in the 1960s. The Ministry of Community and Social Services at one point in time had the glimmer of an understanding that maybe it shouldn't just be providing poverty-level social assistance allowances to people, that maybe there was a role for vocational rehabilitation services. They set up an excellent vocational rehab department under Jack Amos. It grew and developed and was a model program, but it remained a tiny enclave within a ministry that continued to operate without any focus or emphasis on rehabilitation. Eventually, it began to go downhill and it never got anywhere. It never became the major component of the ministry's program, as it should have done.

We have had this discussion before in your own estimates in the Ministry of Labour, Mr. Minister, and you know what I am talking about. I don't want to see that happen within the Workmen's Compensation Board. We

won't be content with a small program operating with a small number of enormously dedicated and competent staff offering a tiny service. That's what you have now. I think the number of people who were placed in 1978 through the training-on-the-job program was 418 people. Again, we are talking about a vocational rehabilitation program with a caseload of 28,000 or 30,000 people a year. So if you are placing 418 individuals through this training-on-the-job program, you have got an awfully long way to go.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: I think Mr. Wisocky would like to comment.

Mr. Wisocky: If I may, you are quite correct with that figure. The 418 training-on-the-job programs were secured by our employment specialists. In fact, they found over 1,400 job opportunities. But we must remember that our counselling staff are also looking for jobs and placing people. Last year, the counsellors in the field and the employment specialists together placed almost 2,800 people—2,787, to be precise—which is an increase of almost 400 or 500 from the previous year and well over 1,000 from 1976. So I think we are on the right track, in spite of the economic conditions in Ontario.

Mr. McClellan: As I said, I believe that Mr. Wisocky and his staff are on the right track. I think the challenge is not even with the Workmen's Compensation Board; the challenge is with the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie)—that's your new title, or will be soon. You can assume it as an honorific for purposes of the discussion this evening. You have a major responsibility as your ministry is redefining its mandate. We in this party have argued for a long time that there was a significant and unique role for the government of Ontario in manpower policy, and a major part of that role—not the whole role, but a major part of it—is to provide a specialized employment service for people who have disadvantages in competing in the work force.

Unless your ministry is prepared to move into a comprehensive, co-ordinated government program of providing jobs, job placement, job training, job counselling and the kinds of support services to provide employment for people who are disadvantaged in terms of their ability to compete in the economy then Mr. Wisocky's operation is going to remain isolated within the Workmen's Compensation Board, as vocational rehabilitation services remain isolated within the Ministry of Community and Social Services, as efforts to find jobs for the mentally retarded remain isolated within another

branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, as efforts to deal with the difficulties that women have encountered re-entering the labour force remain scattered through a number of ministries, and sub-departments of ministries.

I would like to suggest to you that I think 1980 is going to be designated as the year of the handicapped person; I may be wrong, since this is the year of the child. It seems to me you ought to start planning seriously now to expand the kinds of job-creating, job-placement and job-training programs that this government can make available for disadvantaged and handicapped people. You should be ready to put into place a major government program; not as a minor activity, not even as a minor serious activity but a major government program in response to the year of the handicapped person. A program which would result in a serious, co-ordinated government effort to provide jobs and job opportunities.

Part of that co-ordinated government program, I suggest, should be legislation which would establish a quota system for disabled workers. I don't believe a quota system, in isolation, is going to solve the problems of injured, handicapped or otherwise disabled workers in getting into the work force, but if it was introduced as part of a major government commitment, the same kind of major initiative that has been taking place with respect to services for children in the Ministry of Community and Social Services over the past two years, then it would have real impact. The impact would be in providing a legislative mandate to all the people in this province—employers, workers and everybody. It would demonstrate the intention of the government and the Legislature to create openings in the economy for injured workers or otherwise disabled people who can't compete.

The significance of quota legislation is that it expresses a will and a determination by both government and the Legislature. It gives momentum to an overall campaign to create space in the economy for the physically handicapped. That is the importance of quota legislation.

I don't pretend that you can pass a law which says three per cent of all jobs will be set aside for disabled workers, period. You can't expect that, somehow you can take a sledgehammer and hammer people into those job slots. We don't have that kind of crude understanding of quota legislation. That is not what we are talking about.

Quota legislation would be accompanied by precisely the kind of program that Mr.

Wisocky and his still small staff are now engaged in: that is to say discussing with employers all across the province, the kinds of jobs that disabled workers can do, the kinds of contributions disabled employees can make to their organizations; sitting down and discussing and negotiating, in a serious way, the opening up of job spaces for injured workers, plant by plant, trade by trade, sector by sector. You can't do that with the eight people you have now.

You have a relatively small and dedicated staff trying to deal with an enormous problem on a province-wide basis. In the absence of any evidence of an overall government commitment that will stay small, and it won't generate the kinds of jobs on sufficient scale to provide job opportunities for the many tens of thousands of people who need those job opportunities.

I don't think you can do it apart from that kind of major campaign; and that is what we are talking about, a major government campaign to create space in the economy. Quota legislation is part of it, as is an expanded vocational rehabilitation service that does on a large scale what is beginning to be done on a small scale within vocational rehabilitation in the Workmen's Compensation Board.

There is an enormous opportunity for you, as Minister of Labour, to design that program. You have a mandate to do it. You have expertise within your own Ministry of Labour and within the Workmen's Compensation Board to develop that kind of a program, to convince your colleagues to do it, to begin to plan it and to try to have it in place as soon as possible.

It would be a marvellous accomplishment if we could transform our economy so that it would be able to accommodate every disabled worker in Ontario who wanted to work; I believe that is every disabled worker in Ontario. I happen to believe that; certainly the people I talk to in my constituency want only the opportunity to be productive, contributing members of society; to make their contribution and receive a fair measure of financial reward for that. That is what most people want out of life in that realm. We know how to do that; I believe that very deeply. What we have lacked so far is sufficient will and commitment to make that kind of thing happen. You have a unique opportunity to develop precisely that kind of program, and I hope you will. Otherwise, if the program remains a small and isolated program within the Workmen's Compensation Board, I don't see it developing on a suffi-

cient scale, with sufficient urgency to make sufficient impact, to open the economy up for all the injured and physically disabled workers who live in this province.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three areas of vocational rehabilitation that I would like to speak on. One is a followup to some comments that have just been made; so I will continue with that right now.

How many employees are there in the group that is running this on-the-job or affirmative action program with employers to hire injured workmen in their organizations? Is it still pretty small at the moment?

Mr. Wisocky: At the moment we have one administrator and seven employment specialists, three in Toronto and four in the province, one each in London, Sudbury, Ottawa and Hamilton.

Mr. Bounsall: Is that intended to be on a pilot scale, or can one anticipate, based on what you are able to produce, that you are going to be making a recommendation at some time in the future to expand that group rather dramatically?

Mr. Wisocky: I have been given board approval to try it to this scale to see what the possibilities are. So far it has been very successful and the board is considering other personnel in this area.

[8:45]

Mr. Bounsall: I think it has been quite successful. If I might say to the minister and to the chairman of the board, I think my colleague was completely right when he said this is the right avenue to be taking. This so far small pilot group running affirmative action programs with employers and pointing out the on the job training program in which employers can qualify for a subsidy from the board while the injured worker is being trained is certainly an advance over the situation that existed in the past in finding employment opportunities for the injured worker.

I have one comment though. I am not at all sure we needed to set this group up within the board if on employment application forms one was not still able to ask the question which is asked on most employment forms around the province: "Have you ever been a recipient of WCB benefits?" If they check off the "yes" it kills the application. When they check off "no" and the employer subsequently finds out they have, they are fired if they are not in an organized place and not beyond a certain time period. I think in Chrysler it's an 18-month period beyond

which, if your work is satisfactory you can still be retained even if you have lied on your application form about being a WCB recipient. That 18-month rule is not an invariable rule with every corporation, unionized or otherwise.

What I am saying is I am not sure this group would need to have been formed and be doing the affirmative action in the on-the-job training, with WCB subsidy moneys going to that employer if the Human Rights Code had been amended to include physical disability as one of those criteria for which one could not be discriminated against in terms of employment. It has been hanging since 1974 as an amendment, Mr. Minister. That has been promised since the fall of 1974 by people occupying your position.

If that had been passed those questions would disappear from the form and injured workmen would not have to state upon an application that they were a recipient of WCB. By that simple fact alone they could more easily obtain the employment that's there.

This group has to operate in the context in which we find ourselves in Ontario. Every employer can still ask that question; so operating in that context this group is very necessary. If those amendments were made to the Human Rights Code, I am not sure the board would have had to set up this pilot group and consider the expansion of it because of the problems injured workers had in getting re-employed if they couldn't go back to their former place of employment.

Certainly under the current situation in which we operate, with every employer viewing with suspicion any person who has ever received WCB benefits, you have got to have that group there which has been formed in order to give injured workers a chance to get back and be retrained on the job with an employer who is getting subsidized to do that training and the full affirmative action program that takes place with the employee. They explain the on-the-job training program to the employer. All employers should know this. I don't know why they don't pick it up more clearly, but they have this opportunity to explain it to them again in person. A re-injury of an old injury is not charged to them but to the former company at which the original injury took place.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Second injury fund, we have a pamphlet on that.

Mr. Bounsall: I know you have, and I know that this special group is now using it and maybe many of your normal vocational rehabilitation counsellors in the community

are using it. I know that of late I have said to the people who have come through my office who are about to go to vocational rehabilitation: "Go down and ask for retraining and get on their scheme in the Windsor office." I have said: "They have pamphlets which explain the second injury fund. Ask for a handful of them which you can take and give to the employers you try to solicit work from." I don't know whether they do that. I suspect they would. The pamphlets are not very expensive but most employers, until maybe now, or until they are approached by this group have not grasped the point that if a man or woman has had a back injury somewhere and a new employer takes a chance on that back, if there's a re-injury or recurrence of that same old injury, that new employer is not going to be charged, and that has been some of the problem in getting a job with another new employer. But certainly if the question wasn't even asked, Mr. Minister, which is going to require an amendment to the Human Rights Code, that would also help the injured worker in finding a job with a new employer.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Bounsall, if the Human Rights Code was amended it would not necessarily eliminate the question on the employment form at all, and as long as that question was there and was answered it would be difficult to say why the employer refused a job to this person. It would be difficult to say it was on that basis. It would have to be almost eliminated from the form.

Mr. Bounsall: That's what I am saying. If you amended the Human Rights Code to add physical disability as a prohibition for discrimination on the basis of employment, that question would not be able to be asked. It would be off the employment forms, so that would be helpful.

Let me offer one other comment in this same general area. I think your group should still continue. If we get surprised next week and the Minister of Labour and Manpower brings in the amendments we have been waiting for since 1974, amending the Human Rights Code in that respect, I think your group should still continue.

Interjections.

Mr. Bounsall: We would all faint with surprise, but I think your group should still continue and I think it should be considered to be expanded.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We intend that it should.

Mr. Bounsall: When, may I ask—I suppose it's determined by the corporate board—is the date you have in mind for this analysis

of what this newly formed group has done so far, analysing whether it has been successful and whether or not there should be an expansion of it? What sort of general date do you have in mind?

Hon. Mr. Starr: I think Mr. Wisocky, as director, would be able to answer that.

Mr. Wisocky: Yes, I can answer that just by looking at the statistics. In 1977, the employment specialist group—I think it was about two—found 289 job opportunities during that year, of which 131 were utilized. In 1978, we received permission from the board to add five more employment specialists and they were recruited and placed by, I would say, July 1978, so you are talking about six months. During that six months they found over 1,400 job opportunities—1,425 to be exact—of which 418 were utilized. Again, it is just not any job opportunity. It's the types of jobs that disabled workers can do.

I feel that with the expertise we have created we can become more proficient in the area in the sense that we will have the facilities in knowing the types of jobs that we should find for placement of disabled workers, and I think our objective for 1979 is to fill at least 600 jobs. I feel we should be closer to 1,000, but again let's remember that we also have a good number of rehabilitation counsellors out in the field who also look for jobs and place injured employees, so I think through the co-ordinated efforts of both bodies we will find even more jobs and then, with our advertising program and the assistance of members of Parliament, we may be fairly successful in spite of the economic conditions.

Mr. Bounsall: We don't have the time to search for jobs on behalf of our constituents.

Mr. Wisocky: No, but you do address various employer groups and an extra word here and there can help.

Mr. Bounsall: Imperial Oil invites me often; and Chrysler and Ford.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Invites you to do what often?

Mr. Bounsall: There is one other general comment I would like to make, and I made roughly the same comment last year but it wasn't recorded and I want it there for posterity in a sense. Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, and to the people in the area, the localization in the local offices of your vocational rehabilitation branch with the full power to do all the work at the local level is working. You are talking about decentrali-

zation in the future. I can assure you that the decentralization of that service is working.

I am going to be a little historical. There used to be a person in the Windsor office, the local office, who was an amputee—I guess a former WCB recipient himself—whose name was Paul Wheeler and who is now not working for the board.

Paul was, I think for a long time, the only one in the Windsor local office. When Paul was the rehab officer there and someone came into the office and he or she had reached the point where they had either received a letter cutting them off of compensation, or were about to, you knew that the last medical report had gone in, you said, "Go down to the local office and apply for vocational rehab," and you never saw the person again. Whatever happened down there between that recipient and Paul Wheeler was a positive one. I don't know whether Paul found him a job or got them all on retraining, whatever proportion that was, but you never heard from the chap again because he was being handled properly.

Then Paul quit. You went through a period, let me tell you, where every person I sent down ended up angrily back in my office the next day because of the treatment he'd received from the then employees sent to replace Paul. Those employees are no longer there and, for the last couple of years, the staff you have had in the local Windsor office—and I can't speak for all the local offices in Ontario—are excellent. They're simply excellent.

Again, it's a sort of Paul Wheeler thing. You send them down to vocational rehab and if you hear anything back it's a fairly positive story. They might say to me, "Miss So-and-so, or Mrs. So-and-so wants me to do this. Do you think that's the right thing to be doing?" That might get a question back. I say, "Yes, if that is what she is asking you to do, try it. Do you see anything wrong with your trying that?" Then they may say, "No, I just wanted to check."

Mrs. Campbell: I like it.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: What's going on here? What is this all about? What's the centre of this experience?

Mr. Bounsall: In other words if you hear back, it's positive. All I'm saying is that the decentralization program, providing they have the proper staff—with Paul Wheeler in the past and the current staff you have now and have had for the last year at least—has worked well. They're a good staff, they're working well and what's happening in the local offices, at least the local Windsor

office in vocational rehab is good. So don't hesitate to decentralize the checks you may need from head office to see that there is the consistency required based on vocational rehab situations, because it's working.

I think you just added another staff member in Windsor, a fourth one, which makes the caseloads fairly reasonable in the vocational rehab office so they can do some real, meaningful followups.

They would like to follow up. When they get someone placed in a job I'm sure they'd like to make a phone call to them three months later and ask, "Are you still at the job and is it working out?" That's something they've never had time to do. Now, with a reasonable caseload of maybe, what, 60?

Mr. Wisocky: The average at the moment is 61 per counsellor.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, they're now down to 60 in the Windsor office and they're going to be able to do some of that followup which, heretofore, they've not been able to do with a caseload of nearly 90 or 100.

In your manual which goes to the people involved in vocational rehabilitation, you have this nice section on page C3 on policy: "The file of any workman who falls into the eligibility category"—and those categories are outlined for those persons who would be eligible to receive vocational rehab—"should be referred to the vocational rehab department so that these services could be considered."

This is a manual for vocational rehab people. That's nice that the vocational rehab people should be told that these people who are eligible should come and see them. That statement has to be in the operational manuals of the people who are dealing with claimants as they're approaching the point where they need vocational rehab and it should be being applied in another part of the board. It's nice to see it here but what I find that with most of the claimants who come into my office, it's me who acquaints them of the fact that there is a vocational rehab service at the board.

[9:00]

Now, that's an untrue statement in only one respect. For those who have been to the Downsview hospital, as they are about to exit from the Downsview treatment, the Downsview medical rehab people explain to them about the vocational rehab which is back in their local area. As they go from this contact with the Downsview hospital, they're told about both vocational rehab back in the community. But if they're not associated with Downsview, they don't seem to

find out if theirs is just a normal claim and they're getting a normal report back in and that report is a light duty report.

Claims do not seem to be making any effective contact with most of the recipients in terms of acquainting them with the vocational rehab opportunities in the local office. These are the people who, when I say to them, "Have you been down to the local office to talk about vocational retraining?" say, "What's that?" They don't know about it.

Somewhere in the board—other than the vocational rehab department, because they don't know who these people are until they turn up to see them—there should be a re-referral from claims to vocational rehab for injured workers. That's not taking place unless they've been at the Downsview hospital. They are not being placed effectively.

Mr. Wisocky: Dr. Bounsall, actually it is taking place. What is happening is that the majority of our referrals come from the claims adjudicators because as part of the process they have these instructions also. They watch cases and if they feel that the vocational rehabilitation services may be indicated, they refer a copy of the file at the present time to our service controllers who determine the eligibility. I can say that the majority come from the claims adjudicators, but you're quite correct. Other referrals do come from people like yourself or a hospital or even outside treating physicians.

We have now developed a public brochure that is available in all offices for injured employees where they can look at the information and find out what vocational rehabilitation is all about and apply on their own if they feel that they may qualify. There have been some changes in this area.

Mr. Bounsall: Are those fairly recent changes?

Mr. Wisocky: No, this has been a practice for many years.

Mr. Bounsall: Then I would have a look at whether that practice is really working effectively because those that come through my office who are at vocational rehab eligibility time, if you like, or where you can look six months down the road and see that they're going to have problems at that time since some of them are still under medical treatment, have not heard of vocational rehab. When I say, "Go down to the local office as they have good people in that area down there and discuss it with them," I don't hear back from them. Or I hear back, "Yes, Mrs. So-and-so or Mr. So-and-so is doing this for me down there." When they got down there

they must have found they could have been helped, but they had not yet heard about it through other channels in the board.

Mr. Wisocky: Another major development is our computer system for vocational rehabilitation purposes. One of the key ingredients will be the ability of identifying cases from the claim computer system that could be eligible for vocational rehabilitation services, at which time some of our staff will be contacting individuals who are monitoring the case and making sure it's referred at the appropriate time. As everybody knows, early identification of cases for services is the key factor. I think through the computer system we will have that facility so that the counsellors can become involved at the time of the accident or three months after the accident rather than a year later.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Mr. Bounsall, I think Mr. Kerr would like to make some comments as well.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I would. I would not like a misunderstanding to be generated. For years the claims adjudicators have been the ones who identify from the medical reports that come in when they are adjudicating the claim and authorizing payments. They identify the claims that should be referred to vocational rehabilitation division for service. For instance, all serious disabilities where permanent disability is going to result are automatically referred, such as paraplegics and major amputees.

Mr. Bounsall: They're pretty obvious.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, they're pretty obvious. Then you have other types of cases. Let's take the case where the proverbial back is a problem. At that point in time when the claim is first reported, it may not indicate to us in the initial report that it's going to be a problem for vocational rehabilitation. But, as that claim develops, as soon as it's identified that there is going to be a problem with vocational rehabilitation in returning to a job and it's indicated that he can't go back to his former job, that case is referred to the vocational rehabilitation division.

There are guidelines set down for our claims adjudicators and the referral of these cases. In addition to that, when our new adjudicators come in, Mr. Wisocky's division is kind enough to provide somebody from his training area to come and speak to our new adjudicator-trainees so that from the beginning we try to make them rehabilitation aware. As Mr. Wisocky said, we are the major referrals to his division. But in addition when Dr. McCracken's medical staff are

reviewing claims from the point of view of treatment, they would also refer cases to vocational rehabilitation. So for a good many years this has been ongoing.

In the area offices I can understand your feeling that perhaps the claims counsellor hasn't referred anybody to the rehabilitation counsellor in the area office, because this identification normally—I say normally—takes place at head office where the claim file is.

Mr. Bounsall: I didn't say the local claims officers didn't make referrals. I know the position the local claims officers are in. I know it would have to come from Toronto—the local voc rehab—it wouldn't come within the office, necessarily or easily.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's right. But what has developed recently in the area offices, and this is a good thing, we want the claims adjudicators and the claims counsellors and the rehabilitation counsellors to work closely together as a team. In the area offices the support staff, such as the receptionist counsellor, do the reception work for these people who are coming in to see either the rehabilitation counsellors or claims counsellor. We do have this kind of intermingling so that people are vocational rehabilitation aware. We think this combination is developing quite nicely.

I just wanted to let you know that for a long, long time—as long as I can remember—we have had a vocational rehabilitation operation; these referrals have been coming from the claims area and the medical area.

Mr. Bounsall: I don't want to ask you a percentage or have you digging for figures, but let me just put it this way: I wonder if you are sending as great a number to voc rehab as you should be. The amputees, the back injuries, are obvious ones. I know if your claims files are showing that someone is being designated medically as 100 per cent recovered, and that person, from what your files show you, does have a job to go back to when that person recovers, I can see you obviously don't send those cases. But is every other case sent to voc rehab, and if not, why not? Because there's where the shortfall may be coming.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: They are referred at the appropriate time. In the example you've given, it sometimes develops from the information we have—it looks as though this man has a job to go back to when he's completely recovered, but then when we get quite a way along the line the employment situation is such that he does not have a job to go back to. So there could be a late referral, not from the point of view that we have erred but

because we haven't had any information to indicate the referral is possible or is necessary.

As far as we are concerned, we have guidelines for referrals and our people are referring these claims to the vocational rehabilitation division. Mr. Wisocky knows how many are referred. In the claims area we don't keep a record of that particular statistic. Mr. Wisocky has reported the number of referrals he has received. My answer would be, yes, I think that all the cases are being referred, if you allow for the human error factor.

There is the point Mr. Wisocky has mentioned that a computer-assist program should help eliminate that small percentage of human error. I think this is why he mentioned it to the committee—that in addition to referral by human beings, if we can have a computer assist to take care of that human error, then I think that makes the system pretty well foolproof.

Mr. Bounsall: Okay, I would be delighted to have no one in my office asking me what it is they should do now, as their pay cheques from the board are ending and they have nowhere to go. That's where I say go down to voc rehab right away. Those would account for a third of my caseload on WCB and they are very easy ones. I can now send them, as I did when Paul Wheeler was there, down to voc rehab and know I am not going to hear back from them.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We keep asking them about employment in the workmen's progress report, form 41, which we get from time to time. And from time to time we get a report from the employer in prolonged cases, whom we've asked whether modified employment is available. So I keep repeating, as soon as we can identify, or we're told or we're aware from the information coming in from the various sources—from any source—that there is going to be a vocational problem related to the injury, then it is referred to Mr. Wisocky's division.

Mr. Bounsall: Let me put it this way: What you're not picking up is the case in which it is not clear that there is going to be a problem and there is nothing to indicate that there would be a problem; you're just assuming that there isn't one.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We're not assuming. The information on file does not indicate that there is going to be a problem. As soon as the information indicates there is going to be a problem, it is referred.

Mr. Bounsall: But where the shortfall is coming is that you don't get all the input you need in the system. You're not receiving all the input you need in terms of knowing

whether or not in each case there is a problem.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I would have to admit that's correct. For instance, some of the injured employees do not complete all the questions on our workmen's progress report. So you're quite right. I'm sure there must be cases where, from various sources, we don't have all the information.

Mr. Bounsall: It might be best just to take a chance. If you don't have it all, you might just suggest that they go down and talk to the vocational rehabilitation people; it would help inflate John Wisocky's figures for future years.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In our referrals we don't suggest the man go; we refer the case to Mr. Wisocky, and his staff look at it to decide whether or not service should be given.

Mr. Bounsall: If there is no problem, and if your vocational rehabilitation people are as good as they are in the Windsor office, it's going to be a five-minute conversation with a pleasant vocational rehabilitation officer, with the final line being: "Look, if you ever have a problem with your job related to the fact you've had a WCB claim, come back and see me. I don't expect you'll ever walk through my door again, but I'm here."

That's not bad PR for the board to have out amongst injured workers. If they do have a job and they do walk in and say, "Somebody said for me to come in and see vocational rehabilitation down here in Windsor. Why am I here? I have a job," they can say, "That's fine; we just wanted to make sure you did have one. If you ever have any problem, come back and see us."

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I would like to be guided by what Mr. Wisocky requires, because I could refer the whole 160,000 lost-time claims, but that wouldn't make any sense. We're quite happy to work with Mr. Wisocky and provide him with any kind of referral that he deems necessary to give the best service to the injured person. We're open to any suggestions and requirements that Mr. Wisocky has in that connection. You can count on our co-operation.

Mr. Bounsall: If you want to inflate your figures and make your case, you might ask for a few more so we don't get any of them in our office; although it's a fairly positive contact, because you know they're going to walk out and be directed to a place where—at the moment, at least, with the staff that is there in the Windsor office—they are going to receive the proper kind of attention that it is intended they should receive.

The other area of vocational rehabilitation that concerns me is referred to on page C2, dealing with services outside Ontario; it says, "Field service is not normally provided outside Ontario." That word "normally," from my experience, can be read as "invariably." Why is that?

I am not getting into cases, but let's say there is a person who has a bad back injury, who knows he is always going to have problems, and who is a member of an evangelical church in which the training for ministers in that church takes place in Illinois. He says, "What I should do is become a minister of my church, since I'm not going to be in any shape to do anything physically for the rest of my life." Let's say he is in receipt of straight compensation, because the back injury is certainly nowhere along the way where that person can do anything; he doesn't know enough to go to vocational rehabilitation, and hasn't been told, because he's still in the full-receipt category—he's not even approaching half recovery but can sit in a chair.

If he takes off to take training as a minister in Illinois, the board—I suppose using this term "normally," and looking at the list of approved institutions, most of which are not outside Ontario—says: "You didn't ask us whether you could go and because you didn't, we are not very impressed that you didn't. We don't pay outside Ontario, anyway. So what do you mean when you say that you expect us to continue with some compensation for you while you are still completely disabled?" At the same time he happens to be on a course which will definitely lead to employment. It just doesn't happen to be in Ontario.

[9:15]

What I am saying is this: Here is a person who has gone out and helped himself almost immediately. He finds himself in a situation where it is just unfortunate that the ministerial training he has taken is in Illinois rather than in Ontario.

Mr. Wisocky: Well, if I may, we are just in the midst of doing a massive revision of the policies and procedure manual and hopefully, later this year you will see an entirely different format, because changes have taken place and so forth. That is number one.

Two: As I read it in the context of the paragraph it means that normally our people don't provide services to people who leave the province. But we do have an inter-provincial understanding with the other provinces in Canada. So, if a person goes to Vancouver, for instance, we can ask the

BC board to handle the case on our behalf. We do the same thing for them and so forth.

Now, in the example you give, hopefully we can find similar training in Ontario and help that individual, if it is within his entitlement. But there are instances where we do approve training in border cities like Detroit or the Sault.

Mr. Bounsall: Okay. I am not saying we really want to get into the individual case. But let's say that training, as it is in this case, is a little bit beyond the border—you know, only about 200 miles beyond the border. Illinois is that close to Windsor. How far beyond the border can you stretch it?

Mr. Wisocky: Well, Dr. Bounsall—

Mrs. Campbell: How far beyond the border?

Mr. Wisocky: If we have a blind person, the only training we can get for this individual is in New Jersey. We do approve of that. So, if there are no facilities in Ontario, but there is something specialized elsewhere that we need, we do go outside of Canada per se. But it is rather the exception.

Mrs. Campbell: Maybe he should change his religion.

Mr. Bounsall: I mean that's where that church has training; that's where that person had to go.

The other thing is this whole provision of service outside Ontario. It is normally only done in Ontario.

You say that the BC board picks it up. Well, in vocational rehabilitation, I have one problem and this relates to—again, I am not getting into the individual case—

Mrs. Campbell: You are so and you know it.

Mr. Bounsall: I am using it as an illustration. I promise that I will not give him the compensation number.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, good. They couldn't find the file, anyway.

Mr. Bounsall: Now or later.

The chap who went to vocational rehabilitation in Windsor went through all the retraining. He is an iron worker in his 40s. He was all lined up to go to St. Clair College and take a course that would have retrained him as an inspector. This guy has all kinds of clerical ability and, all of a sudden, nothing happened. He was tired of waiting around here. A relative out in BC offered him a job at about 15 hours a week, so, rather than starve, he went to BC. I finally got a letter from him: "Has anything happened to any decisions back in Ontario about

my voc rehab?" I phoned and said, "Have you not placed this guy? He has managed to go outside the province—unfortunately for him, probably—to find himself some employment which is barely keeping body and soul together. He is interested in that retraining which looked as though it might be offered."

Well, let me tell exactly what happened here. The voc rehab worker or workers who were there after Wheeler but who are now no longer there found when they passed his file over, that there was nothing in it indicating the tests he took; nor his contacts with St. Clair College. Nothing. He would have to come back to Windsor and start the whole thing over again in order to see whether he was eligible for that kind of assistance. What do I tell him? Voc rehab says: "Well, we can't make an analysis of him out in BC. Come back to Windsor and we will see." He is worried about leaving his 15-hour-a-week job in BC because at least that is 15 hours a week, to come back to Windsor possibly to be told no.

What about services normally provided only in the province? What can you do with this guy? Do you have it set up with the board so that someone who finds himself in another province for whatever reason who needs vocational rehabilitation assessment—and this person can come back to Ontario for it if he is eligible—can have that assessment done in BC?

Mr. Wisocky: Yes, he can. At any given time we have 60 such cases for all of the provinces in Canada. If you give me a claim number, I can pursue it.

Mr. Bounsall: No, I will get your local staff to do it because that is the only time they have aired that in recent months, when they have said to me that he should come back here rather than saying they will arrange for his retesting out in BC. If that is the answer and they can do that, they will arrange for his retesting out in BC then?

Mr. Wisocky: Please bring it to the attention of local staff and I can assure you something will happen.

Mr. Bounsall: I have one small series of questions on medical rehabilitation, but because we have been so thoroughly on vocational rehabilitation, why don't I leave off and come back in on it later?

Mr. Chairman: Is there anyone else?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes. I wonder if we could get a breakdown, if it is available, of these jobs that you have been successful with. How many have been jobs you have found for

women and how many for those whose language is not English and who are not fluent in the English language?

Mr. Wisocky: We don't post the jobs specifying a man or woman because I think it is discriminatory.

Mrs. Campbell: But don't you have a record of the ones you have found?

Mr. Wisocky: We can get that for you; there is no problem there. In fact, we can get also the figures for the second question you asked. The only figure I have available is that I believe 17 per cent of our constant active caseload involves female claimants, but if you would like I can get those figures for you.

Mrs. Campbell: And could you tell me when someone is going into rehab, how do you approach the kind of rehab you give? I will give an example too.

Mr. Bounsall: Not the number.

Mrs. Campbell: No, not the number. In the case of a woman whose experience is in the nursing field, while your vocational rehab was in motor vehicle radio installations until we got it corrected, how would she get into that from nursing in the vocational rehab? Would you not somehow try to relate the kind of work experience she had with what you wind up with in the end?

Mr. Wisocky: Generally speaking, you are right. What we try to do is get the person back with the accident employer, if at all possible, in a former capacity and a modified capacity; if not, then with a new firm; and, if not, then training. I believe you inquired a while ago about a nursing assistant with a back injury?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, and I did get it corrected and she didn't continue installing radios in cars.

Mr. Wisocky: Right. She is being trained as a medical health records technician, I believe.

Mrs. Campbell: What I am getting at is how did she get into this other thing in the first place?

Mr. Wisocky: She expressed an interest in that sort of work. In fact, she was installing it in her own car.

Mrs. Campbell: Of course, that isn't what she said to me. When she got into it, she said that that was the alternative offered to her.

Mr. Wisocky: I think it was through her brother-in-law who was a manager of one of the outlets.

Mrs. Campbell: That you got her in there?

Mr. Wisocky: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Are you sure you don't know the number?

Mrs. Campbell: I think he knew I was coming.

Mr. Wisocky: If you would like the name, we will give you the name too.

Mrs. Campbell: No, I don't want the name. Generally speaking, you do try, I assume, to get them in something related to their work experience if it is possible.

Mr. Wisocky: Yes, you're quite correct.

Mrs. Campbell: Do you have an ongoing difficulty in this area, as you have certainly had in the past, with those people who really have difficulty with English and who probably have difficulty in some areas with their own native language? Those are the ones I've had most difficulty with, in the course of my experience with the board in the vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. Wisocky: Language limitations are always a problem. There's no question about that, Mrs. Campbell.

Mrs. Campbell: Then how do you go about it? What do you do?

Mr. Wisocky: We can send a person to school to learn English as a second language and we've even started a program now where we are going into the Italian community to find job opportunities there for placement of injured employees. I was just looking at a statistical survey we did recently and I believe our success in placing people with limited language problems was almost the same as the ones without any problems, but I'm just trying to get a figure for you here.

By the way, in that particular survey, 11 per cent were female, and 89 per cent male, so it gives you a rough idea.

Mrs. Campbell: You do have some nice words.

Mr. Wisocky: Oh yes, we do, we're trying anyways.

Another factor is, through Dr. McCracken's auspices we've allowed Frontier College to come to the hospital and rehabilitation centre to get their people to help our injured employees if they choose, so they can get started at the hospital and continue when they go back into the community. There are several things we are doing.

Mrs. Campbell: If you have someone who is not able to study in his or her own native language, do you make any provisions for, first of all, training them in that language before training them in the English language? It's almost impossible for them to learn Eng-

lish if they don't know how to read and write their own language.

Mr. Wisocky: We don't. We have never had a request and also there are so many dialects.

Mrs. Campbell: There are indeed.

Mr. Wisocky: Yes. Also, the facilities may not be available, and this is why we concentrate on training in the job because that is something practical they can learn and do with their hands. I think that's the approach we use there.

Mrs. Campbell: Let's get to the nitty gritty of it. If they can't do work with their hands and they're in this position, what do you do?

Mr. Wisocky: We try very hard to get something. There's no doubt there, but if in the final analysis we can't get anything because of a combination of many factors like language, education, disability and so forth, then if the worst comes to the worst we try to get a person all the benefits to which they are entitled from the board and other social agencies. I guess that's the best we can do, but certainly we will entertain or try anything we possibly can. In some cases, it's just reality. There's nothing we can do.

Mrs. Campbell: Is age a factor and if so, at what age do you sort of give up?

Mr. Wisocky: There is really no age limit, but I do want to mention there are some cases where a person may be a couple of years from retirement and we've tried everything possible to get him back and it's not possible. Then we ask the claims services division if they would consider some sort of supplementary award until retirement age. In most cases, they look at that factor and give favourable consideration.

Mrs. Campbell: Would that type of approach be before or after the Ombudsman committee tackles that?

Mr. Wisocky: It's well before. I even remember my days in claims. It was the practice then and it is the practice now.

Mrs. Campbell: What if there are some slippages in that fact, as there have been?

Mr. Wisocky: I can't answer that. That's Mr. Kerr's responsibility. I'm sure there aren't, not deliberate ones anyway.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, nobody is suggesting they are deliberate.

[9:30]

Mr. M. Davidson: There are a couple of questions I would like to ask Mr. Wisocky. Just following up a bit on what Mrs. Campbell said, referring to the age factor, you said a couple of years from retirement. Can

you put a firmer figure on that? What would you consider a couple? Are you talking about a couple as two?

Mr. Wisocky: I think I'll have to ask Mr. Kerr to explain that. I think it's more than a couple.

Mr. M. Davidson: More like 10?

Mr. Wisocky: Usually it's around 60 years of age or over, Mr. Kerr tells me. But, again, we don't necessarily just give up. When a person is 60 years old we don't just say, "We can't do anything for you," and that's it. We try our best to place these people. In fact, Mrs. Campbell, I just remembered that we had a 58-year-old female injured employee whom we successfully trained as a bookkeeper for \$275 a week to start with, so it helps.

Mrs. Campbell: I am delighted with that statistic. It makes me feel better.

Mr. M. Davidson: Perhaps you could explain to me what would happen in a situation—and, again, I'm not going to give you the claim number—where vocational rehabilitation sent a man to Centennial College and he attended from August 1977 until June of 1978, and during that period accumulated all As in his courses, with the exception of one course in which he had a B. That was kind of a pre-educational warmup to lead him into business administration and accounting, and then they suddenly told him that they weren't going to let him complete the course.

Why on God's earth would he waste almost a year going to school at a cost to the compensation board and then be told they weren't going to allow him to complete the course? How would that situation develop and why would it develop?

Mr. Wisocky: I don't really know, Mr. Davidson, because it doesn't make sense, but if you give me the case number I would be most happy to pursue it. Generally speaking, the objective is to sit down with the injured employee to see what the limitations are and what the possibilities are and jointly develop a rehabilitation plan. Then it's implemented by both parties. I think if the person was sent to Centennial College for the purpose of business administration it must have been thought out in the first place. For the life of me, I don't see why there would be a change in mid course, but, again, without having the specific case it's pretty hard to answer.

One thing I can add is that we've added a lot of rehabilitation counsellors and maybe the case got transferred to one of our newer

people, and maybe there is something wrong in that area. I'd like to look into it, if you would give me the number later.

Mr. M. Davidson: I'd be glad to do that later, but not right at the moment. I think you're probably going to hear about it anyway, because I understand it's now before the Ombudsman.

Mrs. Campbell: So many of them are.

Mr. M. Davidson: It just seems ridiculous to me. I had the opportunity to sit down with this individual and discuss this case with him. For the life of him he couldn't understand why this had happened and, when he had completed telling me the situation, I couldn't understand how it could possibly have happened. It just didn't seem feasible that you would send someone to Centennial College from August 1977 to June 1978 and then suddenly tell him, "We're sorry, we're not going to allow you to complete the course."

I expect one of the possibilities or reasons may be what I just heard Mrs. Campbell say. The gentlemen happens to be about 58 years old or somewhere in that neighbourhood.

Mr. Wisocky: There is one case we know of where we did stop training in mid course because we suddenly discovered that the person has been working full-time in real estate earning well in excess of \$20,000 a year. I'm sure that's not the case here.

Mr. M. Davidson: I doubt it very much. He didn't look like he was earning much of anything.

Mr. Wisocky: If you sent it to the Ombudsman's office, I'm sure we'll have an opportunity to look at it.

Mr. M. Davidson: Can you give me some idea, Mr. Wisocky, of the budget that is set aside for vocational rehabilitation in the province?

Mr. Wisocky: The expenditures? In 1977, almost \$6 million—\$5,951,286 was spent in section 53 expenditures. That's direct expenditures. In 1978, they went up to \$6,843,469. That's in direct section 53 expenditures, but we must remember that we have sections 41(1)(b) and 42(5), where supplementary awards under claims services indirectly tie in too.

Mr. M. Davidson: Discounting the other sections, under section 53 it was \$6 million?

Mr. Wisocky: In 1978, \$6.9 million, to round it off.

Mr. M. Davidson: That's a pretty small percentage of the overall budget of the board, isn't it?

Mr. Wisocky: It's a long way from the \$99 in 1925.

Mrs. Campbell: What was it in 1898?

Mr. Wisocky: Sorry, there was no act then.

Mr. M. Davidson: I'll forget you ever said that.

Mr. Wisocky: My apologies.

Mr. M. Davidson: Could I ask you a question? I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Brownell and—I forget the other gentleman's name; he works out of the London office, I believe.

Mr. Wisocky: Steve McGillen?

Mr. M. Davidson: That's right, with regard to the new program you have. I, too, feel it's probably going to be an excellent program. I say probably going to be because my own opinion is that right at the moment you're very much understaffed in terms of trying to provide jobs for disabled people in the province of Ontario.

I think the work that is being done and has been done by the very small staff you do have has provided excellent results up to this point, but as I mentioned during my leadoff on Tuesday, we're still a long way from providing job opportunities to disabled workers. Hopefully, that group will expand and will be able to carry out its operations in a better manner than it is able to at the present time.

I say that because Mr. McGillen, who works out of the London office, covers somewhere in the neighbourhood of an area from Windsor over to Cambridge, and I think he goes up into the Grey-Bruce area or somewhere up in there. When one person is trying to provide that kind of service in that area, I would think he's probably spending more time on the road than he is on the job. That doesn't make life too easy for him, nor does it provide him with the opportunity to carry out his function in a manner it probably should be done.

I am a little concerned though because—and I won't tell you where it comes from—I did hear that a recommendation had been made by you to add more people but the possibility of that taking place is pretty remote. Is that true?

Mr. Wisocky: No. I think it's under consideration, but for your information we have a posting going up as of today for another employment specialist for the western area, and he will help Steve in that particular area. Quite frankly, I think we need a further period of assessment to make sure we're on the right track, and we're also thinking of other changes which will supplement the efforts of the employment specialists.

I think you'll see that the year 1979 will give us a better picture of what direction we should go in.

Mr. M. Davidson: Let me ask you a more pointed question than that. In your view, or in the view of Mr. Brownell, how many of these special counsellors would be required in order to do a proper job in the province?

Mr. Wisocky: Ideally, you should have one in every major city where there is an area office or information service office, and I think we will have that in the not too distant future. Right now I feel it's no good to add hundreds, or even dozens, of new employees. It takes a while to integrate people, to train them and so forth, and still try to maintain a higher service level than before, so I'd like to do it on a gradual basis.

All I can say is that I've never had any difficulties in giving the corporate board the facts, and so forth, and asking them for additional staff. But, again, it has to be on a responsible basis and it has to be something we feel is meaningful for injured employees.

I'd like to do it on a gradual basis myself, but, again, once we define our direction in the future and once we have the other capabilities that we're working on right now, we'll be in a better position to determine just what to do.

Let's not forget that the rehabilitation counsellors also have a heavy responsibility in finding job opportunities. It's not as if these people, the employment specialists, are doing it in isolation.

Mr. M. Davidson: I can only say that I hope the near future doesn't expand as the two years expanded to five years. I'd like to see a greater thrust put in that direction; I think this is the direction that rehabilitation programs should be going. With that kind of service, perhaps we can get many of our disabled workers back on the job and doing something that makes them feel more useful in society.

I'm not at all certain I have anything more right at the moment.

Mr. McClellan: A short followup question; it relates to who makes decisions on spending money around the rehabilitation program. I understand that decisions with respect to section 53 would be made within the rehabilitation services section by their staff. Is that correct, Mr. Starr?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. McClellan: But the decisions with respect to financial support under section 41(1)(b) or section 42(5) would be made in claims. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to suggest to the members of the corporate board—to Mr. Starr and the other members of the board—that they have a look at the validity of claims making rehabilitation decisions.

I'm experiencing some difficulty with the rehabilitation service in terms of people being cut off in claims when they're in receipt of rehabilitation service and occasionally being cut off against the advice and recommendation of rehabilitation staff.

Administratively, it would make more sense to me if rehabilitation decisions were being made by rehabilitation staff on the basis of rehabilitation criteria. I don't think the claims staff always operate from a rehabilitation perspective; in fact, I know they don't.

I know you have different levels of perception from claims person to claims person; and if a file ends up on somebody's desk who doesn't have a rehabilitation orientation, that can be too damned bad for some injured worker who is under the rehabilitation program. I know that happens. I suspect Mr. Kerr knows it happens, I suspect Mr. Wisocky knows it happens, and I suspect Mr. Starr knows it happens.

I believe there is a real need for the board to look at some mechanism to supplement the financial support under section 41(1)(b) and section 42(5) so that those decisions are made solely on the basis of rehabilitation criteria and no other considerations. That's not happening now.

I'll be coming back to that again at the next opportunity we have a chance to discuss it in the committee.

I said before I think that the vocational rehabilitation people are making real progress. I notice the progress in my own case-load. I'm willing to compliment the board when I feel that good service is being provided. It remains a problem, though. It remains a problem around getting the financial rug pulled out from underneath you in the middle of a program. That shouldn't be happening.

I am anxious for some response from Mr. Starr as to whether this is something that has been discussed or is of similar concern to the board.

Hon. Mr. Starr: It may happen occasionally; it's not the general practice. Maybe we should ask John Wisocky to tell us whether he experiences any difficulties of the nature that you describe.

Mr. McClellan: I'm anxious to hear from Mr. Wisocky, but I'd be surprised if he

would be prepared to say in front of this committee that he was having the rug pulled out from under him by claims.

[9:45]

Mr. Wisocky: I suppose you are quite correct in that sections 41(1)(b) and 42(5) are being administered by the claims services division. The rehabilitation counsellors provide the necessary input for the adjudicators to make that decision.

One thing I do know is that there are several factors taken into consideration by claims adjudicators, besides the content of the rehabilitation counsellor's report, in making the decision about entitlement. One of the variables, I suppose, is continuing entitlement and degree of disability. Those are two.

In the past while I think the co-ordination between the two areas has improved even more. Yes, we have people who sometimes let things slip by, but we try very hard to ensure a co-ordinated effort. After all, we are all serving the injured employee. I don't know if Mr. Kerr wants to supplement that or not?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think you have summed it up nicely, John.

Mr. McClellan: I'm having some problems around this with my own caseload. I bring it to your attention. If I continue to monitor my own caseload—and I relay those cases to the board with more thoroughness now than I have in the past 12 months—it is a point of concern with me because I see it happening to people.

Hon. Mr. Starr: But it's not a general practice. In any case of that nature, we are glad when you bring it to our attention so we can rectify it.

Mr. McClellan: It is enough of a problem in my caseload that I am bringing it to your attention as a general concern—granted on a small sample of cases. I have no way of assessing the extent to which it is a problem, but it is a problem.

Mrs. Campbell: Do you get the feeling, Ross, that you wish you were in Windsor instead of Toronto?

Mr. Bounsall: Leaving vocational rehab, for the moment, to go to medical rehab: I'm sure when I make this statement that my colleagues will all jump on me tomorrow if they hear I've made it.

Mrs. Campbell: They'll do it tonight.

Mr. Bounsall: They can deny my general impression immediately.

Mr. M. Davidson: We'll let you start; but there are no guarantees that you will finish.

Mr. Bounsall: In other discussions we have had about medical rehabilitation in other years—and we went through a period of a couple of years, at least, where there was great dissatisfaction with some of the stuff that went on at Downsview such as the attitudes the workers ran into, the things they were asked to do and so on; I am sure these gentlemen remember those discussions—have you made any changes at all at Downsview? I won't tell you why I am asking the question. If I told you, my colleagues would lynch me immediately.

Mr. McClellan: You're not saying everything is rosy?

Mr. Bounsall: No, I'm not saying everything is rosy. But we are not getting the type of complaint we used to get some two and three years ago from people who had been to Downsview. Two or three years ago, people who went to Downsview were asked to go back. Then they were on the phone crying to me, "Do I have to go back?" with voices shaking and tears in their eyes because of what had happened when they were there the time before.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: All that over the phone?

Mr. Bounsall: We have the latest electronic equipment in our office, I tell you, Mr. Minister. But that is not happening now. Have you made significant changes in Downsview, at least in the way you approach people who are there, so that is not now occurring—at least to the same extent as it appeared to be occurring two and three years ago, or more?

Dr. McCracken: I think the best way to answer that is that, yes, many changes are occurring. They are occurring on a progressive, ongoing basis. In other words, we have done nothing in a given interval of time and completed it and then gone on to something else.

A good example is, we decided we should change our admission criteria and that we should develop the admission data from the hospital rather than from head office. In other words, we felt it would be an excellent idea to communicate with the outside doctor and with the patient who is going to come into the hospital—give him some information beforehand. In order for the personnel at the hospital to get a handle on this, we developed a pre-admission form which we asked the medical staff at head office to complete—why did they want the person admitted to hospital?

In the past there have been quite a number of patients at the hospital who felt like

fish out of water. They were unhappy and certainly if they were asked to come back for readmission they were greatly upset. In the first place, there had been a series of rather erroneous assumptions made between the treating doctor and the doctor at head office. The patient ended up out there and we really were not able to accomplish what everybody thought we were going to. In other words, it was either the wrong time for the patient to be there or possibly it was even the wrong case to try to apply further treatment at Downsvew.

We changed all this and we moved the admission data to the hospital and rehabilitation centre. So that now goes out from our admission and discharge office. They are in the picture before the patient ever arrives on the scene. This has improved it considerably. Over and above that, I think there are quite a number of things we have done on an ongoing basis.

But there is another way to approach it. With certain patients such as major amputee cases, we insist these patients should be admitted as quickly as possible following the definitive surgery—hopefully within the first week following definitive surgery, so that we can get started at the process of getting them adapted to their amputation and fitted with their new prosthetic devices as quickly as possible and thus help them. In other words, this is the real key to early rehabilitation.

Other than cases such as that, the reason a large percentage of the patients are at Downsvew is because every effort which has been made on their behalf by the treating physicians and treating specialists—if one is involved, and usually there is—has really not reached the point where they have been able to resolve the medical rehabilitation. The patient has not recovered fully and has not been considered capable of returning to work. This is the type of case we get.

Having said that, the staff at the hospital started asking ourselves, why it is these people have not been able to return to work. There are many reasons, but the one very common factor is pain. We estimate at least 95 per cent of the patients who are admitted to the hospital rehabilitation centre have a major pain factor. The causes are many and sometimes compound in a given case.

We thought it high time we addressed ourselves to identification of pain and we have set up the pain identification and measurement unit there staffed by our staff plus consultant staff. It has proved very successful. The beauty of it is that what they have found has, by osmosis, gone to the rest of our medical and paramedical staff, so now they

are very conscious of the fact they have to address the patient's problem with pain.

Another factor is, there is no question at all there has been improved communications between the patient and the physician and the rest of the treating team. We felt many of the problems these patients had were due to the pressures of medical practice, that their family physician and the specialist had really never had time to sit down and explain to them what it was all about.

When we started to analyse this we found an amazingly high percentage of patients coming to the hospital who really didn't understand what had happened to them. They really didn't understand why they hadn't recovered from it.

Again we made the decision this was to be part of our program, we had to explain to the patient what was preventing them from returning to a normal home life, to productive employment. This has been a big factor too, this marked improvement in communications. We still run into cases where, despite this effort, we fail to communicate with the patient, but these are becoming fewer all the time, so it has been a major step.

Some of these decisions take time to come to fruition, but we made a decision three and a half years ago that the type of patient in the hospital and rehabilitation centre was ideally suited to what is known as the problem- or patient-oriented medical record system. Rather than try to approach it as is done in a general hospital, which is to arrive at a medical diagnosis and from that you arrive at a recommended treatment, we felt the best way to approach these cases was to utilize the problem-oriented medical records so that we looked at the whole patient.

In looking at the whole patient, every member of the treatment team—the physician, the occupational therapist, the physiotherapist, the remedial gymnast, the social worker and the vocational rehabilitation counsellor of Mr. Wisocky's group, who sit on each treatment team—could address this problem. The problem might be not a diagnosis but, "I have pain in my knee I can't get rid of," or, "I feel wretched and unable to even think about going back to work because I can't sleep at night, despite all the sleeping pills my doctor has prescribed for me," or, "I am worried about the fact my bills are piling up at home and I don't know what to do about this." It covers the whole spectrum and this has made a big difference, there is no question about it.

There are many things we have done that we feel improve the situation. One of the most important, of course, is that Dr. John-

son, the director at the hospital, really tends to set the whole pace because he decided shortly after he was appointed as director of the hospital that he wanted to communicate with the patients. He didn't want to sit in his office.

He started to make it a point, and continues to do so—and in fact he has enlarged his activity in this direction—that he will not only address any problem the patient feels he might have by having them come directly to his office, but just about every morning you will find him talking to the patients or in the patients' cafeteria having coffee with them and seeing exactly what their problems may or may not be.

This is an excellent thing because, again by osmosis, he sets a good example and the rest of the staff pick it up.

Mr. Bounsall: I don't suppose you could relate it to any one thing you have outlined but the combination seems to be—I hesitate to say working, lest you become complacent—but it is working better than it was in the past and people who were there a year ago, when asked to go again, go because the experience they had was not what was happening three and four years ago in the hospital. That is all I can report. They say, "They want me down at the hospital again. This is when I am going" and you don't hear from them that they are afraid to go. I can relate that to you.

One other area is, how are you fixed up for language communication? You were talking about improved communications. Do you have staff and counsellors out there who can handle all the major language groups who will appear in Downsview?

[10:00]

Dr. McCracken: Yes. Last year in 1978, we again increased our staff of full-time interpreters by one and the new interpreter is fluent in five languages. We now have four full-time interpreters, all of them doing an excellent job. The major language to be interpreted is Italian; the second largest language, Portuguese; the third largest language, I believe, Spanish, and the fourth, French. Over and above that, at any given time we have slightly in excess of 55 members of our paramedical staff who are fluent in the more common languages.

Mr. Bounsall: Do you have members of your psychology and psychiatry staff who are fluent in those languages as well?

Dr. McCracken: Yes.

Mr. Bounsall: Do you have group therapy being run in Italian?

Dr. McCracken: No, I don't think we have it being run in Italian. They haven't gone into a full group psychological counselling treatment in the Italian language that I'm aware of. But they will have a situation where they will have two or three Italian-speaking patients and then they will conduct it in Italian. But there's no formal setup that I'm aware of.

Mr. Bounsall: One of the faults I have—and it's really not a fault—is that when the patient leaves there seems to be rather a positive exit, compared to what it was before. The patient is sat down and as a result of the communications as to why he or she is not functioning well or what he may expect in the future, this is when he is told about the voc rehab, which they may find available back in the nearest local office. This all takes place, it seems, at some point near their exit.

Sometimes they are a little optimistic. For instance, the recipient comes to me and says: "When I left Downsview they told me I'd be able to, but I come back and I'm not getting it." But at least they leave Downsview with a positive attitude of what they might get. That's really being a little over-optimistic sometimes about what's going to happen to them when they get back in their home community.

It's the psychological area I want to address myself to. I suppose it results from your pain analysis on a person, but it must often become clear to you that there is a major psychological component to their pain, if you can't find the physical disability easily or at all.

Dr. McCracken: I don't think it's a matter of not being able to find the physical disability. Something very important that I should mention has happened, that is, in the approach taken by the staff of the hospital—and I think it's a very realistic approach. When a patient arrives there and part of the inquiry reveals that he is suffering from continuing pain, which is the thing that is getting to him and is really dragging him down, the approach is to say: "All right, you've told us that you are suffering from pain. Now we're going to tell you something. What we're going to tell you is we believe you have pain."

This comes as quite a surprise to many of the patients because nobody has really told them that before. As a matter of fact, all too often unfortunately they have been told: "We can't find any reason for your pain." Ipso facto the doctor implies they don't have it. The approach we take is to say: "You

say you have pain and we believe you have pain. What we want to try to do now is find out why you have it and what's causing it."

Mr. Bounsall: I don't suppose you can generalize in an answer. I'm tempted to ask what percentage of the pain do you find to be psychological. On an individual case, do you find a real component of psychological pain with most people you deal with? Maybe that's the best way to put it.

Dr. McCracken: It depends in part on the type of case. For instance, we have identified that in the current complicated back cases that are going through the back assessment and rehabilitation clinic, almost 70 per cent of those have a very significant psychogenic factor. We know that for sure now.

Mr. Bounsall: That is where some of the problem comes; they are told this, and they leave the centre. We all have the same problem of the middle-aged person not really wanting to accept that somehow his pain is psychological, as you have been telling him; that implies something else to him, that it is in his mind rather than down in his back where he is feeling it. We have that problem of convincing those people, as you do, that there can be a psychological component or a psychogenic factor.

Many of them leave, having gone through that conversation, saying that some of it is psychological. But the next thing that happens, when you apply for psychological treatment on behalf of the patient, is that a letter comes back from the board, saying: "We can't see any connection; it is clearly psychogenic. You certainly have a functional overlay, but we can't establish the connection between that and your injury. Therefore, you are off benefits as of a certain date." There is something not happening there.

If you can say that 70 per cent of chronic back injuries have a psychogenic factor, then why do they not automatically get treatment back in their home communities under the auspices of the board? Too often they are cut off without getting that treatment.

Dr. McCracken: Actually, something is going on and something is happening. Another thing is that, more and more, I am convinced that assessment and evaluation is the direction we should go; in fact, we are becoming more and more assessment-and-evaluation-oriented. Many of these patients have been through six weeks of physiotherapy and then another six weeks of physiotherapy; they have seen this doctor, that doctor and the other doctor. It is really rather pointless for

us to start all over again and recycle them through the same thing.

We are getting into evaluation and assessment so we can try to identify what the problem is and see whether some stone has not been turned and whether something can or cannot be done. In the process of doing this, as we identify patients who do indeed have an identifiable psychogenic component, then we are involving Mr. Kerr's claims people at the hospital. We are putting the question to them: "This is what we have found. There is a psychogenic component here. What we require is a claims ruling as to whether or not there is entitlement." We are doing this more and more all the time as Mr. Kerr can verify.

When that patient does leave the hospital, the matter of the entitlement has already been settled. I am not saying it is done in every case, but it is being done more and more all the time. This is what is going on in the pain identification unit for instance. This is what is going on in our back education program. This is what is going on in the psychological social evaluation unit, which now has been operational since September 1975; in excess of 1,000 cases have gone through there by now. Again, there are claims people there who are part of the assessment and evaluation team. Right at that time, as soon as we have been able to determine whether there is a psychogenic component and whether there is a psychological diagnosis to be made, the determination is made by the claims personnel as to whether there is entitlement for this condition flowing from the compensable injury. This is going on in all those areas.

I say again, we haven't got all these holes plugged, but we are really getting there; no question about it.

Mr. Bounsall: Let me make a statement and then ask you one further question. When I hear from a recipient that has been told at Downsview—and often they don't want to accept the report they have heard—"They told me out there that there is a psychological component of this pain; there is a psychogenic thing," or I see it written in a letter from the board, I immediately assume there is some way that can be relieved.

I think maybe I differ from some of Mr. Kerr's claims people, who are resident at Downsview, who perhaps take the opposite view. You've told them it's psychogenic and they maybe are a little bit unsure as to whether there's any way that can be removed. That may be where some of the problem lies. I merely assume it can be. Do you? What would you recommend as the best means—it

could vary with the person of course—once they're back in their home community, of having that psychogenic problem worked on and removed? Is it removable in your opinion to a large degree? What would you recommend as the means of removing it? What kind of treatment? I wouldn't think one-to-one in-depth psychiatry, but I'm not a psychiatrist. I tend to like groups in this area, but maybe that's my bias.

Dr. McCracken: Well, there's no ready answer to whether or not a psychogenic disability can be corrected, reversed, cured or not, just the same as with a non-psychogenic or organic component. Any doctor who makes the statement, "I can cure any disease I see," really is not facing realities. Indeed, this is doubly true when you come to the psychogenic group of diseases.

We know this, and of course we have proved this by the operation of the psychological social evaluation unit. We do know the whole key to it or the great part of the key is to identify the problem as early as you can, the same as in vocational rehabilitation. If you want vocational rehabilitation to work, the vocational rehabilitation counsellor almost has to chase the ambulance into the hospital. If we could identify those cases who are not going to recover, this would be ideal. It is a similar situation with the psychogenic component.

Mr. Bounsall: John would need some more staff for that, though.

Dr. McCracken: Ambulance chasers. It is similarly true with the psychogenic component that you have to develop methods of identifying these cases as quickly as you can. Jointly between the medical services division and the claims services division, we did set about and we have developed these flags we look for. There are any number of things.

For instance, if we suddenly get a drug account and the patient is receiving a psychotropic drug for an injury for which ordinarily you would never think of prescribing that, that's a flag that immediately goes up and the question is raised, why is that person receiving that type of mood-controlling drug? Similarly, we may get a report from the doctor and the objective clinical findings are minimal or even nil and the doctor in his report says it would appear he still is unable to return to work. There may be some factor here that is not being identified, and that's another flag that goes up.

We use any number of these flags to identify these cases. We know if we get them early enough—and when I say "early enough" I mean within three months of the identifica-

tion being made—I would say almost 100 per cent are reversible if we can identify them and get them into a unit like the psychological social evaluation unit. In other words, three months from the time the doctor at home thinks things are not going well or we identify that he's on a psychotropic drug, something like this, we have a high success rate.

From three months to 12 months, I would say our success rate is currently running at over 50 per cent. Then comes the bad news. From 12 months on, it starts to deteriorate very rapidly. By the time you reach the situation where it hasn't been identified for whatever reason until it's been going on for two years plus, the only way we know you can help these cases is not to recycle him back through the whole medical system. The one thing we know is you mustn't get that patient into a situation where he is recycled through the whole medical system again. All that does is make him that much worse. It seems like the logical thing to do, or has seemed like the logical thing to do for a long time.

[10:15]

A doctor, I suppose in desperation as to what to do next when the patient appears on his office doorstep, takes one look at it and he really doesn't know what to do next, because in actual fact there is nothing more to be done from a medical science standpoint. But doctors, I guess, hate to admit defeat, so they will say, "I am going to give you a prescription and try you on these pills." Then off he goes on the merry-go-round again, because all the pills do is build up a resistance; they don't really control the pain; they really don't control the patient's inability to get his sleep. Then comes another round of physiotherapy and then maybe comes another session in the hospital lying in bed and then maybe another orthopaedic consultation and—hopefully very, very rarely—another operation, in desperation.

Mr. Bounsall: Okay.

Dr. McCracken: The way you cure it, you don't do this; but one of the things you do, we're finding out now, is explain to the patient what he has and what he can do without damaging himself, even though it hurts, and what he can do to live with the residual pain he has. I guess it's a confrontation time.

This is going on every day in the back education program. These people are being told: "This is what your problem is; we're not miracle workers; you're going to have to participate in this with us. This is what you

can do, even though it hurts; you're not going to damage your back any more; you're not going to damage your knee any more. These are the things you can't do; this is what you can do to help yourself; these are the tricks of the trade."

I think this is the only thing that's left to help these people who are in the phase when the psychogenic component has become so chronic and so intransigent that you certainly can't cure it from a purely medical standpoint.

I don't know whether that answers your question or not.

Mr. Bounsall: Are you saying that after two years of what you suspect is a psychogenic problem, that cannot be treated by psychological means?

Dr. McCracken: This is my opinion. I think psychotherapy is probably a total waste of time. I think psychiatric consultations are of very limited, if any, value at that stage of the game, except when you're trying to identify the problem. In other words, investigation, evaluation and assessment; yes, psychological testing, psychiatric consultation; but so far as treatment I really don't think they work.

Mr. Van Horne: I'm wondering; you've used the terms evaluation, assessment; is this sort of a combined history-taking process along with some standard format testing? Could you elaborate a little bit on that term?

Dr. McCracken: Yes. It's coupled with the problem-oriented medical records. The purpose of the problem-oriented medical record is to identify what the problems are, not necessarily to get at a medical diagnosis. They might be social, they might be medical, they might be economic, they might be anything. Once you've done that the appropriate person who is trained in that particular field can then address the problem.

Mr. Van Horne: This is done by one of your medical staff?

Dr. McCracken: No, this is done by the whole team. The physician takes the medical history and then the treatment team develops the problem-oriented medical record. In taking the history, part of the history will elicit part of the story and the treatment team will develop the rest of the story, and involve the patient, obviously. In other words, the social worker will sit down and talk to the patient and determine what the problem might be, in the home environment for instance. The social worker in fact will make a visit to the home and speak to the person's wife and figure out exactly what

has gone on and what the problem is in the home environment. Similarly, the psychologist will carry out the necessary psychological testing and evaluation to determine what the component might be there.

We're not trying to identify what treatment we're going to give the patient, because we feel that in many of these instances the patient really doesn't need any further medical treatment per se, but he needs to have a very thorough and exhaustive series of interviews, examinations, tests, et cetera so that we can come to some final conclusion as to what happened to this person, as to why is this person in hospital instead of at work?

Mr. Van Horne: Is it during this process, by some or all of the team, that clients are questioned about their marital sex life; about the habits they had prior to marriage related to sex? Questions that, according to some, are rather offensive and questions they would choose not to answer?

Dr. McCracken: About the only place that occurs, to my knowledge, is as part of psychological testing. It is the Minnesota multi-phasic indexing. There are, I think, approximately 300 questions in that test, out of which I believe four or five relate to the sexual aspect. This is part of recognized psychological information required in order to establish a baseline.

Mr. Van Horne: To the best of your knowledge then, there is no in-depth questioning about the number of times a person had intercourse prior to the accident or after the accident, the time of day, et cetera? This is not part of the questioning?

Dr. McCracken: It is not part of the MMPI testing, no; no question about it. Over and above that, in carrying out the tests the patient does not have to answer any question, be it related to sexual habits or any other part of the questioning if that patient does not wish to do so. It is not mandatory. It is not forced upon the patient. It is part of the information the psychologist wants to develop, but in-depth questions, no.

Mr. Bounsall: To whom are these tests administered? Just those you have flagged?

Dr. McCracken: Not even that. Of the patients admitted to the centre where the problem may have been identified, in other words the suspicion exists that some psychogenic component is interfering with this person's recovery; of that group currently 20 per cent have this test carried out. So you are probably looking at about 300 or 400 such tests per year out of 7,500 patients.

Mr. Van Horne: One final question, if I may. Yesterday, I asked you about research that might be called innovative, or experimental perhaps, in so far as treating or accommodating amputees or people with very special problems. Is there any other form, other than what you have referred to as your psychosocial unit, of experimentation; or anything you would describe as experimental in treating or assisting people for what are perceived to be psychological or psychiatric problems?

Dr. McCracken: First of all, there is really no experimental medicine going on out at the hospital. The medicine there is medicine that has had its roots in prior basic research and the basic research has indicated that these various methods of treatment are worthwhile. Examples of that are biofeedback. Biofeedback has been well established for some time now, but unfortunately it has not been utilized to the extent we feel it should have been. We utilize biofeedback at the hospital in cases where the psychology staff or the medical staff feel it will be of assistance. This is a case where, by using special equipment, electromyographic machines, the patients can visually see or can hear by an auditory tone what is happening to their muscle spasm, and with training, they can learn how to relax and alleviate that spasm and, therefore, alleviate the pain.

Another thing that's going on is the utilization of transcutaneous nerve stimulators. These are small units that look like miniature radios that the person carries around. They have a couple of little metal electrodes that the patient places on the skin in predetermined areas.

Again, this is based upon exhaustive research that has been carried out by persons who have been involved in pain research. We believe it works by introducing an electrical impulse that is carried up a large nerve fibre to the brain and the brain receiving this impulse. The impulse acts as a blocker to the pain impulses that are carried up the small nerve fibres. When you hit the right spots to place these electrodes, and the person adjusts the amount of current and the frequency of the current depending on the type of unit we find works for him, he can put the electrodes on, adjust the current and apply this stimulus to the skin surface, which has an effect upon the nerve endings deep in the muscle and carries out this blocking process to alleviate his pain either totally or in part.

This is being done out at the hospital now. In the cases where it works they are given one of these units to take home with them.

Currently, on the latest figures, we now have over 700 of these units that we have issued and patients have used.

Do they work? We are in the process now of starting to carry out our first analysis, but we already have a fairly reasonable indication because we have had in excess of 60 of them already returned over a period of 10 to 18 months since they were put into use. The reason they've been returned is that a person will send one back and say: "I no longer need to use this because my pain has improved to the point where I find I just don't need it and I'm returning this to you." This is one of the things we do; we instruct them that when they don't need it, don't use it and let us know.

Over and above that, in our followup we're going to see how many others we have made a difference in. We know there are patients who have gone back to work with pain and they have been able to carry on at their work with pain because they can now control it by using a transcutaneous nerve stimulator. The beauty of this is that it does them no harm whatsoever and it keeps them away from something that can do them a tremendous amount of harm, namely a lot of pharmaceutical preparations. People who well might have become very dependent on drugs which would not control their pain at all, now are away from drugs and utilizing this piece of equipment. This is the sort of thing that's going on.

Over and above that there is the research activity. The research activity is not experimental; it's investigating the effects of certain treatment procedures carried on outside the hospital and obtaining the end results.

I guess the best example of that is our research into back surgery. We're into the third year of our back surgery research project to find out what the indications were for the surgery, what surgery was done, and what the end result was, then feeding this information back to the treating surgeons in the province. In our computer printout on back injuries in 1975 there were 1,060 major surgical procedures to the spine. In 1978 it had dropped to 300. This means there were all those other people who had been operated on in the past who are now not being operated on.

[10:30]

I had an orthopaedic surgeon from Haifa, Israel, make the statement that he felt what we were doing will probably have been one of the most important things in back surgery in the preceding 25 years. So that is a very

positive aspect in our research going on in the hospital.

Mr. Van Horne: I wish you hadn't said that with Dr. Elgie here. They will be sending Marvin Shore back to further investigate.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: As long as he stays in the same party, he'll eventually end up there.

Mr. Van Horne: Or stays in Israel for a long period.

Mr. Bounsall: Could I make a comment here?

Mr. Chairman: Before anything is said, we have lost half an hour today. Some of the members stated when we started we would put in 15 hours. We agreed to that. In order to finish at one o'clock tomorrow, we would have to go until 11 tonight. That is up to yourselves, whatever you want to do.

Mr. Bounsall: No way, we are too tired.

Mr. Chairman: If that is the wish of the committee, it will be adjourned until after question period tomorrow.

Mr. Van Horne: In light of the interesting comments made by the doctor, I can't find

here any indication that either the unions or industry, for that matter, have made large donations to accommodate research in this area. Is that a fair statement?

Hon. Mr. Starr: The money industry puts up through its assessment is used for that purpose.

Mr. Van Horne: You are satisfied that there is enough money coming in from industry and from the unions?

Hon. Mr. Starr: There is no problem with that aspect of it.

Mr. Van Horne: Where is it identified in here?

Hon. Mr. Starr: In the medical rehab budget.

Mr. Van Horne: You are the only person I have ever met who said he had enough money for research. You obviously aren't a medical person.

Hon. Mr. Starr: We haven't got enough.

The committee adjourned at 10:32 p.m.

CONTENTS

	Thursday, March 29, 1979	
Interim supply motion, Mr. F. S. Miller, agreed to		473
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Community and Social Services, Mr. Norton		479
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Mr. F. S. Miller		488
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to		497
Appendix: Resources development committee (meetings of March 29 afternoon and evening) consideration of Workmen's Compensation Board annual report, 1977		498

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Edighoffer, H.; Chairman, Committee of the Whole House (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Deputy Chairman, Committee of the Whole House (Humber PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Van Horne, R. (London North L)
 Villeneuve, O. F.; Chairman, Resources Development Committee
 (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
 Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
 Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
 Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
 Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
 Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

Assisting the Resources Development Committee:

From the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario:

Hamilton, D. F., Commissioner of Appeals
 Kerr, W. R., Executive Director, Claims Division
 McCracken, Dr. W. J., Executive Director, Medical Services Division
 McDonald, J. F., Secretary of the Board
 Starr, Hon. M., Chairman of the Board
 Stewart, C. D., Director, Claims Information and Counselling Services Branch
 Wisocky, J., Executive Director, Vocational Rehabilitation Services



No. 12

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Friday, March 30, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1979

The House met at 10:03 a.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

PUBLIC SERVICE NEGOTIATIONS

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the members that a tentative settlement has been reached in the negotiations with the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, representing the 51,000 employees in the bargaining unit. The union will recommend acceptance of the settlement at ratification meetings which will be held in various locations across the province, beginning next week.

Mr. Kerrio: Is that a profit-sharing plan?

Hon. Mr. McCague: It has been agreed by the parties that details will not be released—

Mr. Kerrio: The leader will be sorry.

Hon. Mr. McCague: —until the employees have had an opportunity to consider the proposed settlement.

[Later (10.20)]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, might I revert to statements?

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent to revert to statements?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: This time will be added to the question period.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Yes. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. By the way, it was not a riding event that I was at; it was a very interesting meeting with a prenatal teachers' group which happened to be held in Don Mills.

Mr. Nixon: What was the minister doing at that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Why was I there?

Mr. Van Horne: Share it with us.

Mr. Bolan: What's her name?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I was a scout once, and they said something about being prepared.

AIR AMBULANCE SERVICE

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the members that our heli-

copter ambulance service has been extended in its present form for an additional year, until March 31, 1980.

Over the past 19 months, as a pilot program, this service has proven its value for the transport of critically ill patients over a medium range, within a radius of roughly 100 miles of Toronto. The helicopter utilization committee, composed of representatives of the Toronto teaching hospitals, the Ontario Medical Association and the ministry, has recommended continuation of this service.

To date, the helicopter ambulance service has transported 222 critically ill people to hospitals in Toronto. Approximately 35 per cent of the 222 patients transported were premature newborn babies. In the recent bus tragedy near Barrie, the helicopter ambulance proved a vital link between the Royal Victoria Hospital and the Toronto teaching hospitals, transporting four young patients.

The helicopter ambulance service is also beneficial to small communities where hospitals cannot support the medical specialties or the equipment required for all critically ill patients. It allows physicians, without having to leave their communities, to transport patients in safety, with the help of critical-care personnel and specialized equipment, at greater speed than by standard land ambulance.

We are convinced a medium-range air service is a necessary part of our ambulance system. Now we need to assess ways to broaden the area served and the nature of service provided. In that context, we will look to taking advantage of both the flexibility of helicopters and the availability of fixed-wing aircraft. We must also examine the best way to provide such a service, be that by charter, contract or in co-operation with other government agencies, or a combination of these arrangements.

The estimated cost of the helicopter ambulance service for the extended year of service is approximately \$1 million.

The helicopter ambulance service has received considerable positive support from both the public and the medical profession. We believe it is essential to extend this service so that we can continue to meet the

air and land ambulance requirements of this province.

[Reverting (10:06)]

ORAL QUESTIONS

FEDERAL ENERGY BILL

Mr. S. Smith: I will direct a question to the Minister of Energy. Regarding the Ontario intervention on the federal energy bill—the intervention delivered by the member for Durham West (Mr. Ashe), the parliamentary assistant—can the minister tell us whether he ever read that intervention before it was delivered; whether he, in fact, approved of it; and where it was he read it and when? And could he tell us whether that intervention was written by a member of the ministry or by a consultant to the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I read the intervention. I read the final draft and I read two previous drafts. I agreed with it, although it was being rewritten during the plane trip to Ottawa by the parliamentary assistant and deputy minister for delivery to the House of Commons committee that evening.

I might say we were notified by Telex the preceding Friday afternoon, I believe, that if we wished to appear the committee could accommodate us. They had originally suggested Wednesday afternoon or perhaps Thursday afternoon. We indicated that we couldn't be prepared by then and they finally kindly agreed to receive us on Thursday evening.

I guess the final version that was delivered was a joint effort of a number of people, including myself, the deputy minister, and the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister says he approved of it and allowed the parliamentary assistant to deliver the report. Will the minister not confirm that apart from any last-minute commas or little changes that may have been made on the plane the bulk of the report prepared for his review, and which eventually found its way into the presentation, was, in fact, prepared by a consultant, rather than by a member of the ministry? If so, could he tell us whether or not that consultant was Ralph Hedlin, the chairman of the "Elect Joe Clark committee" at the Tory convention? And can he tell us how much was paid for that consultant's report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can certainly inquire. I frankly don't know. I'm glad to hear, though, that Mr. Hedlin was involved in the

"Elect Joe Clark committee." I think we will all be happy about that in a month or two.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: The minister referred to his deputy minister. Could he confirm that this is the same person who was deputy minister when the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) was Minister of Energy—when the former minister indicated that he had been "mugged in the corridors of power by the deputies and the mandarins from the Premier's office"? Is this the same deputy who assisted in the writing of that report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The present deputy minister has been deputy minister for some time. There have been several ministers, but only one deputy, for some time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: A new question.

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to direct my second question to the Minister of Health, but I don't know if he is going to be here. Perhaps, with the consent of the party to the left, I could wait for the Minister of Health and deliver my question at that point after the two questions of the leader of the third party.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: We got into trouble a little earlier by deferring leaders' questions, so you can take your turn in the go-around.

Mr. S. Smith: If the members of the New Democratic Party cannot agree to something as simple as that, I will take my first turn.

Mr. McClellan: With respect, there was no disagreement.

Mr. Kerrio: Oh yes, there was. Your leader shook his head.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I sought that from the House the other day and it was refused to me. I do not see why that privilege should be given to one party and not to the other.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre has the privilege of putting his first question.

HEALTH SERVICE CHARGES

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question which I wish to address to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the absence of the Minister of Health.

Last Tuesday, I mentioned the case in this House of a Mr. Nicola Laurella, a pensioner who now is threatened with a collection agency for a bill of \$167 from his surgeon, a bill which is a surcharge on top of the amount paid for his operation by the Ontario Health

Insurance Plan. I want to tell the minister that clearly is not a unique kind of case.

Between February and November of 1978 a Mrs. Ljuba Morog, also a pensioner, and now deceased, had three operations from two doctors. Her family now is facing doctors' bills of \$426.58 in addition to what OHIP had paid—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Cassidy: I will come to the question in a minute.

Mr. Speaker: No. You will come to it now. What is the question?

Mr. Cassidy: —and is being asked to—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order!

An hon. member: Fling him out.

Mr. Cassidy: Since these two people are both threatened by collection agencies—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order! The honourable member and leader of the New Democratic Party has been around long enough that he knows how to put his question, given his journalistic background. Now, put your question forthwith.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister explain why, in the discussions with the Ontario Medical Association, the government has failed to reach agreement that no physician will charge interest on overdue medical accounts and that in no case will any physician in Ontario submit his or her bill to a collection agency; and will the government act now to stop doctors using collection agencies to collect these surcharges from patients?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member put this question to the Minister of Health last week, the minister said that he was as concerned as the honourable member and that he would look into the situation. The minister will be in the House very shortly, and he may have an answer for the honourable member at that time.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary: Since the minister does not appear particularly concerned, and since during this minister's tenure a regulation was passed which allows doctors to charge interest on overdue accounts—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Cassidy: —where previously that had been a matter of professional misconduct, will the Provincial Secretary for Social Development intervene with the Minister of Health to protect the patients of Ontario against these unjustifiable and unacceptable practices by doctors?

Mr. Swart: Yes or no?

Ms. Gigantes: Not a word.

Mr. Cooke: You're the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Some minister!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ontario Centre with his second question.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Health, I have a question for the Premier.

The government statement yesterday with respect to the Ontario Medical Association agreement has been interpreted as meaning that all medical services in public hospitals in Ontario will be provided at insured Ontario Health Insurance Plan rates. Can the Premier clarify that this is the case and that in future all medical services in public hospitals in Ontario will be provided at OHIP rates; and can the Premier say how that will be achieved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the legitimacy of the question. I would only observe to the honourable member that if he had demonstrated a certain degree of flexibility in acknowledging that on occasion a minister is delayed for some reason or another, and that this question should appropriately be put to the Minister of Health, and if the Leader of the Opposition had been given the right to ask his questions when the minister arrived the leader of the New Democratic Party would then be able to do the same thing.

[10:15]

Mr. di Santo: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on. Really. Where are the rest of you today? Are you all out canvassing in Wentworth and Scarborough West?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you all canvassing in Scarborough West?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question dealt specifically with a health-related matter. If the Premier wants to refer the question to the Minister of Health that's his pleasure to do so, but not to ramble all over the ballpark.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where was I rambling. All over the ballpark?

Mr. Warner: No beer in the ballpark.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The distinguished member—and I say that in the loosest sense of the word—from wherever—Ellesmere is worried about beer in the ballpark. I really was concerned about their health. That's why I was rambling a little bit. But you're quite right.

Mr. McClellan: Question, question.

Mr. J. Reed: Name the Premier.

Mrs. Campbell: Name the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The question should properly be put to the Minister of Health, and he will be here shortly. I know he will take great pleasure in answering it for you.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: When the Minister of Health gets here you can direct your question to him. The question was taken as notice and there can't possibly be a supplementary to a question that was taken as notice.

Mr. Kerrio: And you'll take your turn.

Mr. Speaker: You've had your second question.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order. I would ask you to clarify the matter about the deferral of questions or the answering of questions which are referred by a minister to another minister at a future time.

Mr. Kerrio: Another ballgame now.

Mr. Speaker: No. I think it's quite clear what the procedure is during question period.

Mr. Sargent: Tell us about it.

Mr. Speaker: You'll have an opportunity to place your question at a later time or if the question was referred to a specific minister, when he answers there will be ample opportunity for supplementaries.

RETAIL BUSINESS HOLIDAYS

Mr. Van Horne: I have a question for the Solicitor General. In the light of his legal branch director's recent indication that he is considering suggestions for amending the Retail Business Holidays Act, 1975, can he tell us when these amendments will be made?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker. I'm not familiar with the document to which the honourable member has just referred. We've had a number of submissions with respect to this legislation and they're still being reviewed very carefully, but I can't tell him when any amendments are likely to be introduced. I think it's unlikely during this session.

Mr. Van Horne: Supplementary: I'm referring specifically to an article in the Toronto Star, March 3, 1979. There's an indication in that article that the Solicitor General is open to suggestions for amendments and particularly as there has been some harassment of operators of such things as flea markets, that he would specifically consider amending section 3 to add exemptions for coins, tokens, paper currency, postage stamps and crafts.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes. This matter is under active consideration. I thought the question was directed to when legislation was likely to be introduced. I'm just advising the honourable member that it's unlikely to be introduced this spring. But we are reviewing these suggestions and I think we can say we have a very open mind on the subject.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Now that the Minister of Health is in the House—and I do understand he had an engagement in his riding—I wish to ask a question of the minister to clarify the statement he made yesterday with regard to his discussions with the Ontario Medical Association.

The statement by the Minister of Health has been interpreted as meaning that all medical services in public hospitals in Ontario will be provided at insured OHIP rates. Can the minister clarify his statement of yesterday and assure the House that that is in fact the case and that in future all medical services in public hospitals in Ontario will be provided at the insured OHIP rates, and can he tell this Legislature how that will be achieved?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let me see what I've done with my extra copies of my statement from yesterday. I'll be glad to send a copy over to the honourable member. I think it's fairly clear. It states that the services will be available at opted-in rates where the individual insists. Also connected with that, of course, is the reinforcement of the principle that the individual must agree beforehand in order that they can proceed to be treated and subsequently billed on an opted-out basis.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The supplementary will relate to the OHIP fee schedule.

Mr. Cassidy: To the first question that I asked of the minister; that is correct.

Mr. Speaker: To the first question, yes. Three minutes will be added to the question period.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary in response to the minister's reply: The minister is saying that the right to insured services in hospital at insured rates will only be available if the patient insists. Can the minister explain exactly how patients who may be intimidated by a doctor, or who may suffer from language difficulties or other problems, will be able to insist? Can he assure the House that this right to health

at the insured rates will be available from all medical practitioners within a hospital, or will it only be from some?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, it will apply to every citizen of this province. As I indicated, the two principles go in tandem. First, we have the right as individuals, if we insist, to have services provided at the opted-in rates. Secondly, if we do not agree beforehand, we do not pay. I think that will cover the situations which concern the member.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister be a little more explicit about what he means by "insist"? Surely he recognizes that people who are about to undergo surgery, for instance, and are visited by the surgeon and/or the anesthetist the night before the operation and asked with a steely-eyed glint whether they insist on not paying the full fee, are hardly in a position to stand up for what might be their economic wellbeing.

Would the minister agree that if there is such a so-called "insistence" to be done, it be done in the pre-admission formalities or at the office of the hospital by merely ticking off whether you are willing to pay more than the OHIP rate, and that the patient should not be forced to have to stare down the doctor in dire circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as you know, and as the honourable Leader of the Opposition knows, the medical association and the hospital association have undertaken to come up with a mechanism. I would anticipate that in practical terms the kind of situation the member described is what would pertain.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not the steely-eyed part.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I could arrange some surgery for the member for that, if it would help.

Mr. Conway: Can you imagine meeting the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) under those circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, you'd be fortunate to have her services. She'd likely take one look at you and say, "I won't operate."

Mr. Conway: Blundy would have me next.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the Premier is interrupting. I can't finish my answer.

Mr. Speaker: He is indeed. Perhaps you could have a private talk with him.

An hon. member: It's the vest.

An hon. member: Where is the Minister of Education anyway? Is it her day off?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As I said, in practical terms that's what will happen inasmuch as most surgery comes under the elective or urgent category, which is planned ahead of time. In the mechanism which will be developed, I'm sure we will provide for that.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. In his fumbling around for an answer to the problem which he helped to create—

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is just no charity in your heart at all.

Mr. Warner: —why did the minister reject the suggestion put to him and agreed upon unanimously by the health committee, including the Conservative members, as to how to handle the problem of the opted-out physicians in the province? Why did the minister reject that suggestion out of hand?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In point of fact, we didn't. If the honourable member will take out his copy of the select committee's report, he will recall that there were concerns expressed about this and the select committee said that one area in particular to be addressed was—

Mr. Warner: It suggested a multi-year contract along the lines of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that of general practitioners' incomes. If the member will take note of the recent schedule, and even prior to the recent schedule in fact, the increases for general practitioners have been significantly higher than even the average overall increase.

The member undoubtedly saw some of the recent press. I said this to him at the select committee, if he will recall, when I was there on September 15 last for a lengthy discussion with the committee at which time we engaged in discussion on a number of subjects. I indicated that we wanted to give more emphasis to the general practitioners' income as a means of encouraging them to stay within the plan and to also take note of the pressures on the physicians' income.

Mr. Warner: You can't evade the question that way. You are evading the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member will recall that we did discuss at some length the question of the Quebec plan.

Mr. Warner: You rejected it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I indicated to the member that I thought it was inappropriate to Ontario.

Mr. Warner: Your Conservative members agreed.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On this side of the House we can disagree. I was just telling my colleague the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott) yesterday about the time seven years ago, when I sat over there as a backbencher, when I voted against the government, and a member of that party came over to me and said, "God, I wish I could do that. I can't vote against my party. I can't disagree with them." Over here we can disagree.

Mr. Mackenzie: Hallelujah.

Mr. McClellan: You can do it again when you're a backbencher again.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On that one I, as the minister responsible, have to say I don't agree. The present plan we have in operation works extremely well. The members opposite have taken a few examples—they are no less important because they are few in number—and tried to take the specific and make it into a general condemnation of the plan.

Mr. Warner: You're playing games.

Ms. Gigantes: You're looking bad.

Mr. Warner: Why don't you sit down? You're playing games. You're playing games with a serious question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: When last year we paid claims for 56 million services to the health insurance plan—

Mr. Warner: You may as well sit down. You're playing games with a serious question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the member's arguments cannot in any way possibly be logically construed to condemn the health plan.

Mr. Renwick: Why didn't you pay that? What has that got to do with it? It wasn't your money that you paid out.

Mr. Mackenzie: It wasn't your money. It borders on dishonesty.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Mackenzie: It wasn't your money at all.

Mr. Renwick: What were you going to do with it, bank it?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. S. Smith: With regard again to the negotiating process outlined in the statement the minister made, does the minister have any concern about the fact that—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't know whether Hansard picked it up, but the member for Hamilton East made the side comment that

"it borders on being dishonest." I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Mackenzie: I said, "It borders on dishonesty." That's not the minister's money; that's the people's money and he knows it.

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am keenly aware of that, more so than the member.

Mr. S. Smith: Does the minister share my concern about the negotiating process in which the OMA is recognized, as the minister stated, to be the sole negotiating agent with regard to the OHIP schedule? Does the minister not recognize that the OMA is counselling many of its members to opt out? In fact, if they are to be the negotiating agent on behalf of the opted-in doctors, there is a certain difficulty in the bargaining process.

In particular, can the minister assure us that if agreement is reached in this bargaining committee, the OMA, as part of the agreement, will advise its members to opt in? Otherwise, does the minister not recognize the OMA might be party to negotiating a set of OHIP fees and then turn right around and tell its members to opt out, leaving us no farther ahead?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As the honourable member knows, it has been the stated philosophy of his profession for decades, generations, that physicians should deal directly with their patients. That notwithstanding, the bulk of the profession deals directly with the health insurance plan for their billing.

With respect, I think it is slightly incorrect to say they are counselling opting out. To my knowledge, they are not engaged in any campaign to promote opting out. I know sometimes this can be distorted in the reporting of the answer to the question, but if asked, they will state honestly their principles are, their philosophy is and always has been, that they feel they should deal directly.

That notwithstanding, the bulk do deal directly with the plan. It is 82.1 per cent currently.

If the new negotiating mechanism works as well as we hope it will to arrive at reasonable settlements that will be seen to be reasonable, that will have a very positive impact on the whole question of the option activities of physicians.

Mr. Cassidy: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, surely the problem is not whether the doctors wish to bill the patients directly or bill through OHIP. The problem is now that opted-out doctors are charging an average of 42 per cent higher than the OHIP fee schedule, and that is having to come from people

who in many cases are not in a position to afford it.

Since this began by talking about doctors in hospitals, can the minister assure the Legislature that every doctor practising in a hospital will provide services at the OHIP rate to patients even if, as he says, they have to insist?

We think it should be a right, but if people insist, will every doctor provide that, or only some?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We believe it should be a right for a patient to choose his doctor and for the doctor to choose his option status.

Again I would point out, when he considers the number of times in a given day or a given week and a given month of a given year these services are being provided, compared to the kinds of situations he is trying to take from the specific to the general, the plan has worked well.

Mr. M. Davidson: Where did the patient get the right to choose?

Mr. Warner: Try answering the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What we have done is indicate the principle of access to services on an opted-in basis is and has been ingrained.

Mr. McClellan: There should be one fee schedule.

Mr. Cassidy: Every doctor should be able to provide the services.

Mr. Renwick: You have weaseled.

Mr. Warner: Try answering the question.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this is interesting. Last week the member for Ottawa Centre was for opting everybody in. As of Tuesday, he was against draconian measures. As of Wednesday, he was going to tell the world and Hamilton the solutions of the New Democratic Party to health care.

An hon. member: You were so mixed up you didn't know what he was saying.

Mr. Samis: The campaign is not on yet, Dennis.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: He is like the old politician who said, "Here are my principles. If you don't like them, I do have others." He is flip-flopping all over the place.

Mr. Cassidy: And you are steadily dismantling the system. You are taking it away. You spend \$2 million a year on those hospitals.

Mr. Swart: We are saying what we said in 1960: there should be one fee schedule.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew North with a new question.

Mr. Conway: I had intended a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A new question.

Mr. Cassidy: Take it, Sean.

LAKE ST. CLAIR COMMERCIAL FISHING

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

The minister is aware of a recent meeting between officials from his ministry and the sportsmen's group in the Windsor area. The great concern of the sportsmen's group is that the ministry is going to allow commercial fishing to resume once again in Lake St. Clair.

Can the minister, at this time, tell us his decision? Is there going to be commercial fishing this year in Lake St. Clair?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is correct. I believe I announced some time ago the ministry was prepared to re-establish a commercial fishery in Lake St. Clair when the fish inspection branch of the federal Department of Fisheries advises us, it will allow those to be sold when they meet the contaminant standards.

The commercial fishery we were talking about though will be based on coarse fish only—species such as carp, bullheads, bullfin. There are a number of species like this which have a market, particularly in the US, but which individual anglers are not particularly anxious to catch.

Mr. Kerrio: How do the fish know which nets to go into?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The real concern in the area, I believe, has to do with the possibility of commercial fishing for yellow pickerel. I have indicated there would be no licences issued for commercial fishing of yellow pickerel and also that we would not be permitting gill nets, so they would be using live gear and any pickerel that would be caught could be returned to the water.

Mr. Kerrio: What pickerel? There are no pickerel there.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We still have not heard from the federal people but in the view of my staff, it will improve the anglers' fishing by keeping a balance between the sports species and the so-called coarse fish species.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Health. You must be aware, aren't you, Mr. Minister, that your budget limitations of—

Mr. Speaker: Do you mean is he aware?

Mr. Swart: Is he aware? I said, "Are you, or aren't you?" That perhaps is a question too, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister aware that his budget limitations of one and a half per cent to the Welland County General Hospital have forced them to close 30 out of their 287 active treatment beds effective two days from now? Does he know that 27 of their active treatment beds are occupied by non-active treatment patients, most of them chronic care, and there's no place else for them to go because the chronic wing is operating at 99.7 per cent of capacity and there are additional chronic cases still in the community which are eligible for admission?

In view of this will the minister reinstate funds in the Welland hospital so it can operate some of those beds scheduled to be closed as chronic care beds?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if the local health council in assessing that situation were to be able to show there is a need for additional chronic beds, we would indeed add them back in.

Mr. Swart: A supplementary then: can I ask the minister whether he will provide the additional funding for those beds that are being used for chronic care to stay open until he gets a report from the health council? If not, will he tell me where he is going to place the 12 chronic care patients occupying 12 of those exact beds that are to be closed two days from now?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm sure they'll stay right where they are until their condition is such that they can be discharged from the hospital—

Mr. Warner: With some funding? With the needed funding?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —as we are doing in any number of centres. When we receive a report indicating a need for additional chronic beds, at that point we will work with the individual hospitals to add it back in.

Mr. McClellan: Right on top of things, Dennis; right on top.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: For instance, my friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Grant) and I are meeting a week today with a group of hospital people from his great part of the province, and that's exactly what we're going to talk about with them—how to do an assessment of need for additional chronic facilities—

Mr. Warner: The Artful Dodger.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —which can then be added back in over and above the four active treatment beds per 1,000. It bears repeating again. When we talk about the planning standard for active treatment beds we're talking about purely active treatment beds. If there's a need for chronic or rehab beds over

and above that, we want to see those needs met—

Mr. McClellan: You could be replaced by a computer.

Mr. Mackenzie: Say you are not going to close them then.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and we're prepared to add them back in.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the budgetary cutbacks take effect next Monday, actually on Sunday, and there is probably a good deal of confusion in the minds of hospital administrators, if not in the mind of the Minister of Health, as to what they should do when there is pressure from the medical people and the community at large to continue the utilization of some beds—even four or five beds—simply to relieve the transition for a few weeks, who is going to pay that additional cost? It would simply be an overrun on the local budget with no resources to pay it.

Is the minister saying that if in the opinion of the local authorities they must overrun the budget cutback, at least by a few weeks, he is prepared to give them that amount of flexibility, as he did in part in Brantford when they applied for it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Brantford is a very special case inasmuch as the hospitals there have been working together for more than a year now on a hospital rationalization study. As the member knows, I gave them assurances that certain amounts of money would be added back, but not until they sign a rationalization agreement. Any deficit above that would be recovered from the savings as a result of rationalization.

Mr. Nixon: If they don't sign, who is going to pay?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As of midnight tomorrow night, the fiscal year begins and the budgets have been allocated. What I am saying is that at this point every hospital knows very well the budget formula and the implications of it and they are responsible for living with those budgets.

I am looking ahead to the future through this fiscal year and beyond. Where additional chronic needs are identified and, for that matter, where additional extended care needs are identified through the local planning process, we are quite prepared to meet those needs and to add them back in. In many cases, that will mean the conversion of active-treatment wards to chronic wards, staffing them accordingly and setting up proper chronic programs.

TURKEY QUOTAS

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the large numbers of inquiries we are having from individual farmers in our own ridings and across the province with regard to the raising of turkeys, could the minister bring us up to date as to where this matter might stand at this time?

An hon. member: You are raising all kinds of them over there.

An hon. member: Gobble, gobble, gobble.

Hon. W. Newman: Listen, you turkeys. Yes, we have had a lot of discussion with the Ontario Turkey Marketing Board over the period of the last number of weeks. Many members on all sides of the House have written to me and many of our own members have brought their concerns directly to me. As a result of the Ontario Turkey Marketing Board meeting yesterday, I believe a satisfactory solution was reached last night by the board which will have to be confirmed by regulation. I would like to make it clear that every farmer or every producer in this province will be allowed to grow 50 turkeys—no permit, no licence, nothing.

Mr. Van Horne: Would you settle for 49 and a goose?

An hon. member: And a partridge in a pear tree.

Hon. W. Newman: Sometimes the members opposite make more noise than they do, but I would like to finish answering the question. I could say something, but I won't because we have some young ladies in the gallery.

For those producers who up until 1979 were producing more than 50 birds and up to 400 birds, the Ontario Turkey Marketing Board will provide a new basic quota so that they will not be hurt. Any producers who were producing—and there are a few—prior to 1970 who never did get involved with the board and can substantiate that they were producing at that time and how many birds they were producing, will be allowed a quota.

Mr. Sargent: That's a fowl statement.

VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Bradley: I have a question for the Attorney General. It is a question which could equally be directed to the Minister of Education but it deals with crime to a certain extent. In the light of the fact that there were media reports and there are continuing media reports of violence and vandalism, particularly in secondary schools in the province of Ontario, including a contention by a

Hamilton secondary school principal that drugs, booze, vandalism and defiance of authority are in every school—

Mr. Speaker: I have heard no question.

Mr. Bradley: —would the minister indicate to the House whether he has, in consultation with the Minister of Education, discussed this matter and planned any legislative or regulation activities which would deal with this problem, particularly from the point of view of law enforcement?

[10:45]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Minister of Education is away at the present time, so I haven't had an opportunity of discussing—

Mr. Conway: You are fairly fortunate in that regard.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —with her these recent news reports. But I would say that I have no legislative initiatives in mind because my own personal view is that these very distressing media reports really reflect growing forms of alienation in society, which are the product of a whole host of problems and of social ills.

Mrs. Campbell: You are a law and order man.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I would be very pleased to hear any suggestions from any of the members of the Legislature as to how one can effectively alleviate the growing incidence of violence and of vandalism.

Mr. Cooke: How about some jobs?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It is a matter that has concerned law enforcement authorities and the courts in recent years.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier appointed Judy LaMarsh to deal with it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have urged the crown attorneys in this province to seek stiffer sentences in relation to vandalism, for example, because of the serious problem and the enormous cost that it represents to the taxpayers. We have pressed for tougher sentences in relation to crimes of violence as well.

The courts do not always respond to our pleas in this respect, but we are continuing to do our best.

Mr. Bradley: Supplementary: In the light of the fact that a specific problem exists with intruders into the school buildings, which apparently cannot be dealt with adequately under the Education Act or the Petty Trespass Act, would the Attorney General then look into those specific areas and deal with that specific problem, recognizing that the other problem is much broader?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, I would be very pleased to discuss this with the Minister of Education upon her return. Again, I would just make one further observation: In this particular problem, I think the honourable member can appreciate that the police resources are stretched very thin at the present time.

I say that because there is some suggestion that there should be more police resources allocated to schools to keep out these trespassers. The presence of police officers on school grounds can perhaps create the wrong impression, but I will be discussing this matter with the minister.

Mr. S. Smith: They don't have to be police.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Ms. Gigantes: I have a question for the Minister of Energy. Would the Minister of Energy explain to this House why the Three Mile Island nuclear accident could not happen in the Ontario Hydro system, in spite of the fact that internal working documents of the Atomic Energy Control Board and the interorganizational working group, of which Hydro is a part, which were tabled with the Porter commission and with the select committee on Hydro, provide clear evidence that the emergency core cooling system of the existing Ontario Candu plants are not satisfactorily reliable?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I missed the beginning of that question.

Ms. Gigantes: I asked for an explanation.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It will take me a little time to get the various information together. If I may, I will take it as notice and try to report back shortly, next week.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It has been taken as notice. There will be ample opportunity then.

Mr. Cassidy: As the Minister of Energy, he should know there are people across this province who want to know if it could happen here.

Mr. Speaker: He hasn't responded. He has taken the question as notice. There will be ample opportunity when he responds.

Mr. Cassidy: What kind of Minister of Energy is he?

Hon. W. Newman: A very good minister.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the Minister of Energy not have any communication with his own people?

DEER HERDS

Mr. Kennedy: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. In the light of a radio news report recently that said the deer herds of Ontario are dwindling and in view of the harsh winter that they have been through, would the minister comment on the success of remedial measures or feeding measures that have been taken and also tell the House if indeed deer herds are dwindling as was reported?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It has been a very difficult winter in a number of parts of the province for deer herds. Remedial action has been taken by the ministry in three main areas, cutting browse and providing other feed in the form of grain in the deer yards, and making tracks—because of the high snow and little or no crust—so that the deer can move around and get to their food. I do not have the final total, but I would think that something in the order of about \$100,000 has been expended for material and casual labour to do these things.

It is not yet apparent what damage has been done. There has been some problem, as usual, with dogs chasing deer because of the fact that the deer cannot manoeuvre in deep snow. But we are a little more optimistic now than we were, say, about six or eight weeks ago. As honourable members are aware, part of the problem is that when deer are unable to protect themselves by moving away, particularly from dogs, the does are liable to lose their fawns. That is what happened, I understand, a year ago. How much of that has happened this winter we do not know yet.

The only other thing I would want to add is that I am delighted to say that we have had a great deal of volunteer assistance from individuals—sportsmen, hunters and so on—who have been helping our own staff in getting these things done.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain why it is that he should have kept himself as well informed as he is on the question of deer herds, but that two days after the worst nuclear power plant accident in North America—

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Cassidy: —he should not have sought any information from his staff in his role as Minister of Energy?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would like a very short explanation, I can tell him that the Pickering operation and the Bruce operation—

Mr. Speaker: Order. In fairness, the honourable minister took that question as notice. He cannot go back to it.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister: In view of the fantastic potential of spills and leaks in this province, and in view of the fact that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Ontario Hydro are famous for their coverup of the spills that we have had in this area, why does Hydro not have a team down there now finding out what the hell is going on? I phoned them yesterday, through our research department, and they have done nothing about it yet.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, Hydro does have people down there.

Mr. Sargent: Where are they now? In Harrisburg?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have not heard what room they are in at the hotel, but I know they are there.

Mr. Sargent: Who is down there?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not have the names of the people down there. I was informed yesterday that Hydro sent people down as soon as they heard about it.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Grey-Bruce take his seat?

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Minister of Energy, does he not think he might advise a spokesman for Hydro not to do propaganda on TV, saying Candu is absolutely safe and Three Mile Island cannot happen, until he assures himself that is true and until he looks at the documents which indicate that it is not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, any comments made yesterday by any spokesman for Hydro about this event, to my knowledge, were based on information which was conveyed to that spokesman by the media and which came from press reports over there. My understanding is that Mr. Morrison had indicated that, based on sort of hearsay, he could make certain comments. I think it is always a mistake to try to answer a hypothetical question.

As I say, Hydro has people there. The United States authorities are making an investigation.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Minister of Energy might undertake to create a public statement regarding the two different technologies that apply in this situation, and the fact there was a problem with this pressure container

type of light-water reactor in the United States; and that while Candu may have its own set of problems, whatever they are they are not necessarily parallel in any way.

I wonder if the minister would undertake to make some sort of factual statement which would help the people of Ontario to really understand this whole question, to understand that the problem really results from the fact that information is not getting out from either Hydro or AECL to the public about the technology.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I thank the honourable member for his informative question. It is quite true that while there are some similarities in the machinery, the processes are quite different—enriched uranium and light water as opposed to natural uranium and heavy water, and quite different steam pressures involved. Our plants all have a vacuum building which is connected to the reactor room, so anything that leaks goes into the contained room, where it can be dealt with.

Mr. Sargent: You have had numerous occasions of spills at the plants, too.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Just as a matter of interest, the system which is used here—well, I agree with the honourable member that I should give a complete statement—

Ms. Gigantes: You better go back and find out.

Mr. McClellan: Come back when you know.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —once everybody knows what we are making a statement on and what we are comparing.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Philip: A question of the Minister of Health: Can the minister inform the House what action, if any, he is contemplating to fulfill the promise made by his assistant deputy minister, Dr. Dyer, to representatives of the administration and board of the Etobicoke General Hospital at a meeting last June in which Dr. Dyer promised to try to provide additional funds for that hospital as savings were created in other areas? One of the justifications for his promise was that the ministry's own study, published in November 1978, indicated that at that time there was a shortage of hospital beds in the borough of Etobicoke.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As a matter of fact, I had the great privilege of speaking at the annual meeting of the auxiliary of Etobicoke General about two weeks ago Tuesday, I think it was, and I also toured the hospital. Prior to that, I had also had some discussions with the chief administrator of the hospital.

Members of my staff, if they haven't already been in to talk with him will be talking with him very soon, in particular about two aspects of the operation of that hospital; namely, obstetrics and psychiatric beds. We will work with that hospital, as we have in the past, to assist them in meeting their needs.

It is part of the Metropolitan Toronto hospital centre, and the hospital centre as a whole is, roughly speaking, right on target with our planning standards. But I recognize that the Etobicoke General in particular is in a growing part of Metropolitan Toronto and one that bears constant scrutiny. That is why we are working with them, particularly on obstetrical and psychiatric needs.

Mr. Philip: Supplementary: I am pleased the minister recognizes the problem of the obstetrics ward, which I believe has been allotted 29 beds and is now averaging 40 to 43. I wonder if the minister will be taking into his considerations the fact that the Etobicoke General Hospital in 1974 went on its own cutback and austerity program and trimmed the budget and the operating expenses of that hospital considerably before the ministry even decided to go on its cutback program?

Will the minister also advise us what he plans to do about the present situation where the Etobicoke General Hospital is now about 3,000 patient-days over budget?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The Etobicoke General Hospital is, by the last report I had, managing its budget very well for fiscal year 1978-79. I would anticipate, given the excellence of the board and administration of that hospital, that will continue in the future. [11:00]

Mr. Philip: Why don't you answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have. I think it is a well-run hospital. As regards their past performance, I think I've mentioned in this House before that since I have been minister we have been progressively updating and revising the budget formula to try to find even more equitable ways to distribute the available sums of money. Through 1978 we worked very hard at trying to see if we couldn't develop a formula that would tie in with the peer group comparisons, which members would receive from time to time—we send them out to all the members—that compare all the hospitals by various standards.

We have found, frankly, that if we had been able to do that it might have taken account of the kind of argument that one hears from hospitals that feel they are more efficient than most. Frankly, we were not able

to come up with such a formula that wouldn't have been so bureaucratic and really just unworkable.

What we did instead was to bring in the new financial incentives that provide for the use of moneys resulting from efficiencies to be applied against agreed-on new programs, to be applied against unanticipated deficits, to be applied against capital cost associated with the costs of making an operation more efficient or of providing a new and agreed-upon program.

In addition, four or five months ago, in recognition of the fact that we had not been able to arrive at that kind of a formula, we asked the Ontario Hospital Association and the Ontario Council of Administrators of Teaching Hospitals to form a tripartite group with the ministry to come up with an entirely new budget formula for the future to take into account these and many other concerns. For instance, recently we have also discussed in this scenario what is of particular concern to me, the problems of the very small hospitals.

NURSING HOMES

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Minister of Health. In view of the commitment of that ministry to alternative care, and in view of the fact that on December 12, 1978, the minister stated: "I am advised we will likely be able to table the recommendations flowing from the report on nursing homes of 1977 on February 1 or about February 1," when is he going to table those recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker. I regret that we did not make that deadline. Frankly, the reason is very simple, that all of the same senior people who would work with me and advise me on those matters are the very same senior people who have been working with me and advising me on hospital matters, and that has taken a great deal of time. It has not been completely put aside; work is progressing on that. Rather than pin myself to a specific date I will just say that it will be done as soon as possible.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: In view of the concerns of the public at large about this matter, and the minister's commitment in closing hospital beds to alternative care, is it not top priority with him to get those recommendations forward so that we can look at them this session?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the recommendations as such came forward in the fall of 1977 and I, frankly, have not heard

reactions from those. I don't want to be unkind, but I don't think I have had reactions to those recommendations from anybody over there.

The question is severalfold. First of all is the review of the act and the regulations. The other is in regard to the supply question. The member's concern would be Metropolitan Toronto. We have asked the Hospital Council of Metropolitan Toronto to do an assessment of the nursing home bed needs of Metropolitan Toronto so that we can determine how many nursing home beds should be added in this area.

DEPARTMENT STORE TAKEOVER BIDS

Mr. Samis: My question is to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

In view of the two recent bids by the Thomson interests and the Weston interests to take over the Bay, and in view of the fact that Ontario is the largest retail market in Canada, can the minister tell the House what position, if any, his ministry is taking on the takeover bids and what he intends to do in terms of making meaningful representation to the federal minister on the whole matter?

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, for some days, even prior to the current activity, the Ontario Securities Commission has been keeping a watching brief on the situation just as it did at the time of the purchase of Simpson's by Hudson's Bay and, prior to that, the attempted acquisition of Simpsons by Sears Roebuck.

Secondly, in terms of what the province might do: it really depends upon the culmination of the present flurry of activities surrounding the acquisition of Hudson's Bay by one or more parties. Indeed, there may not be any acquisition.

Mr. Samis: In view of the vague answer, could I ask the minister—and I realize this question is partly out of date, in view of Mr. Trudeau's action—that is, the incumbent federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs did say he intended to proceed with the reintroduction of a competition bill. Could I ask this minister if it would be his policy to support a reintroduction of such a bill? Does he recognize the need for such a bill, in view of the recent spate of corporate takeovers and the ever-increasing concentration of power in the hands of fewer and fewer people?

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, I want to correct the record. My answer to the honourable member was not vague.

Mr. McClellan: Yes it was.

Hon. Mr. Drea: If no takeover bid has been achieved how can he ask me what I am going to do about it?

Mr. Samis: I asked what your stand was.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Secondly, on May 23 I will be absolutely delighted to support any and all activities of a Conservative Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa.

Mr. McClellan: Lord help us.

Mr. Kerrio: Things can't be that bad.

ENERGY FROM WASTE

Mr. J. Reed: I have a question of the Minister of Energy: Recent press releases by the Ministry of Energy indicate there is a renewed interest—

Interjections.

Mr. J. Reed: —in creating energy from waste in resource recovery. The observation is that this is now the second ministry that has taken up this issue.

I wonder if the minister could tell us, first of all, the size of the commitment to energy from waste. Secondly, does this indicate that the government is prepared to change the financing base which in the past it has had through the Ministry of the Environment? Is it going to broaden that base so that now municipalities can get into energy from waste projects on a choice basis, or on a broader basis?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can't give the honourable member the figure for next year's budget, but I will have it, I would think, in another couple of weeks. However, we are very interested in energy from waste. We are discussing with the government of Canada a joint program. In fact, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is discussing with all the provinces a share program which would include these kinds of projects. It is still not clear just on what basis that would be done: whether, for instance, it might be a program that was available to every municipality; or whether it would simply be a program that would pick one or two projects of each kind, as pilot or demonstration projects.

Also, I can't tell the honourable member whether we will be starting what in effect would be a new, continuing capital subsidy program to municipalities to deal with what has always been considered a municipal responsibility, paid by local taxpayers, for the disposal of waste. There are still a number of questions. In other words, I can't give answers today to a couple of those questions.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

MINISTER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Cassidy: I want to rise on a matter of privilege. In the House today, the Minister of Health said that I had said doctors should all be opted back into the plan. I believe he was commenting in some way on my speech last week in East York.

I said then that the government of Ontario must act to guarantee that no citizen has to pay extra on top of the insured rates to get medical services. I made no reference to doctors being forced to opt in. Would the minister please correct that misstatement and not repeat it at every opportunity?

Mr. Speaker: You have already done so.

PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: Dealing with petitions, yesterday the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) tabled what purported to be a petition pursuant to standing order 33, signed by 20 members, the purpose of which is to refer the compendium of background material on Bill 19 of last session, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act, to the standing committee on social development.

I must point out to the honourable member and to the House that the provision contained in clause (b) of standing order 33 for the referral of reports on petition of 20 members applies only to statutory reports of ministries, and reports of boards and commissions and other agencies reporting to ministers, such reports being for the last reporting period. It does not apply to compendia even for the present session. I must, therefore, rule the petition out of order.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, perhaps with the unanimous consent of the House we could have that particular sessional paper referred to the committee.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Cassidy: It was blocked by the Conservatives.

Mr. McClellan: By the Minister of Health.

Mr. Cassidy: It was the Minister of Health who blocked it.

Mr. Gregory: What is the member going to be when he grows up?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of supply.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

On vote 903, Regional Priorities and Development Program; item 2, Northern Roads:

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have an opening statement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Chairman. For the convenience of members, particularly those from northern Ontario, who may wish to be fully informed of the request we are making today, which is in the amount of \$3.1 million, I would like to read into the record a short statement which clarifies the need for this request.

We are requesting your approval of an additional \$3.1 million appropriation for northern roads, which is part of our regional priorities and development program. You will recall that when the 1978-79 estimates for my ministry were before the Legislature we asked for your approval of a total of \$46.9 million for northern roads construction. These supplementary estimates of \$3.1 million will bring the total appropriation for northern roads construction to \$50 million in 1978-79.

Approximately \$1.5 million of the additional funding is required as a direct result of the unusually good weather conditions which were experienced in the late fall and early winter months of last year. This weather permitted contractors to continue work beyond the normal closed period of mid-November to well into December.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I'm sorry to interrupt the minister, but there are a number of private conversations by members and others under the galleries and I wish the members would refrain.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This could thereby increase significantly expenditures on both carryover projects from the previous year and new projects tendered in the current year.

A further \$980,000 expenditure was necessary to expedite a resurfacing program on Highway 11, from Beardmore easterly. The 14.6-mile resurfacing project was necessary in order to salvage the existing road base, which had deteriorated more rapidly than expected.

A reconstruction project on Highway 65 from the north junction of Highway 560, Elk Lake, northerly for 10.5 miles was accelerated in order to maintain a continuous program on Highway 65 following the last project which had been completed in 1977. This project resulted in an additional expenditure of \$620,000 in 1978-79.

[11:15]

Mr. Conway: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question in this connection and it relates to this item.

Mr. Minister, you will recall that a year ago in this supplementary budget the then Treasurer, the honourable Darcy McKeough, in dealing with the OHIP difficulty, tabled a supplementary budgetary statement in which he indicated that the government would effect one of its cuts to make moneys available for that OHIP premium decrease, as it was then. He indicated on April 25, 1978, that \$9 million would be taken out of the Ministry of Northern Affairs and, in particular, the regional priorities program. I personally felt that was an unhappy choice, but that was the Treasurer's decision.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You were part of it.

Mr. Conway: I was certainly part of the overall decision.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The north will remember that.

Mr. Conway: The choice, in this instance, was not something recommended by me and I felt particularly unhappy that the then Treasurer took such an insensitive view of northern Ontario.

What I wanted to know, since it was a decision taken by your government at that time—I was looking at this particular supplementary estimate and it reminded me of the progress of that cut. Does this \$3.1 million in any way relate to difficulties growing out of that \$9 million cut? Could you indicate at this time whether that \$9 million cut that was talked of in that vote was taken out of or shifted back into this vote? Whatever became of that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm pleased the honourable member has brought this up. I would have to remind him that it was the opposition parties that forced the government into that position, that forced the Treasurer's hand in removing \$9 million from the Ministry of Northern Affairs' budget. I regret, as you do, sir, that that had to happen, but nevertheless that was the decision of this Legislature. The Treasurer did it, but I just want to reassure the honourable member that the \$9 million was taken out of the regional priorities and the community priorities budgets, not out of the road construction program.

Roads, as you are very much aware, are important to those of us who live in northern Ontario, and I am particularly pleased that I am able to come back two years in a row for supplementary estimates for the road construction program. It's that kind of enthu-

siasm that we have in this ministry to get on with a needed program—much welcomed, I might say, in northern Ontario.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, as a northerner I'm certainly pleased to support any revenues the minister might be requesting from the Legislature for road construction in northern Ontario.

Certainly the construction of highways has long been neglected in that part of the province. Some of the people in the southern part, of course, don't understand what a road really means. It is one of our main development tools. Without proper highways, we are not going to develop properly.

The main highway, the Trans-Canada, goes through the northern part of the province—Highway 17 being part of the Trans-Canada Highway system. I would like to refer a couple of questions to the minister relating to a couple of projects which I think have high priority on Highway 17, in the extreme northern part. I'm referring to the area between Terrace Bay and Marathon, and some resurfacing west of Schreiber, and between Wawa and Montreal River Harbour.

These two stretches of Highway 17 are in dire need of repair. I just wonder what the delay is in getting at these two projects.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm pleased to advise the honourable members of the Legislature that I will be in Thunder Bay on Monday to table in northern Ontario the capital construction program for the coming fiscal year. If memory serves me correctly, I think at least one of these areas to which you refer is in that construction program, but I'll make sure you get a copy on Monday afternoon.

Mr. Germa: I would like to ask a further question relating to Highway 17, and the problem at the Garden River reserve with obtaining right-of-way from the band council. Can the minister bring us up to date on that particular project?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: My colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) has been in constant discussion with the Garden River band. My last information is they are making progress. How fast it is going to develop is not known at this time, but I can report some progress.

Mr. Germa: This project has been in the works for several years now. I am a little frustrated with the delay. I wonder if the ministry, the government, is sincere in obtaining right-of-way. Why hasn't it taken assertive action to ensure the right of way is available?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have to recognize the rights of the native people. As the

honourable member is very much aware, this road does go through the middle of a federal Indian reserve. Discussions and negotiations are lengthy and protracted, and it is with that kind of an attitude we move into these discussions. We don't want to ride roughshod over our native peoples; they should be involved in the negotiations.

I just further repeat, we are taking this program seriously. There is a commitment to put a four-lane highway between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie and in no way do we intend to back away from that commitment.

Mr. Germa: We have a unique situation, Mr. Chairman. The town of Killarney, while it is only 32 miles from the town of Espanola, has no direct communications link with Espanola. In fact, all communications are through the city of Sudbury, some 75 miles removed, to the extent that children going to secondary school have to spend over three hours a day on a bus.

For many years the Ministries of Transportation and Communications and Northern Affairs have been rumbling about a road which would connect the village of Killarney with the town of Espanola and would open up a whole new avenue for these three or four hundred people living in the town of Killarney.

Could the minister explain why we haven't got some action on this particular project?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As the honourable member is very much aware, the proposed road link would connect Killarney with Whitefish Falls. It is an issue which has been discussed in many circles of northern Ontario. The cost benefits of that road are undergoing some very careful review at the present time.

The honourable member is further aware the road would pass through the Killarney Provincial Park, which raises some concern with the Ministry of Natural Resources.

I can report to you that there is a very intensive study going on at the present time that will look at the cost benefits of putting a road through this very difficult terrain. I am not aware of the exact timetable, but I would be glad to find out and let you know.

Vote 903 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That completes the supplementary estimates of the Ministry of Northern Affairs.

On supplementary supply for the Ministry of Correctional Services, page six.

Mr. Conway: If it walks, pension it; if it doesn't, pave it.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

On vote 1502, institutional program, care, treatment and training:

Hon. Mr. Walker: I would like to make a few remarks of interest in clarifying the request for \$2.8 million in supplementary funds.

The primary reasons for the overrun are—

Mr. Conway: Can't you balance your budget, Walker? Come on, we need some old line Tories over there.

Hon. Mr. Walker: —expanded community resource centre programs. This was announced by my predecessor as a means of alleviating severe overcrowding in many of our institutions. During the year, 10 additional community resource centres were opened providing 188 additional bed spaces at an additional cost of \$665,000.

It was planned at the time of the announcement to extract these funds from the budgets of the institutions. As you understand, when you remove 188 inmates from the institutional system, they do not come from one specific institution, but from across the whole system. However, the reduction in the number of inmates in our longer-term institutions has allowed us to close down a number of units within individual facilities.

In 1978-79, we experienced an overall seven per cent increase in the use of our jails and detention centres. However, the facilities in Toronto and Hamilton experienced a 25 per cent increase in their utilization. The ministry's problem is that it does not control intake when the police arrive at the front door of an institution with an inmate and a warrant of committal. The institution has no choice but to accept that inmate. We cannot say there is "no room at the inn." The increased workload for the three Toronto facilities and the Hamilton-Wentworth detention centre necessitated the use of unclassified staff and overtime, at a cost of \$800,000.

As a result of the decision not to raise OHIP premiums, the government placed a hiring freeze on the civil service in order to reduce expenditures. Although the hiring freeze had the desired economic impact across the government, and in some areas of our own ministry, it did create a real problem with regard to the correctional staff. As you know, our facilities operate on a 24-hour basis and in the interests of public safety must be properly staffed at all times. To maintain these proper staffing levels, it was necessary to incur overtime expenditures amounting to \$200,000.

During the past year, community work programs by inmates were greatly expanded by this ministry. Across the province, inmates were escorted into communities to shovel snow for senior citizens and to clear and maintain conservation areas and parks; to help the handicapped and older citizens in many ways, and to perform tasks for the community that otherwise would not have been carried out because of lack of funds. The cost of escorting and transporting inmates amounted to an additional \$200,000. I should say that I strongly support this program begun by my predecessor. It has received a very positive response from many of the honourable members, as well as the recipient communities.

It is our intention to expand this program in the coming year. We estimate this initiative provided approximately \$1 million worth of service to the community.

We expanded our industrial work programs, primarily in manufacturing mattresses from non-flammable, very low toxicity materials. We also started manufacturing signs for use by other ministries. These supplementary estimates contain an amount of \$225,000 which represents the cost of raw materials for these programs. The cost of the materials is recovered by the sale of these items, with the moneys going to the government's consolidated revenue fund. We are rather proud of our mattress operation. The mattresses we produce are probably the safest in the world. They are certainly not flammable. The only one less flammable would be a waterbed.

We undertook research, in conjunction with the Ontario Research Foundation, in order to determine the most appropriate kind of mattress. When we could not find a suitable producer in our private sector, we went into production ourselves. Now we're selling mattresses to other ministries, to federal institutions, and we are receiving international inquiries.

The ministry had also to bear the cost of increased OHIP premiums for our employees and these totalled approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Bradley: We saved you some money on that.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Two facilities, Kitchener Jail and Glendale Adult Training Centre, were scheduled to close by April 1, 1978, but incurred costs beyond that date for which no budgetary provision had been made. The cost amounted to \$610,000. The Kitchener Jail, which was built in 1853, was replaced by converting a maximum security unit of Grandview Training School into the Waterloo Detention Centre. A commitment was made

not to occupy the facility until a security wall was completed. The work on the wall was carried out by an inmate work force. Expenditures of \$350,000 were incurred because the Kitchener Jail remained open after April 1 while the wall was being completed. Due to overcrowding of the jail, it was necessary to house intermittent inmates in a section of the former Grandview facility.

In addition, part of this expenditure was for the on-site training of staff at the new facility. The overrun of \$260,000, with regard to Glendale adult training centre, resulted from efforts to fully co-ordinate the closure of this facility with the transfer of children's services programs and staff from Hagersville.

Those figures, Mr. Chairman, represent the division and distribution of the components of our overrun of \$2.8 million which we are asking the House to approve today.

[11:30]

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Chairman, I will keep my remarks relatively brief in view of the fact that we will be beginning the next year's estimates in the upcoming weeks.

The interesting point that the minister makes, I think, is the fact that the additional funds are going where some of us in the opposition have suggested that they do go. We are not necessarily delighted with the overexpenditures within the ministry, but at least the money is being channelled into areas which we feel are important, namely, the community resource centres.

What is perhaps a little disappointing is the fact—and the minister has mentioned some of the reasons—that the savings have not been effected in other areas. I think we recognize the same thing, for instance, in education; when there's a declining enrolment, so to speak, in education, you still have certain fixed costs. We recognize that, within institutions where some of the people are removed from institutions for other purposes, the costs are still going to be there, or that you are not having these people going into jails, so to speak, and instead into community resource centres. We recognize that you are not going to realize the same dollar reduction in other areas.

However, I would express the concern of those who are genuine advocates of the community resource centres and the other programs that they consider to be progressive. I would be concerned that there would be resistance to these programs from those who are employed in the existing institutions. Perhaps a little later I could get a comment from the minister as to whether he feels that one of the reasons for a lack of reduc-

tion in costs in institutions when he embarks upon community resource centres and the other institutions—the jails—might be as a result of certain resistance in the old-fashioned type of institutions. I should not say they are old-fashioned, because some of them are obviously going to be necessary, but those institutions that have existed for a number of years and are called jails.

We recognize, I think, the problems that have existed both in Toronto and in the Hamilton-Wentworth situation. There are some who would question the use of overtime as opposed to perhaps hiring additional employees, but no doubt the ministry took that into consideration before making that particular decision. Those of us in opposition who ask questions in this regard recognize that there was a situation existing in each of the institutions mentioned that necessitated the further use of employees of the ministry. Of course, some of that perhaps results from the fact that the institutions themselves are overcrowded but, as the minister once again points out—and I do not wish to be an apologist for the minister—neither he nor his ministry has control over the fact that the police officers deposit these people at these particular institutions.

We would hope that the pre-trial programs that are in the early stages now will eliminate the need for some people to be confined to institutions for long periods of time before actually coming to trial or perhaps actually being sentenced. With the improvement in the bail situation, with the kind of supervision that could exist outside of institutions and be undertaken either by volunteer groups or by others who have a standing in the community of such that they would be trusted with this responsibility, perhaps further savings could be effected. I know that we will get into that in next year's estimates when we deal with that particular problem.

I think it is significant as well that the minister mentioned that \$1 million worth of service has been done in communities. We have expressed some concern that the services provided are not going to be those which would otherwise be done by employees hired by a particular community. With the consultation that takes place with the labour union movement, for instance, and with others, I think the ministry has made a genuine attempt to avoid that particular situation.

When we look at the additional expenditure that we see in the Ministry of Correctional Services, I think we have to take into account the fact that approximately \$1 million worth of services is being pro-

vided to the community at the same time so there is a little bit of a balancing off there. I shouldn't even say a little bit; a substantial balancing off that can be pointed to with some satisfaction.

The other point I found rather intriguing, being a minister who is probably noted for his great faith in the private enterprise system and a member of a government which has extolled the virtues of the private enterprise system on many occasions, I find it interesting that there is a competition taking place in the mattress business. He says that it simply can't be done as well otherwise or that there aren't others prepared to do it. Perhaps that can be expanded upon a little later on today or when we get into next year's estimates, as to why this situation exists. Apparently you are not receiving competition or no one else really wants it. Therefore, the ministry either is so efficient that competition is not possible, or for some other reason these companies don't wish to get into that business.

The last comment I would make is in regard to Glendale and the fact that perhaps some criticism—and the minister no doubt will defend the situation—might be directed to the fact that perhaps the closing was not planned as well as some would have expected and, therefore, the extra expenditures that resulted might draw one to the conclusion that it was poor planning. The minister and his officials might be able to explain otherwise.

In that we will be dealing extensively with 10 hours of estimates beginning next week, I will conclude my formal remarks and look for some replies from the minister.

Mr. Ziemba: Mr. Chairman, the minister is asking for \$2.8 million for 10 additional community resource centres. I would like to know where those resource centres will be located and, specifically, whether one of them be in the Sault Ste. Marie area. I visited the Sault jail and it is a dangerous situation. It is not only overcrowded, it is also understaffed and, while we hear about a hiring freeze, I think it goes against all common sense to have a situation where there is an old building, jammed full of prisoners, some of them dangerous, and then have two or three guards to supervise 40 or 50 prisoners. The Sault Ste. Marie area is one that cries out for a community resource centre as an alternative to the present system.

The other thing the minister mentioned was that the Toronto area has had a seven per cent increase in its prison population while Hamilton and some other jurisdictions

have had a 25 per cent increase. That tells me that some of the judges are not co-operating with the program of alternatives to imprisonment that this government has been promoting and I would like to focus on this in the estimates by asking the minister to provide the justice committee with a list of those judges who prefer to jail people as opposed to assigning them some community work or to a restitution program; in other words, those Neanderthal judges who believe in the old hanging idea.

It really bothers me that we have 5,000 people locked up in our provincial prisons and half of them are there serving sentences of 30 days or less for minor driving and drinking offences. Even in the Don Jail, the notorious Don Jail, a large number of people are there every weekend serving time for parking offences, for Pete's sake.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't they pay their fines?

Mr. Ziemba: Well, maybe they can't. Times are tough out there, you know. You might not know that, but there is an awful lot of unemployment here in Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: It is amazing the way they can run those cars around without any money.

Mr. Ziemba: Some of them are running those cars around trying to find work.

Mr. Germa: Keep them in debtors' prison.

Mr. Ziemba: That is what we have got here in this province, debtors' prisons, people serving time because they can't pay their fines and the judges who impose those sentences should be exposed. They are costing the taxpayers—

Mr. Nixon: You mean they are making the sentences in secret?

Mr. Ziemba: If there are some enlightened judges I would like to commend them, but there may be others who believe in throwing people in jail for not paying a parking ticket. They are making a habit of this and they are costing the taxpayers \$50 a day over a parking ticket that may be worth \$2.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I wish the honourable member would return to the item before the committee.

Mr. Ziemba: I would like from the minister, as I said, the list of the 10 proposed community resource centres. I disagree with the minister as far as overtime is concerned. I don't know whether he has spent much time in jail, but it isn't the kind of place you want to spend more than eight hours. Temper can get very short and in some of these prisons that are really overcrowded you are creating a dangerous situation by allowing overtime. I would rather see more staff

hired working eight hours each and have a situation that doesn't deteriorate as far as the relationship between prisoner and guard is concerned.

We have heard an awful lot of brave new initiatives by the former Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Drea) though not much has changed in the meantime. We still have the women in the Kingston prison, although the former minister promised us they would be home by last Christmas. Now we are hearing stories that this Kingston prison, which is a human jungle, is a place where women want to remain. I think you, Mr. Minister, have an obligation to repatriate the Ontario women prisoners. Bring them back to Ontario prisons as your predecessor has promised the justice committee, and the sooner the better. I don't think because there is a kind of permissiveness allowed in Kingston that you should be going along with it.

I am worried about the money you are collecting from offenders. You collect \$25 a week for being involved in the parole program, and are also charging prisoners at Mimico and other prisons rent every month. You smile, but I wonder whether you in fact may be breaking the law by collecting that money.

Mr. Nixon: You are smiling at this important matter.

Mr. Ziemba: The Criminal Lawyers Association has stated what you are doing by collecting this money is imposing another sentence, another fine. I would agree with that. You have \$160 stashed away, collected from people serving these intermittent sentences and you make out a way of teaching them responsibility is by making them pay rent. In fact, you may be doing something illegal to extract this money. I don't think any of them want to be there and it is ludicrous to suggest they are paying you rent for space for the weekend. I think you might want to hang on to that money because you may have to give it back to them with interest if you are ever brought to task for that.

The success of your ministry is based on the fact that you have so many volunteers who dedicate countless free hours to working with prisoners, such as the Salvation Army, the John Howard Society, the Elizabeth Fry Society and many others. Your new corrections act would limit the scope of the volunteers. Although I haven't had any complaints from any of these volunteer agencies, I wonder whether you have rethought your ministry's position with regard to control over these volunteer groups? Some concerns were expressed during debate on that particular bill in this regard. I wonder whether you

have had occasion to review your position on that?

[11:45]

I wonder, also, whether any of the \$2.8 million is going to be funneled into the probation and parole services branch of your ministry? It seems to me most probation officers have a caseload of about 90, while the experts claim that 30 or 40 is a reasonable number one individual can handle. I wonder whether this field is being properly funded with this money you are seeking today?

I have a number of other points that I will raise, as Mr. Bradley indicated, during the estimates. We will save them until then.

I objected to the \$40 million your ministry spent in 1978 building new prisons. That was a bad mistake. Every one of these new prisons you have built was immediately jammed to capacity. Most of them were designed for 200 prisoners and you have got 400 and 500 —

Mr. Chairman: The honourable member is straying from this particular vote.

Mr. Ziemba: Am I straying from it?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Ziemba: It is interesting, though, isn't it? Did you ever visit any of these new prisons?

Mr. Chairman: It would be very interesting under the general discussion.

Mr. Ziemba: Yes, you are quite right, Mr. Chairman. In any case, now that the minister has admitted the \$40 million was a total waste of money and has gone along with opposition members' suggestions that alternatives to prison are the answer, I am pleased to see he is putting his money where it can serve the best purpose. It certainly doesn't make sense to lock up someone at a cost of \$50 a day when these alternatives can cost the taxpayers \$5 or \$10 a day.

With the closing of Glendale, as my colleague Mr. Bradley stated, I think you have admitted that your ministry isn't interested in rehabilitation any more. I don't think it ever was. I don't think rehabilitation ever existed in the provincial prisons. They are just simply holding situations. With the closing of that, I think you have just admitted you are not interested in education or rehabilitation, or any sort of cure-all for the offender syndrome.

I'll have a few comments, Mr. Chairman, if the minister can explain where the resource centres are going to be located and whether some of this money will be directed to the

probation and parole service branch of his ministry.

Hon. Mr. Walker: I thank the members opposite, the member for St. Catharines and the member for High Park-Swansea, for their comments. I will try to answer seriatim the questions they have posed.

The first question raised by the member for St. Catharines involved the fact that the increased expenditure in community efforts had not been properly reflected in our institutional decreases. One would expect that as we remove people from the institutions there should be a corresponding decrease in costs, because there is a corresponding increase in costs for individuals who go into community resource centres.

It is fair to say one cannot turn it on and turn it off like a tap and suddenly have a huge saving in the institutions. For instance, the 188 people who went into community resource centres over the last year, during the period when these supplementary estimates stand, were not depleted from one institution. Had they been, then perhaps one institution would be considered redundant. There might be a significant saving of perhaps \$3 million to \$5 million which would normally be the cost of about 200 inmates.

So the saving is not quickly picked up, because the inmates are spread across the entire system. You will have 15 out of one place and 30 from another. All we can say is that during the year some of the institutions, Rideau and Burtch had closings of units so that there was some saving realized in each institution.

I would, however, like to say it does appear in our estimates this year. We feel we are reflecting now the changes which occurred over the past year. Of course, 188 inmates didn't necessarily come out on one day on April 1 last year, rather they came out spread over the year. The saving would not be fully appreciated until a full year is in front of us.

In the new estimates, the institutional figure has increased from \$98,404,000 to \$101,424,900. That increase is about three per cent. Given that inflation is running somewhat higher, members can see we are starting to show appreciable savings in our institution from that type of activity. We are quite pleased with it and quite confident our estimates for the institutions in the ensuing year, which we will talk about next week, do reflect precisely the point the member made, that there has been some saving, but it takes a while for it to occur.

The next point he raised involved community work. This is done by institutions,

whereby the inmate resides in the institution and goes out for some form of community work during the day and is under supervision. There is a certain cost, as he indicated there. As I indicated in my opening statement, the cost is \$200,000. That additional cost is offset by the amount of work done by the individuals, as he properly put forward. We had 177,400 hours of service of community work extended during the past year.

We attempted to put a price on that. If we put a price of \$3 an hour, which I suppose is minimum wage, though we think it's worth much more than that, the range is upwards of \$600,000. If we put a greater price on it, then it approaches the \$1 million mark. That is the offset, and we are quite impressed by the offset. We think it's very much worthwhile.

It was a deviation of policy over the past year to go into community work and we're quite happy and very impressed, frankly, with the results over the past year. Really there have been no incidents to be concerned about in all the community work. There were 177,000 hours of community work and scarcely an incident to report. We're very impressed.

I think the member is well aware of some of the work being done by his own Niagara Region Detention Centre on the Welland Canal, which I believe he encouraged very strongly over the past year. We recognize the resistance of which he made mention. However, it has not reached any proportion that causes any alarm. I am sure all of our correctional officers realize that we have 500 more people today than we had a while back, so it does not appear that we are shrinking the size of our correctional staff.

In fact, what we are really doing is ensuring that through community programs, such as community service orders, people who do not properly belong in jail are not in jail. I think our officers are appreciating that. They now realize that there really isn't that much difficulty. If anything, we are hiring additional officers, it would appear.

The member for High Park-Swansea raised a number of points that I think are worth mentioning. Before I go on to those points, the member for St. Catharines was particularly concerned about private enterprise and whether or not I was in conflict of my principles by setting up this industry within our institutions. I have to tell him that my principles are intact. Please be advised that the Mimico mattress-making operation operates with a private enterprise. The name of the company, as I recall, is Sleepmaster Limited, who are the private entrepreneurs in there providing that service. Our inmates work for

them. That was a somewhat tendered proposal arrangement that is working extremely well for us.

Mr. Germa: Slave labour, eh? Slave labour for private profit.

Hon. Mr. Walker: The mattresses are really very impressive. Nowhere in the world could we find any mattress more flame-retardant, except, as I mentioned, the waterbed. The one thing about the mattress we now have is that the cotton that goes around it and the cotton within is, basically, sufficiently flame-retardant to avoid the kind of incident that occurred in the Stratford Jail type of situation.

We're impressed by the fact that we are now selling these mattresses to federal penitentiaries, to other provincial correctional institutions, and inquiries have come from as far away as Italy and Bermuda.

Mr. Ziemba: Who is saving money on it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: The provincial Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller).

Mr. Ziemba: No, no. But it's a private outfit that runs it, though. Where do they get their cut?

Hon. Mr. Walker: We are quite confident this is a very fine operation. In fact, our institutional program in Guelph is a private enterprise arrangement where we have an abattoir operated by an outside firm. That abattoir engages between 40 and 50 inmates at any one period of time. The inmates are members of the union and receive union rates of pay and go away with money in their pockets. We have a fine operation; we go away with an excellent service being rendered by the company. They handle all the administration. As you know, in a good many cases when government tackles some form of industrial business that private enterprise should be doing, it usually ends up not achieving the mark. We are impressed by the fact that—

Mr. Warner: Your government. You should feel badly about that.

Hon. Mr. Walker: —in this case, this particular operation is working very well. Indeed, the meat you may eat today will probably come from the abattoir at Guelph—meat butchered there. We're doing something like 1,700 head a week. That's quite a butchering feat.

In previous years, when the ministry tried to operate it itself, it did not reach that figure. In fact, it was probably doing about 500 head a week. There's a significant improvement in productivity.

We have other private enterprise operations in our jail system. In Maplehurst, there's an automotive business. Muffler parts are

being manufactured on a contract basis. The lessee leases space from us and pays the inmates and we provide the inmates, who earn a very reasonable rate of pay.

In our food servicing — our food operations — something like nine of the institutions have outside catering firms. That's working extremely well. No complaints about that. However, I'm deviating a bit from the actual estimates.

Let me return to a point raised by the member for High Park-Swansea about the community resource centres. In my statement, I didn't indicate that any of the money would be going into providing 10 new community resource centres. Rather, my statement was that, during the year, 10 additional community resource centres were opened. None was in Sault Ste. Marie. They were in other places. I could provide you with a list of those.

With respect to Sault Ste. Marie, we are exploring the possibility of a community resource centre there. We already have a form of one operating in Sault Ste. Marie in the front building, which I'm sure you toured back in December when you were in Sault Ste. Marie. I think there are 17 inmates in that particular front-end portion. They are not under maximum security; they come and go under the supervision of the operator of that portion of the facility.

Sault Ste. Marie presents a very difficult problem. As you can appreciate, it's the crossroads of America, in many respects. It's the crossroads of Canada, being on the Trans-Canada Highway. It's the crossroads, from the United States, of that eastern seaboard road that comes north. There, we have a lot of inmates who do not have community ties. They're basically on the road, going to and from somewhere. Without those community ties, they have basically to be incarcerated awaiting their trial.

Mr. Warner: It's like a description of some cabinet ministers.

[12:00]

Hon. Mr. Walker: It seems to have more than its share of serious criminals on remand there at any one time. It's not unusual to have upwards of 10 people in the remand area accused of severe crimes such as murder. That makes it very difficult to give much thought to CRCs in a large way.

With respect to the 25 per cent increase in days stay within the institutions in the Toronto area, which is quite different from the seven per cent across-the-board increase across Ontario, the 25 per cent increase has been somewhat alarming to us. We did not

expect that large an increase. We had, based on our previous experience, budgeted for two per cent. In fact, it turns out across the province to be a seven per cent increase. The Toronto area has been mildly alarming to us because the increase in days stay has been 25 per cent in Toronto and Hamilton.

You made reference to what the judges are doing. We are impressed by the degree of co-operation that the judges are extending at this very moment. During the months of January and February, I spoke with almost all of the provincial court judges in Ontario at four of their sentencing seminars spread throughout the province—at Kingston, the Sault, London and Toronto. In the process of that, we had a very good and frank discussion. We've noticed since then a significant increase in community service orders.

I'd like to give you these figures. In the first nine months of operation there were 1,000 community service orders. I can recall late in December saying that we'd had 1,000 community service orders applied. These are people who would otherwise have gone to jail in most cases, some perhaps not, but in most cases they would otherwise have gone to jail and the judges had seen fit to put forward community service orders. That was until December 1—1,000 community service orders.

I can say at this very moment that we have just under, a fraction under, 1,000 community service orders actually in place today, and considering that some community service orders last maybe just a few weeks or a few months, you would probably have, at the rate we're going now, upwards of 2,000 to 3,000 community service orders a year. We are impressed by the fact that the judges in the last two months have responded magnificently to a request that they consider additional community service orders. It's a new program. A year ago it really wasn't that well known, obviously, so in speaking with the judges we were able to share with them our experiences and how best CSOs worked and how they might make use of their CSO co-ordinators.

In that regard, we placed a number of CSO co-ordinators around the province to work with the courts. That has had a very significant effect. We can now say that we have 1,000 people on CSOs today and our view is that we're going to surpass 2,000 for the entire year, or at least the fiscal year that we're coming into. I suspect we will hit around 2,500 CSOs. We are impressed that the judges are responding, and my suspicion is that that is going to show dramatically on the amount of days stay in the Toronto area.

We don't know precisely why the days stay had increased. We think it may have been somewhat related to more serious crimes being dealt with. It's possible that judges who gave two-month sentences a few years ago were giving three-month sentences in the past year. For some reason they are increasing the length of stay. Of course, that has quite an effect on our budget. We are simply the recipients of whatever the judges may do. If they sentence twice as many people to jail we have to provide space for them, and it's very difficult. It causes very difficult problems at some of the institutions. The Sault is one, and there are other places in the province, such as Barrie jail, that have that type of situation. We have had some very difficult times responding to the number of people coming in.

You made reference to the federal penitentiary at Kingston, the prison for women. You have, of course, gathered in the last few weeks that there is disinterest on the part of some of the people in the prison for women to come to, say, Vanier or some other facility in Ontario. You suggest that I have an obligation to repatriate those people from Kingston. I'm not sure I really can say repatriation is the proper word, because it's from one edge of the province to the other edge of the province. We're not really repatriating them.

I suppose what you're saying is that Ontario has a responsibility to look after all women who may be Ontario women in jail, rather than arbitrarily applying the two-year rule, that those serving less than two years would be in an Ontario institution and those serving more than two years would be in a federal institution. I suppose that then raises the question: Should we be looking after all the men as well?

Mr. Ziemba: No. It's something the former minister (Mr. Drea) promised us.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Yes. I have to tell you there have been discussions during the year on the question and we are in a position where we have not really had too many advances made to us. We have discussed it with the federal people. I talked to the federal Solicitor General not too long ago, a week or so ago. It was a very casual chat for just a few moments in a courtesy visit I was making. I got the impression he wanted to sit down and spend more time trading turkey on the question. He was very anxious to encourage a move.

Of course, we'll hear more about that in the future, but obviously if we're going to discuss it with the federal government we have to see what they're saying in respect to cost. That's a very healthy cost for us to look

after the people from there. There would be about 66 women from the prison for women who would quite possibly come to Ontario. Before that can be done they have to solve the problem with British Columbia and with Quebec, as to what they would do with respect to French-speaking people and what they would do with respect to the western women, where they would go. Those issues probably have to be resolved before we solve our problem with them.

If they do come to Ontario's jurisdiction, we would have to provide a maximum security facility for some of them, and Vanier is not a maximum security facility. We would have to provide different programs, because people who are in jail for seven years or more require a different approach from those who are in jail for maybe 15 months. We have a lot of serious problems and a lot of cash questions to deal with.

Thank you for your comments about the volunteers; we agree with them. They are excellent and make a real contribution. We have rethought the question of section 9 of the act which was passed, and we have indicated that we do not intend to emphasize the question of volunteer control. I made that very clear just a day or two ago to a meeting of our private agencies, including the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies.

One last point: You made reference to our estimates of \$2.8 million and ask if any of that goes into probation and parole. We have a new budget coming in as of April 1 and we will be attacking those next week, but, in short, let me just say that our community programs have increased by 25 per cent in dollar value from last year's estimates to this year's estimates. I think that probably answers your question quite well. The institutional cost has only increased by three per cent.

Vote 1502 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

On vote 2402, land management program; item 8, conservation authorities:

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there are two actual projects involved in the conservation authorities item of \$4,975,000.

The first item has to do with property acquisition, and it is part of the waterfront plan for 1977-81, phase two, of the Metropolitan Toronto Conservation Authority. In that plan, a total of \$11 million in provincial grants towards a total cost of \$22 million for property acquisition in phase two, to be expended over a five-year period, was agreed to.

In 1977, \$1.4 million of that was flowed. In 1978, with this amount included, there will be a total of \$5.6 million. It is anticipated that within the next three years we will again be at approximately the \$1.4 million level, to give a total of \$11 million.

Specifically, in here there is \$4.2 million, which is one half of the total price for the acquisition of the Guild Inn and the 88 acres of land which go with the inn along the Scarborough Bluffs; also included are four residences and an administration and storage building.

The other item is \$755,000, which was allocated to the Chesterville dam and reservoir project on the South Nation River and the Chesterville channelization project.

The dam project is expected to be completed and operational in 1979, and the increased costs associated with that component relate to accelerating the contract to have the structure available for the spring of 1980.

Money was applied to the Chesterville channelization project, which is a flood relief channel immediately upstream of the town of Chesterville and which will provide some relief from summer and late spring flooding in the Chesterville area. It is anticipated that the Chesterville channelization project will take approximately three years to complete, and construction funding is currently contemplated for federal and provincial financing.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, further to the conservation vote in the amount of \$4,975,000, at this point I am more concerned about the conservation of life.

About an hour ago in the House I asked the minister, "Why in the hell don't you get somebody down to Harrisburg to check out what is going on down there?" He told me, "We have someone down there." Those were his words. I said: "Who are they? Where are they? When did they go?" The minister did not rise to answer my question.

I challenge the minister at this point. I have been talking to Mr. Dennis Dack, the head of public relations for Hydro. He said to me, "We have no one down there."

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I say to the member for Grey-Bruce—

Mr. Sargent: With the greatest respect, Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order. We are dealing here with supplementary estimates of the Ministry of Natural Resources. It has nothing to do with energy at all.

If you have risen in your place to speak to these estimates, and not to anything in the

energy field, I would ask you to limit your remarks to that.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, it is important. If the minister has misled this House, we should know about it at this point. Give him a chance to defend himself now.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Now is not the time to do that. If you want to ask any questions on natural resources, we would be very pleased to have you continue, but not on the matter of energy.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that we are talking about natural resources, Mr. Chairman, but human life is one of the main factors in natural resources. It is all tied in together.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I am afraid you can't stretch that over into this vote.

Mr. Sargent: I would challenge the minister to answer my question.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I would advise the minister not to answer that question. If there are any questions on natural resources—

Mr. Sargent: It is very important, in view of what is going on in the nuclear field, that we know exactly what Ontario Hydro and this minister are doing about it. If he has misled the House, we should know about it.

[12:15]

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You will have your opportunity on Monday to question the minister in the matter of energy.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, in the interests of saving time I'd like to say something. As it happens, about half an hour ago, I learned I had misunderstood the information given to me yesterday. I called the Speaker to ask him how I might deal with that. It was suggested it might not be improper to rise when I was dealing with this and indicate that in fact what Hydro had indicated to me was that it was monitoring the situation closely. They did not tell me they had a person there. I misunderstood. In fact, I am told the authorities investigating that situation in the US would not have other observers with them. Hydro, as I say, is monitoring the matter very closely.

Mr. Sargent: They're not there.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There is no one from Hydro on the site in Pennsylvania and I want to apologize for making that mistake. I had intended when we had completed this estimate to make that statement.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister obviously knows a great deal

about deer. That was quite an explanation in the House this morning.

The moneys have been spent for the acquisition of land in order to try to complete the waterfront project. It's a good project. It will enhance the beauty of Metropolitan Toronto. I am pleased to see the project going ahead. In Scarborough, we have benefited already from Bluffers Park. The landfill project has provided us with an access to boating facilities and to recreational facilities which we didn't have before, so the project has been of benefit to us.

Similarly, I would take it that the acquisition of the Guild Inn site is of benefit or will be of benefit to residents of Scarborough, particularly those who live in the southerly portion of the borough. It preserves a little spot of history that I think a lot of us in Scarborough would prefer to preserve.

My question to you is: Keeping in mind that these projects are important, or at least projects we would like to see go ahead, why did they take precedence over the preservation of the bluffs? There are a couple of spots in particular where restoration is needed, and where some work has to be done in order to try to preserve the bluffs area. I understand some of that work would likely involve landfill, and of course an expense would be involved. I'd just briefly like to know why that project didn't take priority over the projects you've cited where the money was spent?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, this of course is a separate project, I know the honourable member agrees with me that the conservation authority gets support from ourselves and also from the constituent municipalities and decides its own priorities. However, I have had some concern about the situation to the west of the Bluffers Park restoration project, which has been very successful. I have been in touch with the authority and I am informed they are going ahead this year and have reallocated some of their normal budget funds for work to start on the area to the west where there is quite severe erosion. In fact, the erosion is right up to the south edge of one of the streets, and I've observed it myself.

That is being done, but I just want to reiterate this is separate from the property acquisition project. My recollection is there has been discussion going on with the Guild Inn company for some time. It just happened, I guess, that it came to fruition now rather than next year or two years ago. It is part of that separate project, which is waterfront property acquisition.

Mr. Warner: One final question: When should the acquisition be completed? When will all the lands required—I take it this is only part; it's not the end of it—be acquired?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is a five-year program which is anticipated to finish in 1981.

Mr. Warner: Is there any estimate of how much more money needs to be expended between now and the completion of the project?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the amount that was allocated over the five-year period, in 1976-77 when this was put together, there would be approximately \$4.2 million that we have undertaken to put forward in the next three years.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Chairman, the minister has answered all my questions—not quite as vividly as his description of the deer but none the less appreciated.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister briefly for his views on some matters pertaining to conservation authorities which have come to our attention recently and which I believe would have some bearing on the amount to be voted.

The recent floods, and the reaction of the conservation authorities to them, have left a lot of people in doubt as to the efficacy of the flood control and warning system of the Grand River Conservation Authority and, to some extent, of the Thames Valley Conservation Authority. I believe the staff in each case is competent, and I believe the people from the municipalities and those appointed by the government by order in council are competent and certainly committed to the good of the responsibilities normally associated with conservation.

Having said that, however, I would like simply to say that, in the area I represent, confidence in the conservation authority is somewhat reduced and is continuing to be reduced. There were people involved in the community, such as myself, the works manager for the town of Paris, members of the council of the town of Paris and the former mayor, who publicly indicated they felt the warning system was inadequate and that the conservation authority had not taken the responsibilities and initiatives that it might have taken during the unexpected flooding caused by the ice jam.

It came down to this: The people in the town wanted the ice jam dynamited. The chairman and the officials of the conservation authority said: "This is only done for grandstanding or public relations reasons. In fact, it can do no good. Furthermore, it can only be done by the municipality itself." Also—

and this was in direct reference to me—the chairman indicated he felt I should know better than to indicate they might dynamite it, since the dynamiting would of course come directly under the Attorney General's (Mr. McMurtry) responsibility. I naturally phoned the Attorney General, and he said he had never heard anything about it. To be fair, the chairman has more or less withdrawn the indication he's sorry I didn't know such an obviously well-known fact, because evidently he is the only person who knew anything about it.

I am not here to have a big fight with Mr. Bauer, who has served extremely well as the government's appointee on the board for many years. But for him and the officials to indicate there is nothing they can do under those circumstances, and whatever dynamite is used is strictly for public relations reasons, seems to me to be irresponsible. I say that deliberately. If it is for grandstanding purposes, then they certainly should not do it anywhere—and they have done it at the mouth of the Grand previously, as well as at the mouth of the Thames even this year.

The idea that it should be done by the municipality is absolutely absurd, because the flooding is usually caused by an ice jam that may very well be and almost always is in a downriver municipality and it backs up. What is Paris going to do about an ice jam that is in Brantford township? I do not even want to talk about it, it is so patently absurd.

The thing that concerns me is that these conservation authorities now are mature. They are old. Many of the people on their boards have been there a good long time; they have gone forward and built very large structures to house their administrative staff. They have spent the money, for example, to put remote-reading water-level gauges in many places in the river system that read back at their headquarters; but really, if there is an emergency they seem to be wound up in red tape or simply have their feet set in the usual inertia situation associated with very comfortable public servants.

It is true that 99.9 per cent of the time they need do nothing except go around and in a very responsible way indicate that the conservation authority is looking after its responsibility; but when the river gets on the rampage, then we expect some of these people, who are adequately paid no doubt, to have a plan and to come down and say: "This is what we are planning to do, people, and we are going to do it. We are going to take the responsibility; and if it needs a helicopter we will get a helicopter"; instead of telling the public works person in Paris that he should

contact the police, who might have a helicopter and it won't do any good anyway.

The organization always seems to be looking for reasons why they can't do anything. I am very much concerned, because although the minister has a large number of officials who could probably make the public relations speeches as well as the conservation authorities, his responsibilities lie directly in northern Ontario largely and really the value of the conservation authority is becoming a remote question.

The minister may have even seen that the report of the royal commissioner looking into local government in the Waterloo area recommended the abolition of the conservation authority. I do not join in that recommendation at this time, but I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is time we had a very careful look at what the conservation authorities are supposed to do. They run great parks; the park at Pinehurst in the Grand River Conservation Authority is one of the finest in Canada. But we have to remember that there is a federal parks board, a provincial parks board, a municipal parks board—and whether we really need them all, I don't know. The park is run by the authority and they do it very well, but they should bring forward other initiatives in the community.

They have taken a very strong role in planning decisions; as a matter of fact every proposal in the flood plain—which is an extremely large area indeed, including almost the whole of the town of Paris, for example—any planning decision has to go to the conservation authority. They have a map and they have very competent people—I know some of them, recent graduates from some planning course in Ontario—who have mapped out where the high water level would be if Hurricane Hazel had dumped on the Grand River and they have drawn the line. Everything in there seems to be under their veto and control.

We can argue that this may or may not be a good thing. Maybe the town of Paris should be moved up into the hills in preparation for the once-in-a-century flood. And maybe that is your policy, as long as there isn't a flood. It is not mine. It really concerns me, because it has dislocated so many of the planning decisions, both with delays and what amounts to veto.

I have written to the chairman and indicated that the impression we have is that he runs a "nay" saying organization; and very properly he wrote back and disagreed—in very moderate tones, as is certainly proper. He even indicated at one time, being critical of the mayor of Paris, that the pres-

ent mayor of Paris was getting exercised about the former mayor of Paris because he happens to be a candidate for election in the present campaign. It may be that the very fact the chairman is not ever a candidate for election means that his approach to public affairs is so far removed from the reality in the community as to be approaching uselessness.

I am getting concerned about the conservation authorities and I just want to indicate my concern to the minister. We will talk about it again sometime, I think.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate a little of what was said by the previous speaker, that the conservation authority, with the staff they have and the planning ability they should have, should be doing some monitoring. It seems to me they should be able to tell within a day or two what is going to happen.

[12:30]

I know that in the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority area in 1937 they had the worst flood they ever had. We had no conservation authorities and the people lived through it with losses and so forth. But now that we have a conservation authority, the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, and we have planning, it seems to me that we should be able to monitor the levels all the way up the system and know pretty well what is going to happen, with the studies and with the things that have happened over the past number of years.

It seems to me that the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) would be here today if he knew this was on, because it is very important in Dover township. There was a major catastrophe in that township in the last flood just a few weeks ago. It caused great disruption to that township. We know it is excellent farm land because the dikes pumped it out. That is probably some of the choicest land and the most productive land in Ontario. That disrupted that municipality a great deal and it is going to be a long time getting over it.

It seems to me that conservation authorities should be able to monitor what is going on in the upper levels of the Thames River. They should be able to tell within a few days lower down how long it takes for that water to get down. There should be some warnings and something should be done.

I think this is very serious. It seems to me what the conservation authorities in our own area are mostly doing is buying up land. I don't think they are doing much studying as

far as any flood control is concerned. They may have some studies made on it. If they have, they haven't reported them as far as I am concerned. They are mostly interested in buying park land; which is nice to have, but in areas where the possibility of flooding comes once in a while I think they should be looking at that much more seriously.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If that is the last of the comments, I might very briefly say that we have some concern too about communications in these flood emergencies. That is why I established the committee which is presently working in the lower Thames area to look at, among other things, the question of communications and responsibility and how these things are carried out.

I won't attempt to comment on the question of methods because I am not an expert in dealing with ice jams and floods and so on. We have some concern about this and I am expecting that we will learn about some things that happened, and hopefully find ways of improving them. I am tempted to say that the conservation authorities were originally set up specifically to deal with flood problems.

Mr. Gaunt: They have gone far beyond that now.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think as a result of having to acquire flood-plain lands for reservoirs and one thing and another, and then finding they were not necessarily used for that purpose all the time, they have expanded into the recreation field with the approval of the municipalities, which are paying their share obviously. But I think we have to concentrate on the primary objective and the original intent.

That is what we are looking at at the moment; and we will be looking at more, because of the fact that there are not unlimited funds and there is still remedial work to be done. In fact as far as the Grand is concerned, which is not involved in this estimate, but just for the information of the honourable member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), I am told the environmental study on the dam is almost completed and will be completed in a month or so. When that is available there will be the Environmental Hearing Board hearings. Staff of my ministry are meeting with staff of the authority in a preliminary way to look at what may be involved in financing and so on, assuming the project is to go ahead. In fact, they have a meeting next week.

Vote 2402 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH

On vote 3101, ministry administration and health insurance program; item 11, health insurance.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: A number of unforeseen factors have developed since the ministry's 1978-79 estimates were prepared. Vote 3101, item 11, health insurance, will therefore require \$66 million in supplementary funds for the current fiscal year.

During February and March of the 1977-78 fiscal year, there was an unpredictable surge in OHIP claims. The impact of this surge carried over into this fiscal year and, since it occurred subsequent to the preparation of our 1978-79 estimates, the base calculation for the estimate was understated. The OHIP estimate was based on some anticipated service reductions, but after lengthy consultation with the medical profession regarding the impact of these planned reductions on overall patient care, it was deemed inappropriate to proceed with the reductions.

The original estimate provided for a 1.1 per cent increase in the use of medical services. However, the actual increase experienced this fiscal year is in excess of two per cent. There was no provision in the 1978-79 estimates at that time for the January 1979 average fee increase of 6.6 per cent. To improve service to the public, the ministry wishes to reduce the inventory of claims submitted, but not yet processed, to a minimum. The funds requested for the claims inventory reduction represents eight days normal processing volume.

The factors I have outlined will result in actual OHIP expenditures of approximately \$1.024 billion, compared to the 1978-79 estimate of \$958 million.

Mr. Conway: I want to use this opportunity this morning on the supplementary estimates as presented by the Minister of Health to elicit a few comments from him about this rather topical and timely issue of payment for physicians' services in the government plan.

I was rather interested in the minister's comment that among the reasons for the rather substantial \$66 million additional amount was, to use his phrase, "an unpredictable surge in OHIP claims" submitted during the course of the previous year. What certainly strikes me in this instance is that on the one hand some of us are encouraging—and I make no apologies for that—increases on a sectoral basis within the physicians' community. I want to reiterate my concern about the rate at which general practitioners are presently being paid. But as we increase

that—and the minister pointed out that some of the \$66 million is a result of 6.6 per cent increase in the fee schedule—we seem to be experiencing, on the other hand, a phenomenon of, to use his figures, a rather substantial surge in the rate of utilization. If that is not so, then the minister can take this opportunity to correct me.

Clearly, the present situation within the OHIP program in Ontario is one that is increasingly unsatisfactory to a number of people in this House and outside. I am, for one, deeply concerned about the redress that has been offered most recently by the minister. It is a step clearly in the right direction; I want to make no comment to the contrary in that connection. He has moved, finally, I think in the right direction, to establish a sense of government initiative with respect to a developing deterioration, apparent or otherwise, in the general community.

I look at the minister's statement of yesterday and I see difficulties, administrative and otherwise, that concern me a great deal. I sincerely hope he is able to deal with the medical community, as he indicates he is going to be able to, in developing new mechanisms to control the opted-in opted-out problem that has developed.

In that connection, since we are dealing with that vote in particular, I was most impressed yesterday by the minister's response to what was really an administrative inquiry on my behalf with respect to the burden placed on the system by substantially increased percentages of opted-out physicians. I see the very distinguished general manager of OHIP here and I am sure he will be able to answer some of the points I would like to raise in this connection.

Doctors really opt out at rates of what is now 20 per cent, on average, despite the fact I think the figure used is 17.9. My sources indicate the actual percentage opted out is in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent; roughly 22 to 24 per cent in the specialist category and 13 per cent in the GP category. The minister shakes his head very strongly in the negative, but that information comes to me from informed sources outside the ministry but well within the medical profession, organized medicine in particular, and I presume they would know what they're talking about.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Is the honourable member saying the overall rate is in excess of 20 per cent?

Mr. Conway: I am saying I had informed information presented to me that the actual per cent of opting out is more properly in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent, since the

denominators being offered by the minister are apparently not totally accurate ones. If that is incorrect, then the minister can indicate how that figure of 17.9 per cent opted out is being arrived at. Perhaps he might take this opportunity to elucidate for us how he sees what his officials indicate is the relative breakdown between specialists opting out versus general practitioners opting out.

In that connection, it strikes me one of the serious concerns for those of us in the Legislature is that, administratively speaking, with so many more doctors opting out surely the burdens being placed on the OHIP administration are not only increasing in terms of work load but clearly have to be increasing the cost within the system. As you stop dealing with one physician on behalf of all his patients, upon his opting out you start dealing with, in a payment sense, his 800 or 1,500, or however many, patient episodes with which he is being associated with respect to the plan. Obviously, the cost of sending out 800 cheques or 1,500 cheques on a monthly basis has to be greater than it was previously where the doctor was opted in and the payment was being made on a monthly basis.

If, as the minister suggested yesterday, there really has been capacity at OHIP to deal with this and there is no additional burden, I have to wonder just how much unused capacity there is at OHIP, because I would think from what has been made clear to me in recent months there is a substantial increase in the opting out. I was never aware there was a substantial amount of unused capacity in that connection. I was aware as well, from another source, that it costs roughly three or four times as much to process the claim of the patient of an opted-out physician on a per unit basis as it did to process the claim of a physician and a patient who are entirely part of the plan. If that is not the case, I would appreciate being told how it is possible to have no additional burdens on manpower or overall costs in that connection.

I found it interesting yesterday that we finally got a statement from the government, a government which I imagine must have had some very rigorous late-night sessions with organized medicine, on Wednesday in particular, to try to stem the tide. To the minister's credit, he did exact from organized medicine one or two concessions I hadn't heard them publicly admit before. There seems to be, in his statement of March 29, 1979 a concession finally extracted from organized medicine that they will yield their previously sacred right to apply a means

test. If that is indeed a concession won, it seems to me it's one that is so obvious that it should not have ever been required, but it's certainly something that should not be let go of.

[12:45]

I do sympathize with the difficulties facing the government in this connection, because the relationship between this government and organized medicine has been a very close and intimate one. I was thinking the other day of how, when the former Premier (Mr. Robarts), the member for London North, retired in 1971 he apparently said in his final press conference that perhaps among his greatest failures as Premier was the way in which he allowed this province to be brought into this medicare system, which was, in his own words, a Machiavellian scheme of the federal Grits and he would have liked to have had it otherwise.

This government's commitment to medicare is, from where I stand, an uncertain one, on the basis of a number of past and present experiences. That it should have taken this minister and this government this long to make a few things clear and to extract a few commitments from organized medicine is, in my view, an indication of that uncertainty. The minister may not share that view entirely, but I want to make that point at this time.

My leader drew attention to this today. Let's not make any mistake about where it is the Ontario Medical Association stands in all of this. Ed Morand, Bill Vail and such luminaries in that association are well known to me.

Mr. Hodgson: That great Liberal Vail.

Mr. Conway: The member for York North proffers some advice about their partisan political connections. He is a far greater seer in that connection than am I.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: If I might interrupt the member for Renfrew North for a moment, I understand there was some hope we might complete these estimates today, being the last day of the fiscal year. If that's not so, that's fine, but I wanted to be sure that we allowed equal time to the third party and a little time for the minister's reply.

Mr. Conway: I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I just understand that's a hope.

Mr. Conway: Your injunction is well made. I shall restrict my remarks accordingly.

I want to say one or two things about organized medicine with respect to this plan,

and I hope the government understands. The OMA, in my view, has never really varied from its early position that it doesn't like medicare, it doesn't want medicare and it is committed to the abolition of medicare in a direct or phased-in mechanism. I have never heard anything to the contrary.

I find it remarkable that, indeed, we have the government saying in this document yesterday that the Ontario Medical Association is going to become the sole negotiating agency—and it's not surprising that it should. But again, as my leader pointed out in this morning's question period, I am totally confused as to how they are going to negotiate for two groups of people, one opted in and one opted out, and how they are going to negotiate with a government that ostensibly maintains its commitment in the long and short term to getting government out of medicare. I see in this scheme all kinds of inherent difficulties.

I hope this minister, who according to recent press accounts has certain unofficial campaigns under way, will undertake in the public interest one official campaign, and he will make it clear to organized medicine on behalf of the people of Ontario that medicare is a fundamental social commitment of this government on behalf of the people who, in my view, share a very strong majority commitment to its being sustained.

If this minister wants to, on behalf of any campaign, enhance his public reputation he would do well, in my view, to make it as clear as it can be made clear to special interests in this sector that government will not retreat from its commitment to medicare, a social value system about which all of us feel very strongly. I hope the minister understands that. I believe yesterday's statement showed some signs of his at last coming round to understanding that. I hope he will go forward and make it clear, in a public way, where he stands on behalf of this Legislature of the people in respect to those special interests which continue to maintain a position of dismantling medicare in Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: I have to say that I cannot share the optimism of the member for Renfrew North about the agreement, announced yesterday by the minister, concerning his discussions with the Ontario Medical Association.

I do want to make a few comments about the supplementary estimates; about what is happening within medicare; and about the continuing danger that the whole system will be dismantled while the government stands by and tries to reassure the public that nothing is actually happening.

I would point out, with regard to this particular supplementary estimate, Mr. Chairman, that in the current fiscal year with this supplementary estimate the remuneration to doctors will rise by 11.5 per cent overall; a half a per cent up or down—I don't have my calculator with me. In the two years from 1976-77 to 1978-79, the overall increase in remuneration to doctors in this province by the people of Ontario will be of the order of 28 per cent.

I do want to point out, however, that doctors who chose to opt out from last year to this year are, in addition to those big increases which are taking effect under the OHIP plan, taking further very substantial increases. To the point, in fact, where the fees of OMA doctors are, on average, about 42 per cent higher than the fee schedule of the Ontario Medical Association.

For example, the surcharge on a general assessment, under the OMA schedule, is 37 per cent over OHIP. For a colectomy it's 39 per cent; for a minor assessment, the surcharge is 49 per cent; and, for a routine consultation, it is 52 per cent.

The following are, on average, 43 per cent higher, Mr. Chairman:

A standard office visit under OHIP \$7.70; under the OMA opted-out fee schedule, \$3.30 more. A house call under OHIP is \$14.65; under the opted-out schedule it is \$6.35 more. An appendectomy under OHIP is \$132.55; under the OMA schedule, it is \$190. For an obstetrician providing services for a pregnancy, the difference is \$100—a surcharge of 43 per cent in each of those cases.

The minister keeps on saying, "You're bringing up individual cases." The individuals whose cases we have brought forward cannot comfort themselves with general averages. Because they are finding in their communities that there are no opted-in doctors who are genuinely accessible. Or they are finding, in the case of their particular hospitals, there is no opted-in surgeon accessible. Or they are finding out that in their particular cases their doctors are not prepared to have any mercy at all when it comes to insisting on bills being paid; or about going to collection agencies.

Here is another example, Mr. Chairman. This is the case of a Toronto woman who went to her allergist on referral from the GP and was billed extra. It took about 10 minutes in the doctor's office. The doctor's consultation cost was \$73 and allergy tests cost \$14.30. The total remuneration from OHIP was \$60.80. The surcharge she had to pay was \$26.50, or 44 per cent over the OHIP rate. This woman has refused to pay the bill. But, as others in her situation have found,

there is a grave risk of harassment from a collection agency and possibly a risk to her credit rating. That's one of the fears people have brought before us.

I want to comment on the answer given about this problem by the minister in his statement yesterday.

First, he said clearly patients should have the option to go to a doctor of choice. That will not be an option, Mr. Chairman, as long as certain doctors a patient might choose levy very substantial surcharges on that patient. There cannot be freedom of choice for the patients if they find that they cannot afford to pay any opted-out rates. Therefore, they can only choose among those doctors who are still opted in; particularly in places like Amherstburg and Tottenham, where no physician is opted in at all. Or, as in the case of the many hospitals at this time, where substantial numbers—or all doctors in particular specialties—have opted out of the plan. The principle of choice is not a reality until every doctor in the province is providing care at the insured rate.

Secondly, the minister indicated to the press two days ago that all doctors would be providing services in hospitals at the insured rate. It's clear that the wording of the statement—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, with all due respect, I think I was very clear on the point that the services would be available on an opted-in basis. If I inadvertently said that I certainly apologize, but I think I've been very clear every time I've commented on that matter that services would be available. I did not say or even mean to imply that all doctors would be opted in.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister has been clear within the House, and certainly in re-examining his statement I found it said what I thought it said. However, the impression that was left with the press was clearly different.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You've been a reporter.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister will say that was, in fact, not correctly reported. I've had that happen to me as well. Therefore, I'd like to talk about what the minister has had to say in the House.

It's clear then, from the statement and from his confirmation now, that only some services in hospitals, which are publicly funded, will be provided at the insured rate, not all services; only some patients will be assured of that service—that is, those patients who insist—and only some doctors are guaranteeing that they will be providing services at the insured rate, because the minister once

again has indicated that he is not about to insist that every doctor practising within a hospital has to provide services at the insured rates.

That, it seems to me, is a long way away from the guarantee of universally accessible service at the insured rate, which we thought we had for the past 10 years under medicare.

The minister said in the House on Tuesday that it was illegal to publish a list of opted-out and opted-in doctors, and he has maintained that position. He has not yet explained how it is then legal for the Ontario Medical Association to publish the names of certain physicians who are opted in or opted out. I have checked with my colleague from Riverdale, an eminent lawyer, who assures me that if an OMA hotline gives the name of an opted-in or opted-out doctor that is every bit as much publication as if the minister were to publish the lists. It's certainly clear to us that section 44 of the Health Disciplines Act is there to protect the confidentiality of information about patients, and not to prohibit this kind of valuable information for consumers.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If I may help the member, it's the Health Insurance Act.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm sorry, with the time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish what I have to say.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The minister will have an opportunity to reply.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I was just trying to help him. He has the wrong act.

Mr. Cassidy: I beg your pardon, the Health Insurance Act is the act the minister referred to. It's section 44 of the Health Insurance Act. Thank you.

I had the chance of checking informally with people from the OMA yesterday, senior people, and it is clear that this is not a brand new service which is suddenly going to be accessible to everybody in the province. They said, "Look, if somebody calls up asking for the name of a physician who is opted-in we'll give him the name of one or two, and if he calls back we'll give him the names of a couple more." I was not able to find out what would happen in those communities where no doctor is, in fact, opted in.

Third, my friend from Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) will tell the House that when a trade union bargains and is the sole negotiating agency for its workers, it makes a commitment that all of the workers whom it represents will, in fact, honour that agreement. That's what collective bargaining is all about. If you want to apply this to a profession, people in the teachers' federations

are very familiar with that because when they bargain for their members everybody abides by that agreement.

If the minister had told us that since the OMA was becoming the sole negotiating agency it had also made a commitment that every doctor in the province would respect and abide by the fee schedule resulting from the bargaining, then that would have been very welcome. We think no doctor in the province should charge more than the agreed-upon rate. The minister himself has said that the remuneration will be accepted as fair by both the people of Ontario and the medical profession. There is no cause then to have anybody in the province charged an unfair rate by a doctor who decides to charge more than the agreed-upon rate.

However, it is a factor that there are doctors who are not even members of the OMA at this point. It seems to me it would be very difficult to bind those doctors.

I want to conclude. We are going to ask that this debate be continued early next week, perhaps only for a short time. It does make it difficult if a minister has not had a chance to reply.

[1:00]

Mr. Nixon: If you conclude, he could make a statement.

Mr. Cassidy: There is a suggestion I might conclude in a minute and then have the minister make a statement.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Being five minutes to one, if you will complete your statement in a minute, that will allow the minister four minutes to reply.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Perhaps you can help me. I think the honourable member is suggesting that somehow we can extend the fiscal year.

Mr. Conway: Not even you can do that, Dennis.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I think we are wasting valuable time.

Mr. Cassidy: I understand your vision is a bit blurred as far as the clock is concerned.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry about this, but mine isn't blurred as far as the clock is concerned. There is plenty of opportunity to debate this. I don't know if you want to go over, we just don't do that. You are the people who don't do that.

Mr. Cassidy: With great respect, if the House leader of the Liberal Party doesn't wish to even give the Minister of Health an opportunity to comment on a \$66 million budget—

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, who made the ruling that this had to pass before the end of the fiscal year? It doesn't make sense to me. We passed a resolution last night empowering the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to pay all the bills. We can pass this supplementary estimate a year from now if we want to. What is the rush, other than to get it over?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: There was just a hope that it might be cleared up.

Mr. Nixon: I hope too.

Mr. Cassidy: It might be proper, then, if I adjourn the debate. I am sure the House leaders can agree on a definite period of time to continue this debate sometime during the course of business, either next week or perhaps after the throne debate is concluded. I would so move, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't we just carry the vote?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am looking for some advice. My understanding is that can't be done. The agreement among the House leaders was that we would conclude—

Mr. Nixon: There was no agreement.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —by one o'clock and carry all the estimates.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The time for adjournment has come and since there is no agreement, I would ask the minister to move the committee rise and report.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have been passed a note and I am looking for some advice. We cannot issue cheques without funds and we cannot do that without approval.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell moved that the House extend its hours of sitting this afternoon to conclude the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Would the member for Ottawa Centre try to keep his remarks brief?

Mr. Cassidy: I would have liked more time. However, I was commenting on the real concerns we have that so far we have only begun to find solutions. I would say the full question of medicare remains in grave jeopardy, despite what the minister had to announce in the Legislature two days ago.

Just under a year ago, it was professional misconduct for a doctor in the province to charge a patient more than about 11 per cent above the OMA rate, the OHIP rate, unless he informed the patient in advance. It is now permissible for a doctor to charge up to about 42 per cent more without incurring the risk of professional misconduct.

We have suggested, and I suggest again to the minister, the regulations to the Health Disciplines Act should be amended because the OMA already says in principle that physicians should inform the patient if they are opting out of OHIP.

That adherence in principle is not proving effective in practice. Since the OMA is opposed to those kinds of regulations anyway, even if a doctor is charging more than the OMA rate, it seems to me this is a case where it is up to the minister and the province to protect the health of consumers of Ontario and ensure they get a fair deal and ensure not just that they have access to medicare at insured rates if they insist, but that in fact they are provided medical care at insured rates without having to go through enormous tortuous difficulties in order to get it.

I would remind the House that under the premium assistance plan of the government which exists right now, under which premium assistance is available not as a privilege but as a right, there are approximately 330,000 people who do not exercise that right—who do not even insist, in other words, that they get the premium remission—despite being of very modest means.

The other day, when I was in Peterborough where close to 70 per cent of the doctors in the city are opted out, an old fellow came up to me and said, "Old people have their pride, and they don't like to ask for favours." Some people on small incomes are literally afraid to ask, or they may not know that they can challenge a doctor's bill or that they can insist in advance that they get the services at the Ontario Health Insurance Plan rate.

In our opinion, the idea that a patient has to insist and lay it on the line, risking not being able to see that doctor because the doctor refuses to see that patient, is not good enough. Surely under an insured medical scheme in Ontario, every patient in the province should have access to medical care and should be able to choose from all the doctors who are available and know that he can get the care at insured rates.

Our principle should be, therefore, that no medical service should be provided while requiring a patient to pay a surcharge in Ontario. That is a principle which the Minister of Health and the government of Ontario should have been defending. We have seen them try to pass the responsibility on to the Ontario Medical Association, on to consumers and on to people who might get health clinics started in various communities.

It is about time that the Minister of Health and this government stood up to defend medi-

care. We fought for it for many years; it has done an enormous service for all our citizens for many years. For God's sake, let's keep it intact in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order: I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the procedure to go past the normal point of adjournment is going to lead to nothing but difficulty in the future. Since you have indicated the clock is five minutes fast, I would suggest that we could very well carry this. Now that the leader of the third party has heard with about five people sitting—

Mr. Cassidy: You want to muzzle the minister after agreeing to the minister's motion.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I want to muzzle you; you give me a pain in the neck.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's not covered by OHIP.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, he can make a statement any time. We have just been rehashing the old baloney that we have heard three or four times.

Mr. Cassidy: Boy, are you ever sensitive. If your party were committed to medicare, you wouldn't—

Mr. Nixon: The money has already been spent. In spite of the fact that the government House leader's third assistant sent in a note saying "We cannot pay anybody," the money has already been paid. We have every authority to pass a resolution later in the week. There was no agreement to carry the thing. It is a supplementary estimate anyway. Let's hear from the minister during statements on Monday or some time.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, if we carry on here—we do not even have a quorum; there are three or four interested taxpayers and somebody from the press gallery, so this may be headline news somewhere—if you call this democracy, I call it a ridiculous charade.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right, Mr. Minister, having noted what the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has said, you would have opportunities to make statements.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would be very brief and simply say that there are a number of points which I can respond to in estimates—

Mr. Nixon: Heaven help either of you. If you don't want this session to continue—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can do estimates later this spring or whatever.

Mr. Nixon: You have objected to it every time, you and your House leader.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: There is just one statement that the member for Ottawa Centre

made. He said it was his understanding about what medicare was supposed to be all about—I'm quoting him; we can check the Hansard report—that it was universally accessible service at the OHIP rates in hospitals. That is exactly the principle we have been operating under and exactly the principle we reaffirmed yesterday.

Mr. Nixon: A stereotyped response to a stereotyped attack.

Mr. Cassidy: You're really hurting, aren't you, Bob?

Mr. Nixon: Hurting? It's boring; it's not hurting. You're a bore.

Vote 3101 agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Timbrell, the committee of supply reported certain resolutions.

Clerk of the House: In the absence of Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. MacBeth from the committee of supply reports the following resolution:

That supply in the following supplementary amounts and to defray the expenses of the government ministries named be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Dispense?

Reading dispensed with. (See appendix A.)
Resolution concurred in.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Timbrell, the House adjourned at 1:11 p.m.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read
8	255	1	23	total expenditure ceiling of \$14.482 billion
8	255	1	30	billion for 1978-79 will be maintained.

APPENDIX A

Mr. Edighoffer, from the committee of supply, reported the following resolution which was concurred in by the House:

Resolved, that supply in the following supplementary amounts and to defray the expenses of the government ministries named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979:

MINISTRY OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

903. Regional priorities and development program\$ 3,100,000

MINISTRY OF TREASURY AND ECONOMICS

1103A. Economic policy program 4,690,000

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

1502. Institutional program 2,800,000

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

2402. Land management program 4,975,000

MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES

2802. Social resources program 14,600,000

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

3101. Ministry administration and health insurance program 66,000,000

APPENDIX B

FRIDAY, MARCH 30, 1979

STANDING RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The committee met at 11:25 a.m.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1977,
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD
(concluded)

Mr. Acting Chairman: Members of the committee we now have a quorum. I just don't recall who our last speaker was. Is it Mr. McClellan? Would you like to start this morning, sir?

Mr. McClellan: Some of my questions, I guess, would be handled by Dr. McCracken; he may want to come up.

I have read with interest a list of research projects that was provided to the committee. Some of them are completed and some of them are continuing. What is the status of the four reports—26, 27, 28 and 29 on the sheet you handed to the committee—that all deal with the effect of asbestos exposure? Are any of those completed?

Dr. McCracken: Pardon me, which numbers did you have particular interest in?

Mr. McClellan: It was 26, 27, 28 and 29—the four studies dealing with aspects of asbestos exposure.

Dr. McCracken: Number 26 was a study commissioned back in 1974 and it went into 1975 and early 1976. It was carried out by Professor Ritchie, a pathologist at the University of Toronto, who is the consultant in asbestosis and asbestos-related diseases. That study is completed now.

Number 27 was part of the initial study Professor Ritchie carried out. It was a study where we made the determination that it was not necessary for the worker to have X-ray evidence of asbestosis before a lung cancer he might have developed would be considered as an allowable claim for an occupational disease. This study is now completed and we have the guidelines for mesothelioma which we've had in place now for more than two years.

Number 28 was the study commissioned to Dr. Miller, the director of the epidemiological unit of the National Cancer Institute. Flowing from that we were able to establish the guidelines for certain gastro-intestinal cancers as they related to asbestos fibre dust. We have those guidelines in place and that is now completed.

I say completed, but with all these studies we maintain a watch on any new studies that

are published. We periodically will conduct a search several times a year—for instance on the computer med-line and tox-line and chem-line, as well as the journals we get, to see if anything new is occurring. If there is we will then take that into consideration as it relates to the guidelines that we now have. So while they're completed they continue to be ongoing in that we're monitoring what's going on.

Number 29 is a study we commissioned to Dr. Miller, once again. We requested that he carry out an epidemiological study in the form of case control study in a person's developing cancer of the voice box, the larynx. This study is still ongoing. We got the initial result at the end of the first year of the study, and on the basis of that information we were able to develop the guidelines for laryngeal carcinomas as they relate to asbestos dust and nickel aerosols, but that study is still ongoing. Dr. Miller several weeks ago told me he hoped he would have it completed some time in the third, possibly the fourth, quarter of 1979, when he will have his full number of cases that he wants to get into the study. It will be the largest study that has ever been done in his field—over 200 cases.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you. I would like to ask if you could make available the three studies that are completed and the fourth, number 29, when it is completed. Is there any particular problem with this?

[11:30]

Dr. McCracken: No, as a matter of fact the study in 26 and the study in 27 are already public documents and they were released several years ago.

Mr. McClellan: It would be helpful if you could make at least one copy available to our caucus; and I would guess that the Liberal Party would appreciate a copy of the completed studies, as well and of number 29 when it's available. Thank you.

We have the list of the studies and we know what the board's history of action and inaction has been with respect to asbestos and asbestosis. May I ask you, Dr. McCracken, whether any claims have been submitted to the board for compensation for industrial disease as a result of exposure to fibreglass dust?

Dr. McCracken: No, to my knowledge we have not had any claims submitted.

Mr. McClellan: Are you familiar with the study that was reported at the national cancer

institute by Dr. Tatsuo Sono of—I'm sorry I don't know what institute he is with in Japan. It was a study of the effects of exposure to fibreglass dust in a fibreglass panel construction plant in Japan that showed evidence of pneumoconiosis after a relatively short period of time, as short a period of time as two or three years I believe. Are you familiar with the study first of all?

Dr. McCracken: I'm not personally familiar with it, but I'm almost certain that that's one of the documents the chest disease consultant has already read on the fibreglass matter. There have been recent documents that he has received from the United States where they apparently have had no findings as they relate to the development of pneumoconiosis from fibreglass, so that there are, at the present time, conflicting reports as you can appreciate.

Mr. McClellan: I gather as far as the board is concerned fibreglass is classified as an inert dust, that it is relatively harmless, that's the status; am I wrong?

Dr. McCracken: No. I don't think that is the board's stance at all. Our stand is that we're monitoring the research into fibreglass and we haven't made any decision one way or the other, because there is not enough evidence to make such a decision. So that we're not prepared to say it's inert, at the present time, any more than we're prepared to say it gives rise to lung disease; we just don't know.

Mr. McClellan: Again, in the absence of the minister it is difficult to discuss the full picture, but you would probably know: I gather there are no dust exposure limits to fibreglass dust in effect in Ontario work places; is that correct?

Dr. McCracken: The source that you would have to go to, of course, would be the occupational health and safety division, Ministry of Labour, but I haven't seen any figures indicating that TLV's have been established for fibreglass.

Mr. McClellan: That's my understanding too. My understanding is that there are no threshold limit values for fibreglass dust at all. Has the board been in contact with Dr. Irving Selikoff with respect to the study he is doing of the effects of fibreglass inhalation on workers' health?

Dr. McCracken: We had contact with Dr. Selikoff, I believe it was about a year or better ago, when we asked him to give us an up-date on his studies of his cohort group he is following along in the Insulation Workers' Union. That would include the

fibreglass too, of course, and we didn't get anything back from him about fibreglass.

Mr. McClellan: He is currently engaged in a study. I don't believe the study has been completed, but I would like an assurance from the board that it is in touch with Dr. Selikoff and will receive the reports of that study as soon as it is completed. Is that a function of the board or of the occupational—

Dr. McCracken: It would be my opinion that, primarily, it is the responsibility of the occupational health and safety division. But having said that, we certainly intend to pick up any and all documents, as I have indicated. I can't give you any guarantee we will be able to obtain that report until such time as Dr. Selikoff has published it. As you may be aware, in the past and currently he has been working on a number of studies for quite some time. For his own reasons he has elected not to publish them. Therefore, we are not privy to that information and we have found it extremely difficult to get information from Dr. Selikoff.

Mr. McClellan: The findings of the study by Dr. Sono—I am not able to assess the adequacy of the study, but the findings were, to me, of enormous concern because they showed the onset of pneumoconiosis which can lead to mesothelioma.

Dr. McCracken: I am afraid I must disagree with that, because it has never been proven that a pneumoconiosis will lead to a malignancy.

Mr. McClellan: I am concerned that Dr. Sono's study indicated the onset of serious lung disease in an enormously short period of time. Symptoms showed up two to three years after the initial exposure in the plant, as opposed to the situation with respect to asbestos exposure where the symptoms show up 15 to 20 years after exposure.

I wonder why the board wouldn't undertake to follow up Dr. Sono's study with studies of its own, or take a more systematic look at the potential danger of exposure to fibreglass dust?

I hope we don't have to go through what we went through with asbestos. That is the point I am trying to make. I hope we don't have to do a body count in order to come to an understanding that exposure to fibreglass dust is disastrous for workers' health. It seems to me that as soon as we have any kind of scientific study indicating a relation between serious lung disease and exposure to a particular dust, in this case fibreglass dust, then we should begin to pursue that with enormous urgency. Maybe I will turn the question over to the minister; that is whether

or not studies are taking place in the occupational health division with respect to the effects of exposure to fibreglass dust, which as we have been discussing is currently unregulated in terms of threshold limit values in Ontario work places.

I was calling attention to a study done by Dr. Tatsuo Sono of the National Cancer Institute—a completed report—and an on-going study being done by Dr. Selikoff. What work is being done in the division—to make the point, finally—so that we don't have to have a body count before we impose threshold limit values?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think there is no doubt you have hit on an important problem. I met with the staff about this two or three months ago when the issue first came up in the news article and was assured by them that to date there was no valid report relating to it. A lot depends on the size of the fibres, as I am sure you know.

Recently, when I was in Sarnia, I met with the oil, chemical and atomic workers about this very same issue and asked if they had any concerns. Mr. Sullivan, who is the head down there, indicated that to date they were satisfied it wasn't a problem in the fibreglass industry in Sarnia; but that shouldn't stop us from continuing to monitor what is going on.

As to whether or not we have any specific research projects going on, I can't answer that at the moment but I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Acting Chairman: All through, Mr. McClellan?

Mr. McClellan: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Mrs. Campbell.

Mrs. Campbell: My question is more general; and I guess it is, first at least, to the minister. According to my information you really don't have the capabilities in your ministry to monitor new materials generally. Is that a fact? Are you doing anything to improve that situation; and how does that relate to the Workmen's Compensation Board so that they are not left in a vacuum, as they were on the asbestos issue because of the lack of proper research taken quickly?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Well Mrs. Campbell, as you know we now have, or will have when the act is proclaimed, the legislative authority to require certain information about new material.

Mrs. Campbell: Well I know that, but what do you do with it?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Did you have something to add? I am also hopeful that in a reasonably short period of time, new facilities and large

facilities will allow us to do some testing ourselves if we are not satisfied. As you know, the act allows us to have companies provide the information about material. If we are not satisfied I hope that in the not too distant future new facilities will allow us to do some of our own testing.

So I want you to know that we are on the same wavelength. I am not sure that I can answer you exactly at the moment but that is the general philosophy, and your question related to the general approach.

Mrs. Campbell: What disturbs me is that I understand where they do somewhat extensive testing, in the United States, by the time they have monitored some of the older materials they really don't have the opportunity to test more than a very limited number of new materials coming into the work place. If we don't even have that at this moment how are we going to keep pace, for the purposes of the Workmen's Compensation Board, with new materials which are coming onto the market, as I understand it an increasingly accelerated rate?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The very definition of "new" is a problem, too, as you know. It is one we have met about. I hope you will agree that the new legislation does give us the authority to make certain demands with regard to new material; and I hope, also, you will agree as the months go by that we are endeavouring to deal with new materials as they enter upon the work place.

Mrs. Campbell: For instance, when you seek information on new materials, from the manufacturer or whoever, what do you require of them; are they required to file reports they have initiated on the effect of these materials, or do you simply know what the materials are?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Well Mrs. Campbell, if you would like me to bring some of the staff up to answer the mechanics of it, I would be glad to. That really wasn't an issue we felt would be coming up in WCB matters.

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, I know, but it flows from this. May I ask Dr. McCracken what is his position with reference to these new materials? You rely, I take it, on the ministry, although not entirely, but would you initiate any sort of evaluation yourself if you get reports from the United States or elsewhere on new material, or would you be relying on the ministry to do the testing or to prepare the necessary reports on the effects of such new materials?

[11:45]

Dr. McCracken: When data is brought to our attention, namely running checks on the

computer storage of new research that has been published in the various occupational health journals we receive and which the consultants examine each time as they come out, or if our contacts with people in the research community bring something to our attention, then we share that information with the people in the occupational health and safety division and vice versa. If it is something which does require action and if it appears it will have a primary impact on compensation claims, then we are quite prepared to step in and take whatever action is necessary to follow through on the studies.

On the other hand, if it is not all that clear but there does appear to be some hazard from a toxic substance, that would tend to fall into the area of the occupational health and safety division. I think that is the best way to answer it for you.

Mrs. Campbell: Then I take it you are really developing a new type of procedure? In the asbestos case it was a matter of years of criticism and concern before anything was really done about it. Are we going to face that with new materials in the future, from your point of view?

Dr. McCracken: From my point of view, I would say we will not; and I will be quite upset if this does happen.

As you can appreciate, under the act the Workmen's Compensation Board is not considered to be a research organization. But having said that, I made the decision in 1975 that we had to identify where vacuums existed in research where no outside researchers had interested themselves in a certain problem. Since they weren't I felt we had a responsibility, and this is what I have been attempting to do ever since.

Mrs. Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Campbell. Are there any further questions of the workmen's compensation staff by members of the committee?

Mr. M. Davidson: Not on rehab, but can we move on to the next one?

Mr. Acting Chairman: We are up to vocational are we not, according to the list?

Mr. J. F. McDonald: We just completed that.

Mr. Bounsall: We are just going to hit benefits.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Very well; Mr. di Santo.

Mr. di Santo: I don't know if this question has been asked in the last three days, I wasn't able to participate in that period. Is the minister considering review of the

schedule of benefits this year to introduce possible changes as a result of the cost of living increase?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Your colleague—and I hate to say it this way—to the right of you, far to the right—

Mrs. Campbell: He doesn't have one on the left.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I don't know; sometimes many of us feel pretty close to where he is.

Mr. Bounsall: That's quite true in every respect.

Mr. McClellan: You just made his whole day.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: We spoke about this earlier. There is an internal committee reviewing the Wyatt report, which as you know dealt with the matter of benefits. In addition I have asked the joint consultative committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board to review the Wyatt report. When I have all those recommendations they will be taken into consideration and something will be prepared for cabinet. That is all I can tell you at this time.

Mr. di Santo: Do you have any idea how long it will take to have the recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Do you want timing on it?

Mr. di Santo: No, but did you set a deadline?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: No, but I expect the first preliminary report—we tried to prioritize items; I can't remember the exact priority list, but I have been expecting them to meet with me about the first order of priority within the very near future.

Mr. di Santo: Thank you. I would like to make some comments on a statement made by the chairman of Workmen's Compensation Board, on February 7, 1979, to the Star, and by the newly appointed ethnic co-ordinator, Rocco Lofranco.

A group called APIO, which operates in the east end and which the minister knows very well—it is a very peaceful group of pensioners and disabled people which operates from a small office in the Danforth area—expressed anger at the level of pensions and because of all the problems it is having in dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board, which problems are real and, of course, are not reflected in the statement made by the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board at the beginning of these hearings.

Mr. Starr says that last year, when these people said they were forced to demonstrate and dared to switch from the Workmen's

Compensation Board to Queen's Park, it was because the political decision was made here in Queen's Park. The demonstration, as all of us know, was pretty bitter, because for three years the injured workers had received no increase whatsoever.

We now know that the minister at that time had been telling us she didn't know how much money was needed, or what the situation was with the Workmen's Compensation Board, and she ordered an expensive study. In the end, we knew that not only was there money, but also there was no need for further assessment of the employers to secure it.

Finally, after a very long time, three years, and the tension resulting from that delay, the workers demonstrated peacefully in front of the Legislature. Finally last June, on the last day the Legislature was in session, we passed amendments which we didn't think were totally satisfactory but in a way were a remedy to the inaction of the government for the past three years.

Mr. Starr said, and I quote: "The increases were going to be announced by the minister, but they went ahead with the protest for political reasons. I have said that before and I say that again." Unfortunately, Mr. Starr made the same statement before the last provincial election, in an attempt to campaign for the Conservative Party, I suppose.

The newly appointed ethnic co-ordinator, Rocco Lofranco, says that agitators have links with leftist organizations in Italy and they are trying to do the same things they did in Italy in the 1950s. This is a quote: "They are telling immigrants the compensation board won't give them a penny more without a fight. They want to stir up unrest. That is how they work."

I would like to ask the minister, because he is politically responsible to this Legislature, is there any evidence that this group, APIO, which you know very well, has any connection with leftist organizations in Italy? If there is any evidence, would it be possible for you to table it in the Legislature? If there is not any such connection—as I know—then would the minister tell us if the statement made by the ethnic co-ordinator reflects the policy of the government of the province; and if not, how is it that the ethnic co-ordinator can make such statements?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Chairman, if you wouldn't mind me suggesting this, I think you're asking what basis the board had for allowing the communications division to publish that material, and I think the people to ask that of are the people who are here. We have Mr. Weaver, the director of communica-

tions, and the chairman of the board. So if you wouldn't mind putting those questions to him, and then if you have some follow-up, following the report from the board, I'd be pleased to respond.

Mr. Weaver: Mr. Chairman, I think the comments made by Mr. Lofranco were comments to Mr. Serge, the reporter at the Star, and whether or not they were in context or out of context or accurate I really don't know. I do know that they are Mr. Lofranco's personal opinion as executive director of communications. I don't know the situation that is written about here. It was an interview done with Mr. Lofranco, and with the chairman of the board, and whether it's not accurately quoted I really don't know.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe Mr. Starr can confirm the evidence behind those allegations.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Mr. Lofranco did not confer to me when he made the statements to the writer of the article, who has been identified by Mr. Weaver as Mr. Joe Serge of the Toronto Star. I only saw the words of Mr. Lofranco when I read the article that was published.

Mrs. Campbell: Did you make any investigation of this?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Of this organization?

Mrs. Campbell: No, of Mr. Lofranco's statements? As chief administrator of the Workmen's Compensation Board, since your name was so conspicuous in this interview, didn't you feel that you should make some investigation, since the allegations are so serious; and did you, in fact, ask Mr. Lofranco to substantiate his accusations?

Hon. Mr. Starr: This actually had nothing to do with the function of the Workmen's Compensation Board whatsoever. Mr. Lofranco made his own comments, based, I presume, on his experience with these groups in the past.

Mr. McClellan: It has a lot to do with Mr. Lofranco's job and his role within the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Hon. Mr. Starr: Not at all.

Mr. di Santo: Oh come now.

Hon. Mr. Starr: He is performing his role very well; to our satisfaction, as a matter of fact.

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Chairman, if I can revert to the minister because he is politically responsible to the Legislature, I'd like to ask the minister whether he doesn't think that this is a very serious allegation, because at this very moment the Minister of Labour of the province of Ontario is undertaking a

series of discussions with the Italian authorities in order to settle the problem of the Italian-Canadian injured workers.

Doesn't he think that if there are such links which are prejudicial to the normal operations of any agreement that you will make and that they will stir up unrest, that's a very serious allegation that should be investigated, despite the fact that the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board has the gall to claim that the ethnic co-ordinator is doing a great job?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You know the sort of things that are going on at the present time within my ministry. We have set up an Italian advisory council, which consists of the majority of the groups within the Italian community; and as you very kindly commented, we've initiated negotiations now for reciprocity with regard to permanent pensioners who wish to return to Italy. So naturally, any statements like those, certainly if they are inaccurate, concern me greatly and I will ask the board to report to me about it. Thank you for bringing it to my attention. [12:00]

Mr. di Santo: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I think that's satisfactory, because all of us here, regardless of which political party we belong to, are interested in solving the very serious problems of the workers. I can assure not only the minister but the chairman of the board that we have such an enormous amount of work in going there every day that we would rather see the problems solved without complications. There is no one who makes political gains out of injured workers.

I want to go back to the benefits now. In my experience, I have noticed that in setting the benefits in the administration of the act there is a restrictive tendency on the part of the board in interpreting section 42(5) of the act which grants supplements to injured workers once they are assessed for permanent disability.

Last year there was an internal memo in the Workmen's Compensation Board stating—and this continued a disgraceful practice that had been going on for a long time—the requirement that workers go out and get a certain amount of signatures every day. Despite that fact, the problem has not been solved because of the way the board interprets this. What the act calls co-operation on the part of the worker is interpreted in a very restrictive way.

My experience suggests that we have a very high number of workers even today who are denied the supplement, supposedly

because they are not co-operating with the board. Many times that depends on the fact that they are unable to prove that they are looking for a job. Also, as you know, it's extremely difficult for an injured worker to get a job at this time of high unemployment. Any employer has a very large choice of workers who are healthier or younger and who are not a risk for the company.

I have noticed that the communication isn't very good. In fact there isn't a sufficient number of rehabilitation officers who speak the languages of the injured workers. There are misunderstandings that sometimes are really ludicrous but which every time have a negative impact on the workers.

Just this morning, I had an injured worker who went to the board. He is a tile setter who speaks Italian and speaks almost no English whatsoever. He was asked to go to Manpower where all at once they classified him as a clerk. It seems facetious, but for this poor guy—and I can submit a script—it's a real tragedy because he has been denied the supplement by the Workmen's Compensation Board on the basis that he cannot work. He has a knee injury which prevents him from working. On the other hand, he is willing to work. The board said that he had to do a modified job. Manpower then suggested that perhaps he could work as a clerk. We have a very high number of cases of injured workers who are denied supplement on this basis.

I know that you have previously discussed the medical assessment. Most of the time there is a sharp contrast between the opinion of the family doctor and that of the specialist or the consultants of the Workmen's Compensation Board. That brings up a most serious problem that all of us who deal with the board find every day, and that is that the opinion of the family physician is not taken into any account whatsoever by the board.

Obviously, I think there is also a question that should be asked, which is why the board keeps paying fees to physicians when the board disregards their opinion? I think there should be a ruling on the part of the board saying that injured workers cannot go to their family doctors if the board doesn't accept their opinion. Of course that reflects also on the level of the pensions, because we know that in many instances we have injuries which also have psychological complications. I had an appeal yesterday where an injured worker probably had complications as a result of the accident, but she was examined by psychiatrists and psychologists and she has been denied benefits because she was found to have a handicapped daughter and

perhaps that had created psychological problems with her; this despite the fact that the family doctor, who has been seeing her for the last 19 years, said that this woman has always functioned perfectly, as a mother and as a worker, and never lost a day before the accident.

I think that section 42(5) should be changed. The onus should be shifted from the worker to the board. I think the board should provide the worker with: One, rehabilitation, both medical and vocational; and two, possible ways of getting back to the labour market. If the worker refuses to go back to the labour market, then he should be denied benefits; not as it is now, that they ask the worker to prove he is willing to co-operate and he is actively seeking a job.

In this case I think that we have to realize that this is not only a technical problem, it is a moral problem. We have an injured worker whose injury has been ascertained. We recognize that he had an accident, yet we put on him a further burden, asking him to prove that he is looking for a job when we know that in many instances a job is not available. I think when we are in this situation the board should also consider a further element, that has been raised many times in this committee; ever since I have been elected, every year we repeat the same litany.

There is a very high number of workers in this province who cannot perform certain jobs because of their skill, or because of the language barrier. Now for these workers, I think the board should have special consideration, because if we think that the spirit of the act is to give a supplement to workers who have an injury until the time they can get back to any kind of occupation, we should certainly consider that language is a major factor in many instances, and skill is a major factor in many instances. If you have a bricklayer or a carpenter from Italy or from Portugal and they do not speak English, it is much more difficult for them to find a different kind of job because the labour market has no jobs for them, period.

The moral problem is, if these workers are in a situation that prevents them from getting a job, why should they be penalized? As I have said before, we have been repeating the same things year after year; I think it is time that the government changed its approach in this particular instance; I think an amendment to the act is needed.

I would like to have an answer from the minister, and I will see if I have anything else to ask.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Just to get the relationship straight here; I like to think my role here is to respond to the board's response, Odoardo. If that is not correct I would be glad to have your views on it, since this is really the board answering these questions.

Mr. di Santo: What I really want to know is whether you think it is proper to have an amendment to the act.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: On 42(5), we had an interesting discussion about it the other day. I am sorry I wasn't able to stay for all of it, Ross, but I did speak to my deputy about your comments. I was interested, during the discussion, to hear that there has been some broadening of the application of 42(5) in recent time. Mr. Kerr I believe it was, went into great detail about the criteria for the application of 42(5). I think it would be appropriate for you to review that again for Mr. di Santo and then we can go on from that point. I thought it was a pretty broad application, including employability, that you were putting on in your policy.

Could you cover the general question of what the board means now when it requires co-operating for work, and in the application of 42(5) in general?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think there are two aspects to this, Mr. di Santo, and I would like to deal from a claims point of view.

We have, in recent years, broadened this considerably in that we take the whole person concept approach in determining whether or not the individual is entitled to a supplement. I will just review, as the minister has requested, a couple of the points we discussed yesterday.

One is that we take into consideration the points that you mentioned, such as inability to communicate in English, lack of skills and lack of employment of that nature. We apply this in trying to determine the application of the supplement to his pension.

Last year, of all the pensions that were awarded, not all of the permanent disability awards because some of them were lump sums, but the pensions that were awarded for life, 51 per cent of those pensioners received a supplement on the basis we have been discussing.

When it comes to co-operating with rehabilitation, Mr. Wisocky is in that area, and his rehabilitation counsellors, of course, are responsible to work with the man to try and develop a back-to-work type of program. These supplements are reviewed every six months and considered for renewal. So we do have a number of supplements that are being paid to injured people who have diffi-

culty in communicating and have difficulty in developing skills.

Mr. M. Davidson: The 51 per cent that you mentioned, is that a higher number or a lower number of supplements granted comparable to other years, say for the past five years?

[12:15]

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Let's see. I have 1978 here. Life pensions granted 5,544; temporary supplements awarded 2,836; which is a percentage of 51.2 per cent for 1978. In 1977, life pensions awarded 6,414; number of temporary supplements awarded 3,028; the percentage was 47.2 per cent. There were fewer supplements awarded in 1978, but there are also considerably less life pensions awarded. Life pensions went down 13 per cent in 1978 compared with 1977, and the number of temporary supplements went down by six per cent; but the percentage of supplements to life pensions was 51.2 per cent for 1978 and 47.2 per cent for 1977. I don't have figures for previous years but I can tell you they were much lower in previous years.

Mr. McClellan: That accounts for the increase percentage in recent years, because there is not a correlation in any given year between the life pensions and the supplement. You will be giving supplements to people who had been awarded life pensions in previous years. There is not an automatic correlation; when you say 51 per cent of the awards were supplement, you are not relating that to people who had received life pensions in that current year; or are you?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Yes, I am. That's exactly what I am telling you, sir.

Mr. McClellan: I see.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: That's exactly what I am telling you.

Mr. McClellan: Good.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: If you want, I can go back and have calculated the years 1976 and 1975 if you are interested. I don't have that with me, but I am giving you exactly what you want. Each year you will be able to ask me, and compare from year to year how it goes.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Could I also comment, Mr. McClellan, that section 42(5) was only added to the act in 1975.

Mr. McClellan: Yes.

Mr. di Santo: Can you give us the percentage of the supplement granted, and what is the average length of time for which the supplement is granted; since 1975.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I can't give you the average percentage granted, because as was said yesterday when we were talking in here, when the man is not working the supplement can take him right up to the amount he would be receiving had he been totally permanently disabled, but if the man has gone back to modified employment and has some earning capacity and is earning some money, we supplement him but not to the same amount as the man who is not working. This was the point where there was a difference of opinion; your colleagues expressed their thoughts to us and the board agreed that would be looked at.

Mr. di Santo: I would just like to ask a last question. Are you aware of the fact that many workers who are on supplement, as soon as they are assessed for pension are advised by the board to apply to the Canada Pension Plan for disability pension. Is that a policy of the board or the initiative of the individual board counsellors?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I can't speak for all the board because that person would have contact with my pensions adjudicator; would have contact with our doctor, who would be examining him; and also contact with the rehabilitation counsellor. There may be occasions when it might be in the man's best interest to suggest that he do that. One thing that we have been rather anxious to do in recent years is to make sure that the individual knows that he may be entitled to some benefits over and above the workmen's compensation benefits in other areas; we have been rather anxious to make sure that the people know that they might be entitled to other benefits. Just a moment, I'll check with the claims aspect. I just checked with the director of the claims adjudication branch, and our pension adjudicator says it is not their policy to so advise the man, but it could well turn out that a counsellor, in due course, might in the best interests of the man suggest that he look into that. I can't speak for Mr. Wisocky.

Mr. di Santo: Well okay—

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Mr. Wisocky says my answer is right; that it is possible that might happen.

Mr. di Santo: Thank you; perhaps the responsible official of the board can answer the question. My question is don't you think it is contradictory that when you know that the board has granted 15 or 10 or 20 per cent disability, you suggest a worker apply for Canada pension disability, although you know that either he is totally disabled and he can apply for Canada Pension Plan, and then

your rating is not accurate to say the least; or he doesn't qualify because you have assessed him for partial permanent disability.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I have no knowledge that we have advised a man who has a 10 percent permanent disability from us to apply for Canada Pension Plan. The only situation I can think of, just to peruse it for a moment, might be if that is the extent of our responsibility and he is totally disabled from a non-compensable injury, I am sure that somebody in the board would suggest to him, in his own best interest, that he should look into it. But if a man is just 10 percent disabled as a result of his Workmen's Compensation accident and does not have any other disability, I cannot see where we would advise him, because your statement is correct, there will be no point in advising him to apply to CPP.

Mr. di Santo: Well if I bring to you a number of examples of this type, what will you do?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: We'd be very pleased to look at them, Mr. di Santo.

Mr. di Santo: Well that's not satisfactory to me. Will you change the assessment of the board if in fact the board has advised a number of disabled workers to apply for Canada Pension Plan?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: The answer to that, Mr. di Santo, is regardless of the advice to the man to contact CPP, the assessment we have given him represents the amount of his entitlement under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Regardless of the advice to go to CPP or not to go to CPP, the way to handle that is that if the individual is not satisfied with the board's assessment of his permanent disability, as you well know he has the right to appeal that assessment.

The fact that he has or has not been advised to go to CPP has no bearing on his rating, he gets that to which he is entitled under our act.

Mr. di Santo: Well it seems strange to me anyway.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: You may not agree with the assessment, but that's the procedure.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Mr. di Santo, if I might comment. You talked about the CPP benefits, I am not totally familiar with all of the provisions of their act, but within their information brochure it requires that the disability be permanent and prolonged, it does not necessarily refer to total.

Mr. di Santo: Well severe.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: Yes, permanent and prolonged.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That's right.

Mr. di Santo: It tends to prevent them from—

Mr. McClellan: If the people at the board don't understand that they should, that if you are in receipt of CPP disability that means that in the opinion of the Canada Pension Plan you are unable to work.

Mr. J. F. McDonald: What Mr. Kerr is saying is that that total disability does not necessarily all relate to the compensable conditions.

Mr. McClellan: I understand that, but that's a different point than the one you made.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Are there any further questions under benefits?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Well there were some other things that Mr. di Santo asked that we may not have covered. One was the language capability of the board. I don't know who is the best person to discuss that. John Wisocky.

Mr. Wisocky: I think Mr. di Santo covered many areas, including the language capabilities. We recognize that this is a serious problem in some instances and we do everything possible, at least the counsellor tries to do everything possible to counteract it, including training in English as a second language if possible or some other course if we can. In other words, in a lot of cases it's not possible for the individual to go to school and learn English, because he hasn't got the capabilities. Once we recognize that, there's no sense in putting the man through the frustration of trying to teach him English, so we have other areas, like the basic job-search technique program that the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission gives, where they provide a little more basic type of English teaching, so that the person can prepare him or herself for finding work in the labour market. But if at all possible we do send the person on training in English as a second language, if we can do it.

Mr. di Santo: I understand the situation if the injured worker cannot attend a course of English for the reasons that you outlined, because of age or because he's illiterate. But don't you think that becomes a further reason for which the worker should be considered disabled until the time he can go back to some sort of gainful occupation?

Mr. Wisocky: As Mr. Kerr pointed out there are two facets. There's vocational rehabilitation assistance, and our job is to assist the man in getting back to some form of gainful employment as you say. Then there's the payment and authorization of payments, which is done out of the claims service divi-

sion; and a counsellor will provide the information. If in the final analysis the counsellor, with the assistance of a community agency, finds that the person is totally unemployable due to a combination of factors including language, age and so forth, we bring this to the attention of claims services division and that is considered under a supplementary grant.

Mr. di Santo: I haven't seen any single case in which, for instance, a disabled worker is considered totally disabled because of a combination of factors including language and skill. I'm really curious to know if there are any cases.

Mr. Wisocky: It's right in the section 42(5) policy. I think it's stated in those type of words; but possibly, as Mr. Kerr suggested, if you do have cases we could sit down with you and discuss them. I'd also like to spend a lot of time with you to point out what the board is doing to try to find additional jobs. One of the things we have been doing during the last two months is to go into the Italian community to find job opportunities there. So far we've found, I think 13 or 15, which sounds very small but it's a start. There have been about four people placed in the 13 or 15 job opportunities. So there'll be further work in this area. Our counsellors will try to find job opportunities there too. I think that in the future we may have some answer, but certainly we cannot come up with a total answer to the problems that you raise.

Mr. di Santo: Of these opportunities that you found, do you know if there are any cases of employers where you placed injured workers with a financial contribution from the Workmen's Compensation Board; and do you know if there are any cases in which the workers have been employed when the grants of the Workmen's Compensation Board have expired?

Mr. Wisocky: Yes, there have been a few; but we learn from experience and we are collecting a list of those types of firms. Secondly, we are following the cases very closely to ensure this does not happen; and on top of that we even check with our assessment department or revenue services to see just what kind of firm the company may be in terms of reporting their operations to the board. We try to take every step possible to circumvent that type of problem, but it's the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. di Santo: I'm well aware of that, and that's why I'm asking the question. I had a recent case of a worker who was placed in a restaurant and then after four weeks he was dismissed because the board decreased his grant to 25 or 20 per cent. You said that

we will make sure that doesn't happen. Can you tell me how you can make sure that doesn't happen?

Mr. Wisocky: Several ways. Number one, at the moment we have a manual way of recording that firm. We make a follow-up visit with that particular firm or restaurant to tell them that it's not appreciated and that's not the way to do business. In the future we will have a computer capability to have that done for us automatically.

[12:30]

Mr. di Santo: Have you given any consideration to the possibility of making it mandatory for the companies to hire a certain number of partially disabled workers? I'm asking this question, because as you know within the Ministry of Labour there was an affirmative action task force or group or branch, and I know that the present minister is trying to revive that group. I had two or three cases, and I was probably particularly unlucky but despite the efforts of the people in charge, and I should say that it was quite expensive, I have a very thick file, they contacted almost every possible firm without success. Have you given any consideration to the possibility of introducing a bill which makes it mandatory for companies to hire or rehire a certain percentage of injured workers?

Mr. Wisocky: The board is not in a position to introduce bills. I think you are referring to a quota scheme and so forth. I think we've had some extensive discussions with your colleagues and I personally feel there are at least four different re-employment schemes that can be considered. We've looked at them, and maybe a combination of factors can help, but the co-operative and voluntary system through affirmative action programs hasn't, I think, been tested sufficiently to say that it will not work. I think there's also a lot of work to be done in the area of industrial workshops that we've addressed and have brought to the attention of one of the inter-ministerial committees on rehabilitation services, and I think that can be pursued. On reserve job schemes; I don't really know, but I think we should try the first step first, in other words try the voluntary approach. I think with the advertising program that the board has and the extra employment specialists in the field, we are finding quite a few job opportunities. As I mentioned to the committee before, in six months of 1978 we found over 1,400 jobs of which we utilized a little over 400; but when you look at the counsellors also, besides the employment specialists, we've put almost 2,800 people

back to work. I think there's a lot of merit to pursuing this, and I fully recognize and appreciate that, in principle maybe, the direction in future is something that you're talking about, but it's being addressed right now by committees, and let's see what they say.

Mr. di Santo: Excuse me; how many jobs did you find through this new mechanism that you have enacted recently?

Mr. Wisocky: If you're talking of the employment specialists it's over 1,400; but let's talk of placement of injured employees in 1978 and that was 2,787.

Mr. McClellan: In 1978?

Mr. Wisocky: Yes.

Mr. McClellan: And what was it in 1977?

Mr. Wisocky: In 1977 it was 2,386; in 1976 it was 1,774.

Mr. di Santo: What type? I'm a little bit at loss, because I have 460 cases, for the record, and it's rare. I think I can count the people who went back to work. Your total of 2,787 isn't a very great number, but it shows that there is a possibility. What kind of what disabled workers were those who went back to work?

Mr. Wisocky: It's a wide assortment. I don't have any information as to the types of workers, but I can say that from our surveys about 50 per cent are unskilled and about 30 per cent are skilled and about—

Mr. di Santo: Excuse me, how many?

Mr. Wisocky: About 50 per cent unskilled and about 30 per cent are skilled; the rest are a combination of professionals and so forth. But in terms of success in getting people back to work, and again I can only quote from the isolated two samplings that I've taken, there seems to be no material difference. In other words, we're just as successful with an unskilled person as with a skilled person; generally speaking now.

Mr. di Santo: Do you have any breakdown; for instance the people working in the building trades, how many of them went back to work?

Mr. Wisocky: No, we don't have that type of breakdown.

Mr. di Santo: Or the steelworkers; you don't have any breakdown?

Mr. Wisocky: No.

Mr. di Santo: I think that would be extremely important to determine, at least from my point of view.

Mr. Wisocky: Mr. di Santo, if I may; I think it would be helpful to ask if we could sit down with you to explain the program

and go over some of the basic information and data, and also review the cases you have; maybe we can tie it in and resolve a lot of cases.

One thing you have to remember is that we only handle cases that are referred to the vocational rehabilitation division; and of the 400,000 accidents reported in a year a very minuscule number ever reach vocational rehabilitation, because they don't need services.

Mr. Van Horne: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for coming in at this late point in our hearings on this topic, which may already have been covered in my absence. I would explain that I had delivered to me earlier this morning a case which is a classic appeal problem and I absented myself to present this to Mr. Farquharson. So if these questions that I am raising now have been answered please tell me and I will read Hansard to find what the answers are.

First of all, in going back to the minister's statement of June 19, 1978, what additional evaluation is in fact being done, and I am referring to your predecessor Mr. Minister, the Honourable Bette Stephenson's statement of June 19, in which she says: "In introducing the bill it is recognized that there are benefit areas which require prompt adjustment. It is also recognized that the implications of the report will demand much additional evaluation."

I am wondering if you could indicate to us what additional evaluation is in fact going on; is it an ongoing evaluation or an intermittent one?

Secondly, and I realize there is a degree of naivety in asking this second question, but surely when a piece of legislation such as this comes along it should be introduced early enough in the session that it can get more proper debate, and my understanding is, again, that this particular Bill 126 came rather late and that virtually no meaningful debate took place because of the time factor.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: We did mention it before, a couple of times; but very briefly, as I've said there are two, there are really three things going on.

The first is that an internal committee was established, from all ministries that are involved, to review the recommendations of the Wyatt report in greater depth and detail. We met several months ago to try and prioritize those items we saw as having particular importance and I hope that the committee will be reporting to me on at least some of the items very shortly.

Secondly, I've asked the joint consultative committee of the board to review their report and to present their views to me. Thirdly, as you know, Miss Haley is head of the pensions commission, which is reviewing the whole question of pensions, which includes indexing I believe. We are waiting for her report, which I understand is forthcoming within the next month or two.

Once all that material is in, then it will be considered and any recommendations brought forward together. I can't give you a timing on it though, Mr. Van Horne.

Mr. M. Davidson: My understanding, and I guess it's accurate because it is in the Wyatt report, is that the benefits payable to an injured worker start the day following the injury. I understand that over the years there's been quite a bit of discussion on that, but the position that our party has, and has had for a number of years, is that the benefit period should start on the day the injury occurs.

I'd like to bring to the attention of both the board and the minister, if I may, something in the Wyatt report which I think, and my colleagues think, creates a situation whereby injured workers in the province of Ontario are not granted equity.

The Wyatt report, for example, says: "We are aware of no pressure to require payment for the partial day of lost income." That's not entirely accurate, as I've said, because we as a party, and I am sure injured workers' groups throughout the province, have requested over the years that the compensation be payable from the day of the injury. But it goes on to say that employees who are not in fact paid by the employer in full for the day of injury are free to bargain for such payment.

I don't think that that's possible in all cases. Certainly if a worker in Ontario happens to work in a plant where he has a union and has a bargaining agent as such that can negotiate those types of benefits for him into the contract, he may very well be getting payment for the lost time on the day of the injury, but there are countless thousands of people in the province of Ontario who do not have bargaining agents.

I would suggest to you when you're considering some of these recommendations that it's pretty damn hard for that injured worker to negotiate payment with his employer. As a matter of fact—and I don't think I have to go too far to point it out to you—there are cases where injured workers are released from their jobs by employers who are not unionized, simply because they are injured workers. Maybe they don't perform the function in a

manner that they were able to do prior to the accident and maybe they don't come up to the standard that the company would like to see on their return to the job, or maybe the company doesn't want to take any further risk with them, given the fact that they are injured workers. I would just like to suggest that when these recommendations, Mr. Minister, come from your task force and then from the joint consultative committee that you give some consideration to the fact that that kind of a statement in the Wyatt report is not entirely accurate and that perhaps you could consider making compensation available from the time of accident rather than the day following.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I listened to your remarks and I agree with your comment about comparing the union and non-union sector. One would hope that as your colleague, Dr. Bounsall, suggested, when the Human Rights Code is amended to include physically disabled some of that problem may disappear. I don't know, but certainly he's very hopeful of this and so am I, but if it isn't then we'll have to look at that again. The other comment about when payment should commence, of course, is a matter that the committee will be reporting upon. I was interested to note—you can correct me; I don't have the figures before me—that it's about a week in Quebec before they commence payment, isn't it?

I recently spoke to Dr. Johnson and asked if he intended to change that and he indicated that he didn't and perhaps that's why one of the headlines in the *Globe* today is "Group Plant Threatens Johnson's Life." I don't know! But anyway, that will be a matter we are considering.

Mr. M. Davidson: It varies throughout Canada. There's no question about that. I think the consideration that must be given however is that we are dealing with legislation for the province of Ontario and as the most highly industrialized province in Canada perhaps we should be providing some leadership. I would also point out to you that there's—

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I'll make a quote of that: we should not consider what goes on in other provinces. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. M. Davidson: I said in that kind of a situation.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That'll be very useful in the future.

Mr. M. Davidson: Well I'm quite sure that you ignore some of the things that Conservative governments do in various provinces also on occasion. I mean, I—

Mr. di Santo: In Alberta they are much more advanced than in Ontario.

Mr. M. Davidson: But really it is a problem and, as I say, I don't believe that the statements contained in the wire report regarding it are totally accurate when they say that there has been no pressure. I'm sure that if you go through countless numbers of briefs that have been presented to the Minister of Labour over a number of years, both from the Ontario Federation of Labour and other groups that represent and deal with injured workers, you would find that one of the recommendations has in fact been that compensation start from the time of accident.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I understand that.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Any further questions, Mr. Davidson?

Mr. M. Davidson: Not right at the moment.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Do the members of the committee have any further questions under benefits? If not, then we could proceed to payment levels. Any questions under payment levels?

Mr. Van Horne: Mr. Chairman, we have no further comments on the report period.

Mr. Acting Chairman: How about pensions? Any questions under pensions? Mr. di Santo.

[12:45]

Mr. di Santo: I have only one question for the chairman of the board or for whoever is responsible. Since I think that there is a tendency to consider that there are other factors that determine the disability of a worker, then do you think that the present chart to rate the level of disability should be applied literally as it is now, or should it have some flexibility?

Hon. Mr. Starr: Well, the chart is universal for specific injuries, loss of hand or foot or whatever it is. It is assessed on the same basis. As far as other disabilities are concerned we have to rely on our medical advice and the medical reports we have on file for that individual.

Mr. McClellan: The chart is an absolute. You lose your little finger, you are given a certain pension rating under the terms of the chart. Now the problem with that is that I don't know whether it has any validity in terms of averages or not. I suspect not. But I know that it has no validity in terms of the individual circumstance of an individual injured worker with respect to the impairment of earning capacity.

That's always been our problem around that. Again it is the same principle that applies with respect to 42(5)—you have chosen to limit the definition of impairment of earning capacity with respect to pensions. We discussed the other day how you were limited with respect to 42(5) and the limitations is that the chart is an absolute: there is no real possibility for assessing the individual circumstance of an individual worker.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Except through 42(5).

Mr. McClellan: Right, but that's not a permanent award. I understand that and that's why 42(5) is so important to us. That's why we focused in on 42(5) because that's what saved injured workers from disaster in this province. Because you can't live on the kinds of awards that you get under the permanent pensions. I just don't understand—you are anxious to speak to me and I know that time is running out. I just don't understand why you don't have the flexibility; why you insist on operating on the basis of absolutes; why you don't have the flexibility to develop a criterion additional to the schedule of benefits—what do you call that thing? The little green booklet? What is it formally called? I want to use it.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Permanent disability rating schedule.

Mr. McClellan: "The meat chart" is what the workers call it—why you don't have sufficient flexibility to be able to assess the earning capacity of an individual worker with respect to the individual circumstance. You just don't have that flexibility; you have taken that flexibility away from yourselves.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: There is an anomaly in what you are saying of course. And I notice that in the manifesto that Mr. Laughren presented as the suggested basis for a comprehensive scheme and universal coverage he indicated that permanent disability should be based on impairment of earning capacity as a concept. I suspect you are reading in many ways from the Saskatchewan proposals which are currently going to be translated into a bill, we understand.

Now essentially I think you should know that to adopt an earnings-related pension basis will in fact reduce at least 75 per cent of the awards we make to zero. We start out with a clinical rating which comes from this chart, or in the case of a non-scheduled rating is estimated on the medical reports, and it is a clinical rating which is translated into an award based on the man's earnings prior to the accident and—

Mr. McClellan: I'm not talking about either/or. Please don't misunderstand me. I am not talking about an either/or situation. If you are interpreting what I said that you should withdraw the rating schedule and not have a minimum award, let me correct that.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: May I finish, though?

Mr. McClellan: Yes, but let me make that absolutely clear. I support the rating schedule insofar as it establishes a minimum rating. Now what I am saying is that you ought to have the capacity to go beyond that. You will need to develop your criteria, obviously, but you should give yourselves the flexibility that the act gives you. In a circumstance where there is an impairment of earning capacity that is obviously above the amount that is grantable under the rating schedule you should be able to implement the intent of the act. That's the point that I am trying to make. Okay?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Well, as I understand what is going to happen under the Saskatchewan scheme is that you are going to have a \$10,000 lump sum or equivalent for pain and suffering. And the rest of the award will be purely a function of the actual loss in earnings.

Mr. di Santo: Okay, can I just illustrate with the words of the minister the very day that he was appointed? He said in fact, if I lose—I'm far from thinking that you should lose it—my finger, as a surgeon I am totally disabled, as a minister I can function. Now what I'm saying and what my colleague is saying is, given the schedule that you have to set the rates of disability, shouldn't you take into account those factors that the minister mentioned?

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: We very definitely do and that's what happens under 42(5).

Mr. di Santo: Well, we are talking now of the rates of pensions, not of the supplement.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: Well, actually—and I will ask Mr. Kerr to amplify on this—in fact in establishing a disability rating for that kind of individual that can get put into the original pension as well. Would you like to—

Mr. di Santo: It never happens. Never.

Mr. A. G. MacDonald: In the sense that it can become a permanent award, yes. In the sense that it can become permanent rather than temporary.

Mr. McClellan: If there was a statutory entitlement to 42(5) benefits we probably wouldn't be making the argument.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: In the situation you've described we do occasionally run across, not

surgeons but something equivalent to that, where they've lost an index finger which is important to the job. Our approach at the present time, under the present provisions of the act, is to carry on with the 42(5) as Mr. MacDonald has said. It's a combination of the 42(5) plus the efforts of vocational rehabilitation. I suppose in a lot of cases we've been very successful over a period of time in rehabilitating that kind of individual.

But I realize the point that you are after Mr. di Santo, is that if we run into a situation that we can't resolve the employability of the individual, this is what you're getting at. You're looking for something that's permanent rather than something that's on a temporary basis that's renewed.

Mr. di Santo: No, I'm talking—I know that the time is running out—we are talking of situations which are permanent, like the loss of a finger. In that case, how do you apply 42(5) when you know that that is a situation which will perpetuate itself, possibly for the life time of the injured worker?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It's not unusual for us to—I'm sorry.

Mr. di Santo: What I am saying is shouldn't that be part of the assessment of the rate of the pension for the injured worker?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Well, at the present time—I am repeating what's already been said—the clinical disability rating is for the clinical disability. We have a fair number of cases where there is a low permanent disability award, 10 per cent, which is a pension, and we have granted a 90 per cent supplement, bringing him up to a total permanent disability level. At the present time within the terms of the act we have to renew that on a renewal basis, on a temporary basis.

And the present wording of 42(5)—I am covering your point; I am not arguing against you, sir, I am just telling you what exists—under 42(5) it says temporary and it doesn't give us the authority to do it on a permanent basis. So there is a problem there, but we've tried to resolve that problem by being as fair as we can with the renewal of 42(5), in combined efforts of the individual and vocational rehabilitation to get that individual into a fairly decent economic situation.

Mr. di Santo: Our original question was, are you moving towards changing that situation or not?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: I think, sir, that I can't answer that question, because as I recall this is a matter in the Wyatt report, that has been covered.

Mr. di Santo: Who is the person to be asked?

Mr. W. R. Kerr: Whoever is studying the Wyatt report, I would say.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That will be one of the items that will be reviewed by the committee. I can't tell you what's going to come out of it yet.

Mr. W. R. Kerr: It's out of our hands, sir.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Any further questions, Mr. di Santo?

Mr. di Santo: No.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Are there any further questions under pensions? Investments?

Mr. di Santo: How much money does the Workmen's Compensation Board have invested at this time?

Mr. Acting Chairman: Mr. Cook, please.

Mr. J. G. Cook: At the end of December this year at amortized cost there was a \$1,243,279,251 invested.

Mr. di Santo: That was in 1978?

Mr. J. G. Cook: That's correct, sir.

Mr. di Santo: What was the amount in 1977?

Mr. J. G. Cook: At the end of 1977 the amount was \$1,013,935,505.

Mr. di Santo: Did you lose any money during 1978 because of bad investments?

Mr. J. G. Cook: No, we did not.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Never mind the bad investments.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Any further questions?

Mr. M. Davidson: Could you advise us as to who makes up the investment group?

Mr. J. G. Cook: By percentage or by dollars.

Mr. M. Davidson: No, you have an investment group, I understand; the advisory group.

Mr. J. G. Cook: Basically, we have an investment policy committee, which meets with four outside advisers. This advisory group is made up of four individuals: Mr. Ken Cork, the vice-president and treasurer of Noranda Mines; Mr. Bob Sillcox who joined us in February, 1978, he's the senior vice-president of funds of the Bank of Montreal; J. P. S. Mackenzie who is currently with a consulting firm Mackenzie and Sarlos; and the fourth member is a vice-president and treasurer of Canada Life Assurance Company, Mr. R. D.

Radford. They are the four outside advisers; and inside we have an investment policy committee, which are mainly Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Brewerton, myself and Mr. Thompson.

Mr. M. Davidson: So you do not have, in fact, anyone representing what could be called workers' groups within the province of Ontario sitting on the investment board.

Mr. J. G. Cook: I can assure you that the outside advisers are very conscious of doing as good a job as possible.

Mr. M. Davidson: I'm not doubting their ability whatsoever. I'm simply posing a question. You do not have on the board a representative of the working people in the province of Ontario?

Mr. J. G. Cook: No, sir.

Mr. M. Davidson: Do you feel that there should be one?

Mr. J. G. Cook: I would think that we should get the best advice possible.

Mr. M. Davidson: You're aware, of course, that labour groups do have some very capable people and they do a lot of investing on their own. I would suggest that's something you should take into consideration very seriously.

Mr. di Santo: Or perhaps the minister should recommend the board take that into consideration.

Mr. M. Davidson: It just doesn't sit right, somehow, that in an organization that deals primarily with working people in the province of Ontario, the group that invests and handles the money for that corporate board doesn't have a workers' representative sitting on it, and I think that's something that should be changed.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The board is prepared to think about that.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Any further questions from the members of the committee under investments? If not, this concludes consideration of the Workmen's Compensation Board's 1977 annual report.

Mr. McClellan: There are a number of follow-up items that came out during the course of the three days. I would ask the chairman and the minister to pursue them and that follow-up material be provided. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Chairman: Thank you very much, Mr. McClellan; thank you very much members of the committee.

The committee adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 30, 1979

Public Service negotiations, statement by Mr. McCague	547
Air ambulance service, statement by Mr. Timbrell	547
Federal energy bill, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Nixon	548
Health service charges, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Cassidy	548
Health services, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy	549
Retail business holidays, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Van Horne	550
Health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Warner	550
Lake St. Clair commercial fishing, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. B. Newman	553
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Swart, Mr. Nixon	553
Turkey quotas, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Yakabuski	555
Violence in schools, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Bradley	555
Nuclear plant safety, question of Mr. Auld: Ms. Gigantes	556
Deer herds, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Cassidy	556
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Sargent, Ms. Gigantes, Mr. J. Reed	557
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Philip	557
Nursing homes, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mrs. Campbell	558
Department store takeover bids, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. Samis	559
Energy from waste, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. J. Reed	559
Point of privilege re minister's comments, Mr. Cassidy	560
Re petitions, Mr. Speaker	560
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Northern Affairs, Mr. Bernier	560
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Walker	562
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Natural Resources, Mr. Auld	569
Supplementary Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. Timbrell	574
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Timbrell, agreed to	580
Appendix A: Resolution re Supplementary Estimates, concurred in	580
Appendix B: Resources development committee, consideration of Workmen's Compensation Board annual report, 1977	581

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
 Havrot, E.; Acting Chairman, Standing Resources Development Committee (Timiskaming PC)
 Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
 Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
 Van Horne, R. (London North L)
 Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
 Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
 Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
 Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

Assisting the Resources Development Committee:

From the Workmen's Compensation Board, Ontario:

Cook, J. G., Investment Fund Manager, Financial Division
 Kerr, W. R., Executive Director, Claims Division
 MacDonald, A. G., Vice-Chairman, Administration
 McCracken, Dr. W. J., Executive Director, Medical Services Division
 McDonald, J. F., Secretary of the Board
 Starr, Hon. M., Chairman
 Weaver, E. T., Executive Director, Communications Division
 Wisocky, J., Executive Director, Vocation Rehabilitation Division



No. 13

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Monday, April 2, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 2, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker: Last Friday in the Legislature the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) stated, and I quote: "With respect, I think it is slightly incorrect to say [the doctors] are counselling opting out"; that is, through the Ontario Medical Association. He went on, and I quote: "To my knowledge, they are not engaged in any campaign to promote opting out."

I wish to bring to the attention of the Legislature a document that I have received, which was sent out unsolicited to a practitioner in the province, entitled Ontario Medical Association Kit for Members Considering Opting Out of OHIP. It is dated May 1978. I would suggest that means that the minister's statement that the OMA is not engaged in any campaign to promote opting out was not, in fact, accurate.

Mr. Martel: Hear, hear. He should be forced to withdraw it.

Mr. Foulds: That's putting it mildly.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

Hon. Mr. Parrott: First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I apologize that I do not have a copy of this statement for the critics. Oh, you have just received it this minute? I think it is on the way over. I'm sorry. We have been redrafting it very recently, and I think that likely is the statement.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It is in a brown envelope.

Mr. Speaker: That is an integral part of the standing orders, and I think the honourable minister should—

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it's there now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: We've got it.

Mr. S. Smith: It came in an Energy envelope, but it says "Environment" on it.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We work very closely together; so I think we fulfilled those—

Mr. Martel: We don't have one yet, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) also has a statement to make; if I may, I will defer to him to make sure copies of my statement are in the hands of the critics before I give it.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment can proceed if he wishes. I think they're in the hands of the opposition spokesmen.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the members of the steps which the government and Ontario Hydro have taken since last Wednesday to monitor and to assess the implications for Ontario of the accident at the nuclear generating plant in Middletown, Pennsylvania.

Immediate and direct contact was established by Ontario Hydro with officials in the Pennsylvania - New Jersey - Maryland power pool. Constant and up-to-the-minute technical information was available to us as events took place. The Ministry of Energy was kept fully advised and was given a full briefing by Ontario Hydro last Thursday.

Second, a special co-ordinating committee was set up comprising the Ministries of Energy, the Environment and Labour and Manpower, and Ontario Hydro, to review events and to recommend action.

Third, last Saturday an Ontario assessment team of four qualified scientists was dispatched to Middletown, Pennsylvania, to provide up-to-the-minute information on the procedures being taken to restore conditions at the plant to normal, and to observe the precautionary public-safety measures which have been put into effect by the responsible United States agencies.

The assessment team comprises representatives of the Ministry of Energy, the occupational health and safety branch of the Ministry of Labour, and Ontario Hydro. The team will remain at the plant as long as it is required; we think that will be approximately four or five days, based on the information we have now.

I am pleased to add that our team was welcomed by plant and government authorities and that, in addition to providing us with on-the-spot information, the team has

been able to assist the US officials in a consultative capacity.

I am pleased to advise the House that representatives from the assessment team report conditions in the plant appear to be stabilizing and that there is greater optimism now than there was even 24 to 36 hours ago. This does not mean that all problems have been resolved. We are told there are a number of difficult problems still remaining which will take time to overcome.

We have been in contact on a day-to-day basis with the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada and, through it, with the other federal departments and agencies concerned with this situation and with appropriate agencies and authorities in the United States.

My colleagues the Ministers of Energy (Mr. Auld) and of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie) will also make statements. The Minister of Energy will report tomorrow on the operation of the three nuclear generating stations in Ontario and on the safety control measures which are in effect in these plants. The Minister of Labour will comment later today on Ontario's contingency plan, setting out procedures designed to deal with an incident at one of Ontario's nuclear stations.

Today, I should like to advise the House on the potential implications for Ontario of the Middletown, Pennsylvania, plant.

First, based upon reports from the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, and on other reports from Canadian and US authorities, I am satisfied that the release of radioactive material to this point has been limited and does not constitute any problem to Ontario residents. On Sunday morning we were advised that radiation levels at ground level on the perimeter of Three Mile Island, where the plant is located, were very low and almost back to normal readings.

I was informed this morning that efforts to reduce the hydrogen bubble within the plant, and to reduce levels of gases within the plant, are proceeding satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, I have here a message, received at 1 p.m. today, from Dr. Aitken of our team; he reports as follows: "As of now, Nuclear Regulatory Commission reports that the hydrogen bubble is greatly reduced in size, and the risk of explosion is correspondingly reduced. Radiation levels outside the plant are approximately at normal values. There is little likelihood of requirement for further evacuation of residents."

Mr. S. Smith: Do you not think we have radios here?

Hon. W. Newman: We didn't think you could hear.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I want the Leader of the Opposition to know that we have seen various reports—as I'm sure he has—in the newspaper—

Mr. S. Smith: It was on this morning's news.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —and I think it's appropriate to put on the record the exact latest reports we have had. I'm sure the House would find us guilty of not doing the right thing if we didn't do that. This statement today is so the members have what we have at our disposal in the way of information.

Mr. Laughren: It's all madness.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We have monitored meteorological conditions consistently in an effort to detect any change in the movement of air masses passing over the Harrisburg area. I am thankful that I can report the movement of air masses has been such that no emissions from the plant reached Ontario.

Last night, however, the wind direction changed for the first time in several days with the result that upper air which passed over the Harrisburg area reached parts of southwestern Ontario early this morning. The wind direction is beginning to change again and the forecast is that by midnight air from Pennsylvania will again be moving northeast and will not pass over Ontario.

In any event, emissions at the Middletown plant are now limited and readings of radioactivity are so low that the change in weather last night is not of any concern to us in Ontario.

We will continue to monitor the movement of air and other meteorological factors as we assess the possible impact of any future emissions. We are fortunate that we have in Ontario a network of radiation monitoring stations operating on a regular basis.

My ministry operates an extensive system of high-volume particulate sampling stations throughout the province. Filters from 35 samplers are regularly analysed at the Ministry of Labour's radioactivity laboratory. This procedure takes several days since these filters are also used to provide information on general air quality readings prior to testing for radioactivity. In the light of Middletown, however, we have been analysing for radioactivity as quickly as tests can be made. We have a total of 160 high-volume samplers throughout the province which provide data on air quality. This emergency procedure has been in effect during the weekend and technical staffs of the two ministries have been at work to keep data as current as possible.

Second, a system of seven stations in Ontario is operated by the radiation protection bureau of the federal Department of Health and Welfare which obtains samples and analyses of particulate matter from stations in Thunder Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Moosonee, Ottawa, Windsor, Hamilton and Toronto. The department has announced that a report on data on radiation received from this system will be made today.

Third, Ontario Hydro operates two types of radiation monitoring systems, a total of 87 stations organized in two systems. The first system, consisting of 19 stations, monitors each of the three nuclear stations in Ontario at Douglas Point, Pickering and Rolphoton. Twelve more of these instruments are situated throughout the province. This system is geared to provide long-term readings. Hydro also maintains a system of airborne radio-iodine monitors which are used on a continuous basis. This system is designed for measuring release of iodine in an emergency situation.

We will maintain contact with authorities in Ottawa and in the US and our team of scientific experts in Middletown is reporting regularly. We are monitoring meteorological information and we are keeping data from the radioactivity monitoring system as current as is possible. We believe that consistent and accurate information is essential to the public interest and we will keep the members of this House and the public fully informed of all future developments.

Finally, I would like to add that the developments at the Three Mile Island nuclear station confirm the importance of viewing preparedness and contingency planning in a continental context. What we need in North America is a better system than we have now to cope with all eventualities. Consequently, with an eye to the future, our government is proposing that a North American nuclear monitoring and advisory centre be established among the appropriate jurisdictions. We envisage the need to design and create the necessary permanent linkages, perhaps including computer and telephone hookups, formal and written procedures, and a process for the accreditation of personnel.

[2:15]

We shall be discussing this proposal with the federal government in order to establish the necessary international planning group.

Mr. Laughren: And the madness will continue.

[Later (2:18):]

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, in view of the events at Three Mile Island during the

past week, many people in Ontario have quite naturally been asking what would happen if a similar accident occurred here? In particular, people want to know whether we have plans to deal with an incident which could endanger the public. I would like to assure the House, and the people of Ontario, that we do have plans, in the unlikely event that such an incident occurred in Ontario.

The first point I would like to make is that plans for a contingency at Pickering were incorporated in the station development plan. When the station become operative in 1971, the Emergency Measures Organization was responsible for a provincial response. The first approved interministerial plan, now in effect, was completed in 1974. This plan has been continuously updated.

In 1975, the cabinet established the "lead ministry" concept which designates the Minister of Labour and Manpower as having prime responsibility. This means that my ministry has the responsibility for co-ordinating the government's response, in the event of a nuclear accident with off-site implications.

Having said that, I would like to point this out: As in most accident situations, immediate and urgent responses, to be most effective, must be initiated by someone on the spot. The shift supervisor at a nuclear generating station would be the first to know of a dangerous situation. Although he would notify government officials immediately, he would have to make some rapid decisions on his own, decisions required for the protection of nearby residents. It is an essential part of the plan that these initiatives be taken by the shift supervisor and carried out with the co-operation of local authorities.

Once the government assumes control of the situation, Hydro relinquishes its jurisdiction for off-site safety to this interministerial control group. In addition to members of my ministry, the group includes representatives of Hydro, the Ministries of Health, the Environment, and Agriculture and Food, the Ontario Provincial Police, local authorities and senior physicists at the University of Toronto.

Arrangements have been made to keep the public informed of what has happened through releases to the media, at first by Hydro and later by the control group. I and other cabinet members would be briefed on the situation by this stage of activity. Meanwhile, residents living near the station would be advised on a continuous basis of what actions were required for their protection.

Should such an incident escalate, decisions would be made and announced concerning the safety of things like drinking water, milk

and other food supplies. I should mention that all activities relating to the safety of personnel inside the station would continue to be the responsibility of both Hydro and the Atomic Energy Control Board. In the event of injury to station personnel, the local authority would be responsible for any medical treatment that may be required. Should evacuation be required, this would be under the control of local authorities who are represented on the control group.

I have many details but these are the essential features. To date there have been three full-scale exercises, the last in October 1978. In addition, there have been a number of smaller exercises to test its effectiveness. All of these are in addition to Ontario Hydro exercises which are conducted on a regular basis. As an aside, I might say the outside referees of the most recent mock full-scale exercise commended the whole group for the efficiency and the adequacy of the operation.

We are well aware that there can always be unpredictable aspects to an accident situation. In fact, it is in the nature of accidents that they are unpredictable, but we believe our approach is one that would allow us to deal effectively with off-site nuclear emergencies.

[Reverting (2:15):]

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, today I would like to table the Ministry of Transportation and Communications' and the Ministry of Northern Affairs' road construction program for 1979-80.

During this fiscal year my ministry plans to spend an estimated \$275,600,000 for construction on the King's Highway system in southern and northern Ontario, an increase of approximately \$50,000,000 over last year's expenditure. In addition, we will be subsidizing municipal road construction to the tune of a further \$200,000,000. This generates about \$340,000,000 in total expenditures, when you include the municipalities' share.

Considering these factors, then, approximately \$615 million will be spent on construction of roads, highways and streets in Ontario throughout the fiscal year.

Mr. Laughren: Jim Snow for Minister of Health.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As the members know, this government has been reassessing its overall budget requirements and priorities over the last couple of years—

Mr. Cassidy: What have you got that Dennis Timbrell doesn't have?

Hon. Mr. Snow: —because it is intent on priming the job market and, therefore, the economy. Recognizing the importance of highway transportation in the economic development of Ontario, I feel road tax dollars invested in highway construction not only create jobs but generate business for related industries and local businesses.

Therefore, keeping this in mind, the projects included in this year's program are those we judge most essential to preserving the present high quality of our highway system, while providing the necessary expansion.

Briefly, then, in southern Ontario we're proposing new work on a total of 797 kilometres of provincial highway system, primarily on two-lane highways. In northern Ontario my ministry will continue to carry out the planning, design and construction of some 776 kilometres of the provincial highway system during 1979-80. This latter system, as I'm sure all members know, is the partial responsibility of the Ministry of Northern Affairs. It allocates the funds for capital road construction.

Again, the majority of the work is primarily on two-lane highways, although the construction of passing lanes, remote and municipal airports, are also included in this year's program.

Mr. Martel: It's just another layer of bureaucracy.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Details of all these projects, and others, are contained in the program I am tabling today, copies of which will go to each member's mailbox this afternoon.

[Later (3:18):]

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order or a point of clarification, I believe I inadvertently misled the members of the House when I made that brief statement on the tabling of my ministry's book, when I stated that the provincial roads program was increased by \$50,000,000. That should have been \$15,000,000.

Mr. Nixon: We thought we were back to the old days.

Mr. Swart: Do you know what is going on in your ministry?

Hon. Mr. Snow: It is the total ministry budget that has been increased by approximately \$50,000,000.

Mr. Warner: You can get a calculator for \$29.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I twigged that that figure was wrong, but only when I saw it in front of me.

[Reverting (2:24):]

ORAL QUESTIONS

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. S. Smith: In the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the House leader (Mr. Welch), perhaps I could direct a question to the Minister of Energy, to whom I have served notice regarding the question.

Will the minister support the notion we have been putting forward that the select committee on Hydro affairs begin immediately an investigation of the safety of nuclear generating stations in Ontario? Further, if he does agree, would he be prepared to accede to the recommendation that Dr. Arthur Porter be seconded from the royal commission to the select committee as a consultant for the purposes of this investigation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As the Leader of the Opposition says, he sent me a copy of the statement. I appreciate that and thank him for it. The select committee, with the consent of the House, can pursue any course it wishes. I would have no objection; in fact, I think it would be a good thing for the select committee to take a look at the regulations under which Hydro operates. On the other hand, I think it is important to remember that the controlling body for safety in nuclear matters is the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada. It would seem to me that might be the agency that should also be taking a look at the record.

I might take this opportunity to expand on what the Minister of the Environment said just a moment ago. I intend tomorrow to make a statement that will indicate both the regulations under which Hydro operates and the comparison, where it is comparable, between our kind of operation and the operation in Pennsylvania that is causing all the concern. The reason I don't have it today is that it is taking a little time to put together because it took a little while to find out exactly what has happened there.

I will certainly pursue this. I might say it is the Atomic Energy Control Board that we have to satisfy, but in connection with Dr. Porter I read some press accounts of an interview he had yesterday. I thought the House might be interested in them. Apparently, Dr. Porter was interviewed on CKFM today at 12:10. I have some highlights of what he said, which were handed to me, but I didn't hear him.

Mr. Martel: He said it was more dangerous.

Hon. Mr. Auld: He said that taking the human factor into consideration, it was conceivable accidents could happen in Ontario's reactors. He also indicated the proba-

bility of serious problems in our reactors was very, very small. He said the instrumentation in our reactors is such that several fail-safe systems would have to go wrong at the same time before problems could develop, and if humans make an obvious error, the instrumentation will not accept it.

Finally, in response to the question, "Do they, Hydro personnel, know what they are doing?" Dr. Porter said, and I believe this is a quote: "They are the most impressive bunch of people I've ever met. Sheer dedication is the operative word." Then, in connection with Hydro's operational record: "The best on earth is evidence that these people really know what they are doing."

Mr. Martel: He also said it was more likely to happen.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, and accepting the fact that there could well be a federal forum for this as well, would the minister encourage his cabinet colleagues to put forward the necessary motion before the Legislature at the earliest possible moment so that if there is assent required from the House it might be granted? Would the minister agree that, surely, it's the public that needs to be satisfied at this point with regard to the safety provisions and that the select committee seems to be an efficacious and immediate way that this can be dealt with, and by bringing Dr. Porter into the committee it diminishes the possibilities of duplication or, for that matter, excessive partisanship?

Mr. Bolan: Self-serving evidence.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, not being the leader of the government, I'm not in a position to commit the government, but I will certainly convey that message to the Premier if he's not here before the end of question period. I would agree that there is a wide misconception of the basic differences between the Candu system, which is the one used in this province—and, as my honourable friend pointed out last Friday and has pointed out before, a very great difference in the records of the two systems—and the enriched uranium system in use in the United States and elsewhere in the world. It is increasingly difficult, particularly at times when there is an incident elsewhere, to get this across to people and anything we can do to achieve that end is important as far as the people of the province are concerned.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, since the select committee was planning to examine the nuclear option including the safety factors in it this summer—and what has happened at Three Mile

Island simply suggests it would be advisable we do it sooner in order to provide a public forum to allay concerns and, indeed, to satisfy the impact of this whole thing on the nuclear industry, no matter whether one is a pro or a con in the nuclear industry at the moment—would the minister through his leader give immediate consideration to authorizing from the House that the select committee proceed with this in whatever is deemed to be the most appropriate relationship with the royal commission and Dr. Porter?

If I may just add here, Dr. Porter is busy doing his report and he has a mass of evidence that he has got from all of the experts. I can tell the House that the staff of the select committee has read that evidence and I would think Dr. Porter and his experts coming before the committee as witnesses could elaborate on that. Whether one calls it consultant or witness, I think is neither here nor there for the moment. In whatever is deemed, after serious consideration, to be the most appropriate relationship with the royal commission in view of the fact that they have all that evidence there now, what we want to do is just to bring it out, take a look at it and come to a conclusion.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will convey that to the Premier.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary: Do I understand the minister correctly when he said he thought AECB would be the appropriate people to take a look at nuclear safety in the Candu system? That they would be the people? Does the minister not realize, as my leader has stated, that it is the public who have to be satisfied and that the kind of information we get from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited does not agree in every way with information that we get from other sources?

[2:30]

I'll just give you one example, if I may have the latitude, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Porter is reported on the radio this morning as saying that while the probability of a meltdown in the Candu system is not very great, it is 100 times greater than those figures touted by Atomic Energy of Canada. Would the minister not agree that a public forum is the place where all of the facts have to be revealed and that Dr. Porter would provide that element of neutrality in that kind of group that would build the trust of the public in the decision that was made?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Repeating myself, as I said a moment ago, I agree that it is important that we get across to people the system we have in this country. I simply am pointing

out that it is the Atomic Energy Control Board that sets the rules and issues the licence to the plant, as the honourable member knows. It seems to me any public perusal of the rules should involve the Atomic Energy Control Board. We want to make sure we remember the difference. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is the crown corporation that has developed the Candu system and licences it. The Atomic Energy Control Board is a different regulatory agency.

Mr. Renwick: By way of supplementary question, is venting into the atmosphere part of the emergency procedure that would occur at Pickering in the event of a mechanical breakdown in the cooling system?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. I think I mentioned on Friday very briefly that in the Pickering and Bruce plants there is a separate chamber under a constant vacuum which is connected to the reactor chamber. Any leakage that goes on in the reactor chamber is automatically taken to this other chamber where it can be filtered so that in the event there were a continuous emission, there would be no radioactive iodine and stuff like that put into the outer atmosphere, as apparently may have happened at Three Mile Island.

[Later (2:43):]

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Ministry of Energy which reflects the very substantial concern now about safety standards in Ontario Hydro plants, public concern that I believe should not wait to be satisfied until after the reports of the Atomic Energy Control Board or, for that matter, of the various commissions and committees that are working at the provincial level.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last fall—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the fact that last fall Ontario Hydro was a member of the interorganizational working group that recommended the Atomic Energy Control Board relax its standards on emergency core cooling systems and relax its standards in terms of the allowable radiation hazard in case of a nuclear power plant accident, will the minister direct Hydro to oppose any such relaxation of standards as it was proposing in the fall until the consequences of the Middletown disaster are fully explored and we know whether or not any relaxation of that nature is in fact justified?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will look into that matter. I am not aware of the technical aspects of what the honourable member is referring to. Without knowing that I am not in a position to comment at the moment.

But obviously, in the whole field of safety as far as I am concerned we don't propose to relax anything that is necessary.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: If the minister says the government doesn't intend to relax any standards that are necessary, and since the interim report of the Porter commission stated Hydro's estimate of a likelihood of a catastrophic accident could be generous to Hydro by a factor of as much as 100, will the minister make it absolutely clear there will be no relaxation of standards and that Hydro will not advocate any relaxation of standards until we have had a thorough review, both in public and also within the ministry, about whether such relaxation of standards can be justified? There is very real concern, Mr. Speaker, across the country—

Mr. Speaker: That is clearly a repetition of the original question.

Mr. Cassidy: —and will the minister assure us that Hydro will take no further action on relaxing standards until these matters have been fully explored?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The honourable member knows full well that Hydro can't change the rules that the Atomic Energy Control Board sets.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Will Hydro withdraw its support for the report of the interorganizational working group of the AECB in which it participated and which suggested very substantial reductions in safety standards—reductions in safety standards which, in the light of the disaster in Harrisburg, are now very much in question?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I said I would inquire about that and find out exactly what had been said. I will do that and I will report.

[Reverting (2:33):]

MULTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question for the Minister of Culture and Recreation concerning the resignation of Philippe Le Blanc. Can the minister confirm there is a Mr. Bob Cook in the Premier's (Mr. Davis) office who is in charge of co-ordinating the government's multicultural activities? Can he explain the necessity for such a person and such an office, when within the ministry represented by this minister is a department supposedly co-ordinating all the government multicultural activities?

Is the co-ordination being done by this Mr. Cook of such a nature as to have prompted the resignation of Mr. Le Blanc on grounds

which Mr. Le Blanc refers to as "what is happening in the ministry is a totally unacceptable and corrupt practice"? Does he agree that his ministry, which should be dealing with the problems of a multicultural and multiracial society, is using its public funds for partisan purposes, as suggested by Mr. Le Blanc?

Mr. Ruston: Ask the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor).

Mr. Breaugh: Has the minister been discovered?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I don't know if it is really necessary to confirm to this House that there is such a person as a Mr. Cook working in the Premier's office. I think that has been public knowledge for a long time.

Mr. Conway: A marionette type of mandarin perhaps?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I can assure members he is not a clandestine kind of figure. He is the chairman of the interministerial committee that was established by cabinet two years ago. That committee was to act to provide a forum for continuing internal review of policies and programs relating to multiculturalism in 10 ministries. So it can hardly be called a clandestine operation.

Mr. Martel: Patronage.

Mr. McClellan: Cash or cheque?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: As I think everybody on both sides of the House would agree, multiculturalism is something that affects not only one ministry. It is not something that one simply points out to the Ministry of Culture and Recreation as being its job and that nobody else needs to worry about multiculturalism. It is something that, in effect, impacts on 10 different ministries. Mr. Cook in that interministerial committee—

Mr. Makarchuk: It sort of becomes the organizing arm of the Tory party at public expense. That is what it is.

Mr. Warner: It's a political weapon at public expense; we pay for it.

Mr. Martel: We'd better conduct an investigation into that.

Mr. Makarchuk: If you're going to do your organizing, pay for it yourself and don't use public funds.

Mr. Hennessy: Back in your cage.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, in so far as the reasons that have led to M. Philippe Le Blanc's resignation are concerned, I find it regrettable that he did not talk to me about it. I have known Mr. Le Blanc for at least eight or 10 years personally; we are not

total strangers. If he felt that there were some practices in the ministry that could be regarded as corrupt or political, or something like that, I wish he would have had a talk with me on that subject. He never once on any occasion even hinted that that was his impression. Moreover, he never even mentioned that to his own supervisor. So, quite frankly, I cannot take as too serious the charges that he makes to the press; and that is when I first heard it, when a reporter from the *Globe and Mail* told me, "Here is what Mr. Le Blanc says in his letter of resignation."

Hon. Mr. Norton: It was a political resignation—politically motivated.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: As my colleague says, it could have been a political resignation. I do not know. But that is about all I can say at this point—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Have you got the letter yet?

Mr. Martel: Lorne, you wouldn't get caught.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You've got the letter.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I think I will have to terminate the answer to the first part of that question. There is a lot of noise here on both sides of the House.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the chairmanship of the Interministerial Committee on Multiculturalism was assumed by Mr. Cook in March 1977, and since that was not the subject of my question, but rather the fact that as recently as the end of February 1979 the Premier appears to have set up a small section in his "office" under Bob Cook in an effort to co-ordinate the government's multicultural activities, will the minister now attend to the question which I put to him, which was, what is the necessity for this new initiative on the part of the Premier to have a small section in his office under Mr. Cook handling multicultural activities when there already exists not only the minister's own ministry, but also an interministerial committee supposedly handling these things?

Does the minister not realize that a man of principle appears to have resigned, with very serious charges about being controlled by mandarins from the Premier's office—mandarins that the Premier airily dismissed the other day?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Premier in his wisdom chose to step up the work of multiculturalism some months ago reflects the deep commitment on the

part of this government to develop a multicultural society.

Mr. Makarchuk: You've got as much commitment to multiculturalism as an alley cat has to morality.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Brantford try to control himself?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I wish to assure members opposite that, as the minister of multiculturalism, or of Culture and Recreation, I will continue to step up in my ministry—and they will be hearing more about this in the estimates—the work of multiculturalism in my ministry. We here are committed to developing a multicultural society in Ontario. If some of the members opposite happen to perceive this as political opportunism, I suggest that is in the eyes of the beholder and has nothing to do with our motives, which are simply to develop a multicultural society.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary; the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker; I have to say that I read the letter from Mr. Le Blanc with great concern. By way of supplementary: Will the minister undertake to establish a committee of inquiry that will investigate and report publicly on each of the incidents reported in the letter of resignation by Mr. Le Blanc, and will the minister indicate what steps he intends to take to assure the people of Ontario that multiculturalism will no longer be used by this government as a political tool?

Mr. Rotenberg: It is okay for you to do it. Why don't you stop doing it, Michael?

Mr. Cassidy: Buying votes.

Mr. Bradley: Must have hit a raw nerve there.

Mr. Warner: You should be ashamed of yourselves.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: After I finally received Mr. Le Blanc's letter of resignation this morning I spent several hours with my staff on the subject. I inquired about the various charges that had been made in Mr. Le Blanc's resignation. I talked to his supervisors and his colleagues—

Mr. M. Davidson: You convinced yourself he was right.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —and I am convinced that these charges are totally unfounded—

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, it might be too embarrassing.

Mr. Swart: Yes, it might be embarrassing.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —and I haven't one intention in the world of setting up a commission of inquiry for this kind of charge.

Mr. Cassidy: That is stonewalling.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: It is not stonewalling. I only wish that if he had these concerns he would have come to me or would have at least gone to his immediate supervisor—

Mr. Swart: So you could shut him up.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: —and said, “Look, this thing is becoming corrupt or politicized,” or whatever other charges he was making.

[2:45]

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Treasurer, who I guess is busy preparing the budget for next week.

Mr. Nixon: No, it has gone to press.

Mr. Cassidy: It's all done, as a matter of fact.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Economic Council was meeting in the Prince Hotel today, and it said that none of the remedies he wants to propose is going to work.

JOB CREATION

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Canadian Federation of Independent Business has recently indicated that in the last six years close to 60 per cent of the jobs in the private sector were created by small businesses, and that in manufacturing 55 per cent of the jobs were created by small firms, can the Treasurer tell this House what share, if any, of any proposed incentive schemes will be made available to small and medium-sized businesses to reflect whether job creation has actually been taking place over the course of the last few years?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to address that issue on April 10.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister reassure both this House and small businessmen and the federation of independent business by saying what proportion of any incentive schemes will be given to small business? Or is it the government's intention to give all these incentive funds to large corporations that in many cases have been destroying jobs, rather than creating them, in this province over the course of the last 10 years?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am a great admirer of small business. I am sure the member will see that reflected in my actions.

TRANSPORTATION OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that may involve three different ministries, and each can take a chance. They will probably have to supplement the information

the previous minister gives. The question involves the Minister of Energy, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Is the minister aware that on Sunday, February 25, 1979, an article in the Detroit Free Press was headlined, “Trucks Defy US Atomic Waste Laws”? Is the minister also aware that on June 1, 1978, Tri-State Motor Transit of Joplin, Missouri, transported five wooden boxes of contaminated radioactive material from Consumer Power Company's Palisades nuclear plant in South Haven, Michigan, through the state of Michigan by way of Interstate 94 to Interstate 96, through Detroit, then across the Ambassador Bridge?

Will the minister contact the Atomic Energy Control Board to ban any further shipments through southern Ontario, as there are already excellent alternative routes through the states of Michigan, Ohio and New York to disposal sites in the east?

Mr. Haggerty: Don't all jump at once.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I might say to the honourable member that the Atomic Energy Control Board sets the rules and issues the permits. We have nothing to do with it. If they are not aware of it, I will certainly pass this information along, although I would suggest to the honourable member that, inasmuch as I do not read the Detroit Free Press that often, it would be helpful if he sent that material along to the control board.

Mr. B. Newman: By way of a supplementary, the information is already with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. Every ministry we ask seems to shove it off on another ministry. The Department of Transport in Ottawa says it is a responsibility of the Ontario Highway Transport Board.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary question?

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the minister can give assurances to the public of Ontario that any shipments that may be allowed to pass through—and I hope we do not allow any—will meet Canadian and Ontario criteria, and that both federal and provincial authorities will be informed of the contemplated shipment of these radioactive wastes?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why I am so foolish as to volunteer. But if the member would look at the proposed legislation that was introduced last week, he will find the definition section is broad enough that if any harm should occur from that transportation it would be construed

as a spill and therefore would be their responsibility.

That doesn't answer all of the question, I'm aware of that, but I think it important to know—

Mr. S. Smith: I am so delighted.

Mr. Kerrio: That's what you call reaction.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Well, I guess they really didn't want to know anyway.

INCO DISPUTE

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower: Because of the contradictory information being given to the media and the community about who made the last offer in the dispute at Inco, can the minister indicate who made the last proposal and who failed to respond to that proposal? Would the minister and his staff, when they meet with both parties on Wednesday, cost the offer of the company and the counter-proposal of the union?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It is my understanding that when the parties last met for 11 days in February, the last suggestion for a settlement did come from the union. The company's response was it was so unrealistic that it didn't feel it had to respond in any formal way to it.

In answer to the question directly, the last suggestion for a settlement was made by the union, the company not formally responding but indicating they considered it too unrealistic to bother responding.

With regard to the question of costing, I am sure the member knows the role of mediation staff is not to get into the costing of offers and counter-offers. They do first have a very good, albeit moderately rough idea of the cost of each offer from whichever side it comes, but it is my feeling it wouldn't benefit the forthcoming negotiations that are going to start this Wednesday to have mediators getting involved in costing offers. I would be pleased to talk to the member about it if he has another view, but that's my feeling at the moment.

Mr. Martel: In view of the company's attitude towards the Sudbury workers in the community, both now and for the past two years, as evidenced by the layoff and a different proposal for Port Colborne workers as opposed to the Sudbury workers in the form of pensions; and in view of their refusal to put any monetary item on the table, despite the fact that Falconbridge Nickel which lost \$8½ million could; and because of their failure to this date to put the COLA clause on the table until September 1980

when they put it on the table in the first round of negotiations with the Thompson workers; doesn't the minister figure it is time he and his government indicated to Inco their displeasure at Inco's conduct towards the Sudbury area? Would the government consider withdrawing three benefits bestowed on Inco, which are the 60,000 acres given last year to Inco for exclusive exploration; the reinstating the 720 tons of daily emission standards required by the former control order; and removing the right of Inco to write off its offshore processing costs against profits earned in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The member well knows that in spite of the feeling that was generated following meetings with the senior negotiators of both parties two weeks ago—namely, the feeling that there was no point in resuming negotiations—I nevertheless took the liberty of having my senior staff go to Sudbury and again discuss matters both with the union in Sudbury and with the company last Wednesday. As the member knows, they still remain very unhelpful, if I may put it that way, with regard to the offer of settlement.

However, I felt so strongly about it, as it has been almost two months now since the parties have been to the bargaining table, that I have suggested they return to the table on Wednesday. I think it wouldn't do those negotiations any good for me or anyone to get involved in the criticism of either party and I am therefore going to decline answering at this moment.

With regard to the question of benefits, the member knows he can ask the Ministers of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld) and of the Environment (Mr. Parrott) and the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) about each of those items if he is serious about them.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I have a supplementary. In view of the fact that the strike in Sudbury has been going on since last September, and the one in Fort Frances and Kenora since last July, an obviously long, involved and bitter strike, is there anyone in the ministry working on new approaches to collective bargaining in this province so that the communities that are so adversely affected by such lengthy and prolonged strikes will not be as badly affected and we can come to a new pattern of bargaining in this province so that these problems can be avoided?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: As the member knows, it was about a year ago—maybe a little more—that the ministry introduced its program of preventive mediation in the hope that this

very sort of thing in companies and in unions that have had difficulties in the past could be avoided in the future, and we continue to do that.

Similarly, we've now instituted a program, even without preventive mediation, where there have been difficulties in previous negotiations. Those particular negotiations receive extra attention.

With regard to the Boise Cascade problem in Kenora and Thunder Bay—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Fort Frances.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: —the member knows full well—as I explained in the House three weeks ago—my view and the view of the two members of the disputes advisory committee is that the only way that matter can be resolved, in our opinion, is through voluntary binding arbitration, a view that neither party to date has chosen to accept.

Through the more frequent use of disputes advisory committees, through preventive mediation and through particular attention to issues which have caused problems in the past, we think we're being fairly innovative in trying to approach such difficult situations as the member referred to.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the company has termed the union request "unrealistic"—I think that was the term the minister used—I wonder if the minister would take into consideration the fact that Inco is funnelling money to the tune of \$50,000,000 a year to its Ray-O-Vac subsidiary in the US to modernize its plants there? Does the minister think that's good corporate behaviour for a company that's destroying the heart of a community in Sudbury right now and for the last seven months?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, so that the member really understands and appreciates, I have the same concern about that particular community that he does, and he knows the effort and the honest, sincere effort—

Mr. Laughren: No, I don't. You haven't told the company to make the offer either. You are playing silly little games.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: —that I have always put into that particular dispute and that particular community.

Mr. Laughren: You never will tell them to make the offer either. What kind of nonsense is that?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Let's not try to suggest there's any difference in the way we see the problem up there. I think it would be inappropriate for anybody to get into the position of criticizing any party at this time

when they're about to get into negotiations on Wednesday.

PCB REPORT

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Since the ministry staff indicated that the report called PCB Formation in Sewage Chlorination would be released within six to eight weeks from March 1978, has the report been completed, why has it taken so long and when will it be released?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I can tell the honourable member that it has been completed. It's extremely difficult for me to tell him why it has taken so long, and I guess I'd better not try. Having been given a little notice of that question, let me assure the member that I share his concern and I have instructed staff that we should have that report in his hands in four to six weeks. That's a fairly firm commitment. I know it's a little longer than he wished, but I can tell him the report is completed. It's undergoing what they call editorial corrections.

Mr. Riddell: That's a little better than "in the fullness of time."

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think he'll have it in his hands before long.

Mr. Gaunt: Will the minister table the report in the House when it is completed, in view of the study's far-reaching implications?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Yes, and I will be sure to send the member the first copy.

CBC CONNECTIONS PROGRAM

Mr. di Santo: I have a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation. In view of the fact that the recent sensational series, Connections, on CBC projected a bad image of the Italian community as a whole, as minister responsible for multiculturalism what does he intend to do in order to rectify the image that many Canadians have of the Italian Canadians, to repair the damage done, and to protect the reputation of thousands of innocent people and law-abiding citizens who have been innocently slandered by the CBC? [3:00]

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Mr. Speaker, although I did not see the TV production, I have heard about it and I have had a synopsis done for me. I could say that I share the view of the member opposite that it did a dreadful disservice to the Italian community in this province and in this country. I, as Minister of Culture and Recreation for the province, am shocked by it. I will be in touch with the Italian community, probably later today, to

see what steps we can take to correct what I think was a most unfortunate image projected by the CBC—that great federal organization that is supposed to bring the country together and develop multiculturalism here. Then it comes up with this kind of garbage.

Mr. S. Smith: Oh, come on.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) want to respond to that, too?

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: While the minister is trying to arrange a meeting with the Italian community—and we would like to know with what sector of the Italian community—can he tell the House if he doesn't think it appropriate that Ontario educational TV start devoting some time to the ethnic communities in order to foster racial harmony? Second, doesn't he think the government of Ontario, through the Premier (Mr. Davis), should ask CBC to devote time to the ethnic communities so that the positive aspects of those communities can be known by all other Canadians?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I think it's rather interesting that the questions of the possibility of TV Ontario doing something more to further the concept of multiculturalism should be raised, because just this morning, in a meeting with some of the senior officials of TV Ontario, we discussed that very possibility. I cannot, of course, at this time, report any kind of specific or concrete proposals we are planning to undertake. But I certainly see that as one real possibility.

I would be quite happy to discuss this further with the member opposite, or anyone else in this House who has ideas about TV Ontario developing programming designed to further this particular objective.

Mr. Conway: Just keep it out of the Premier's office.

TOURISM

Mr. Eakins: To the Minister of Industry and Tourism, Mr. Speaker: In view of our existing deficit in tourism, and in view of the success of British Columbia in reducing its deficit, will the minister give consideration to a program similar to British Columbia's in which low-cost funding will be made available to assist resort operators in upgrading their premises in a structural sense, so that they are able to operate and so that we can encourage more four-season resorts in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course. I would point out to the honourable member that essentially this is something this government has been doing for a great number of

years through the development corporations, particularly in northern and eastern Ontario. They get preferential rates.

Mr. Eakins: They're very difficult to get.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has indicated the money is very difficult to get. I might say that throughout our estimates I did not hear any of those complaints, either from the member opposite or from anyone else. I think the experience by and large has been this: Where there has been some unusual delay in the Ontario Development Corporation programs supporting the tourist industry, a few telephone calls have got to the heart of the problems. The experience has been very good.

I might also take this opportunity to remind the member opposite that in our early statements with regard to some of the target groups for the new employment development fund, the tourist industry had already been preselected as one of those industries to get some special attention from that fund.

Mr. Eakins: We treat you royally.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You bet.

Mr. T. P. Reid: If the government is doing all these great things for the tourist business, particularly in northern Ontario, when does it intend to stop foreign tourists from camping freely on crown land, often beside tourist facilities been built and invested in by people? This government through its crown land free camping policy is in direct competition with this kind of investment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can assure the member the whole question of camp grounds is one I have been speaking with my colleague about at some length—

Mrs. Campbell: Who's winning?

An hon. member: Can't win them all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and perhaps at a later time, he and I might have more to say about that matter.

Mrs. Campbell: Together?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course.

EMPLOYEES' HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. Mackenzie: Can the Minister of Labour and Manpower explain the lengthy delay in implementing Bill 70, the safety and health legislation? What is holding up the regulations? When can we expect to receive the regulations?

Mrs. Campbell: Too busy.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I would like to think there has not been a delay. We have been working very hard on getting the regulations

together, which is not an easy task, as I am sure the member knows. I can assure him I am personally making every effort to see the bill is proclaimed within the next month or two.

Mr. Mackenzie: A supplementary: Can the minister tell us if he has allowed for any real input into the regulations from the workers and their unions who will be working with this particular piece of legislation?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I am afraid I can't answer that specifically. In a general way, however, it is my understanding there is input, but if the member has reason to think that is not so, I would be glad to look into it.

WELCOME HOUSE

Mr. O'Neil: I have another question for the Minister of Culture and Recreation.

Going back to the Le Blanc resignation, I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not he does have present plans to move the Ontario Welcome House to another location and if so, when is that planned and at what direction is that move being made?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have plans to move Welcome House from the Harbourfront site to a more central site on University Avenue. This move is simply a further step which reflects our increased work in the multiculturalism field. We hope when this move is completed there will be some 25 or 26 different ethnic groups and languages being spoken there.

Mr. S. Smith: They all speak Tory.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: We hope all the various communities in the Metro area particularly will take advantage of it. I would like to emphasize that we hope every member of every party in this Legislature will also take full advantage of that facility as a way of building bridges and developing communications with all the many cultural communities here in Toronto and in Ontario.

Mr. S. Smith: Between the Premier's office and multiculturalism.

Mr. Nixon: The mandarins are striking again, lurking in the corridors.

Mr. O'Neil: The minister didn't completely answer my question; that was at whose direction? I would like to know.

Is it going to cost approximately \$1,000,000 to move? Does that move come because of the letter the Premier sent to the minister on February 27 in which it was suggested it would be an excellent idea to relocate the complete multicultural package in a highly visible area with its own building? He con-

cludes in the last part of that letter: "We might soon regain the recognition lost in the past few years because of the wide proliferation of our multicultural efforts."

Hon. Mr. Baetz: The decision to move Welcome House to its future location was the result of recommendations made by a number of people.

Mr. Breithaupt: What about the old Hydro building?

Hon. Mr. Baetz: It did not originate only from the Premier's letter of February 27.

Mr. Gaunt: But it has a big influence; those mandarins are at it again.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: It is a move which I think makes a great deal of sense. It will certainly provide far greater and ready access to the many people from the various cultural communities living in the city.

Frankly, here again, instead of criticizing this move, I had hoped the members opposite would have applauded that because surely they are as much interested in the development of multiculturalism in this province as we are.

Mr. S. Smith: It is the motive for the money we are against.

Mr. Turner: Don't you talk about motives.

An hon. member: Why not?

ACTIVITIES OF WCB ETHNIC CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour arising out of the letter of resignation of Mr. Philippe Le Blanc.

Will the Minister of Labour and Manpower explain to me why the ethnic co-ordinator for the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Rocco Lofranco, attended a meeting at the First Canadian Portuguese Club on March 9 for the purpose of trying to censor a banquet list which had been prepared by the executive of the First Canadian Portuguese Club in order to ensure that no elected politicians, including MPPs, were invited—

Mr. Ruston: NDPs.

Mr. McClellan: NDP or Liberal I may say—were invited by the club who were not acceptable to the Portuguese Conservative Party of Ontario?

Mr. S. Smith: He wanted to avoid occupational injury.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'm sure the member knows that the president of the Portuguese club denies that such a request was made by Mr. Lofranco.

Mr. McClellan: The request was made.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He still denies that.

Mr. McClellan: It was made.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: That's in the press this morning too. As to why he was there, it's my understanding that because of his understanding of problems and his relationship with the ethnic community it was thought his views would be of value.

Mr. Makarchuk: More like the relationship with the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: But if the member feels it was something he'd like me to discuss and review, I'd be pleased to do it.

Mr. Laughren: He is asking you right now.

Mr. McClellan: I have substantiated this morning the presence of Mr. Lofranco and the performance of Mr. Lofranco at that meeting. In the light of this incident and in the light of the incident brought to the minister's attention last week in the estimates—that is, Mr. Lofranco's vicious attack on APIO—I want the minister to explain to me why Mr. Lofranco should not be immediately dismissed from his job as ethnic co-ordinator at the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: In last week's board estimates I indicated to the member that I would review the activities referred to about Mr. Lofranco and report, and I'll be glad to report on this matter to the member.

FOUR-DEATH CRASH

Mr. Stong: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Now that four people have been killed on Highway 7 just east of Bayview—three being members of one family—and in view of the fact his ministry has steadfastly refused the pleas of residents in that area to establish overhead lighting, the lack of which was a contributing factor to that accident, would the minister now consider the construction of adequate lighting to prevent further such carnage in that area?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is referring to an accident that took place about four weeks ago—

Mr. Stong: March 10.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —a very serious and unfortunate accident. Yes, there have been discussions between the municipality and the ministry with regard to improvements at that intersection. My staff in the normal process had planned on construction work, I believe in the years 1980 or 1981, to reconstruct the intersection with turning lanes, et cetera. That would involve lighting and different signal arrangements at that time.

I have asked my staff to review this. I must say that in that particular accident I don't believe lighting or turning lanes or anything else would have prevented those unfortunate fatalities. As I recall the report that I had with me for a few days following that, expecting such a question, the one automobile went right across the median into the other lane. Nothing, other than a concrete median barrier perhaps, would have prevented that accident.

But, yes, I have instructed the staff to see if we cannot in some way make some of the required improvements in 1979 rather than leaving it until 1980.

Mr. Stong: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well really, there has been a commitment made.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the minister ought to be aware that the accident happened one half a mile east of the intersection on a curve. I wonder what steps the minister has taken, or what steps he will endeavour to take, to protect the rights of the eight-year-old orphaned survivor to claim against the ministry without the intervention of a limitation period?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would not wish to make any comment. I would refer that question to the Attorney General who, I am sure, would be more familiar with what the legal rights of that unfortunate child might be.

Mrs. Campbell: He wouldn't want to make a comment either.

NIAGARA RIVER POLLUTION

Ms. Bryden: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. We are all well aware from newspaper reports that the deadly chemical dioxin has been discovered in Bloody Run Creek which leads into the Niagara River in New York state and that the pollution appears to emanate from another old chemical dump of the Hooker Chemical Corporation similar to the Love Canal dump.

In view of the fact that toxic chemicals do not recognize international boundaries, has the minister personally contacted the governor of New York state to urge that the highest possible priority be given to containment and cleanup of this very serious pollution which may affect both the Niagara River and Lake Ontario ultimately and could endanger the health of Ontario residents?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: No, I have not personally contacted the governor, but I am sure that there's no doubt in the minds of officials of his department that we are very concerned,

and we have had a good deal of contact with those officials. I think that might be the appropriate thing at this time. There's not much doubt from following the situation that the governor is quite concerned and is well aware of our concern.

Ms. Bryden: Supplementary: Has the minister been in touch with the federal minister of the environment, urging him to contact the New York authorities and the Canadian government to make representations regarding this very serious matter?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it would be more than fair to say that the Honourable Len Marchand and myself have had several conversations, not specific to that creek but certainly on the aspect of international problems and his role in it. Along with the minister from the federal government, we had a meeting with the Minister of the Environment for Quebec and discussed at some length those aspects of our international concerns.

TOURIST INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Is the minister aware of these comments made by his colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells), while attending a meeting with the Niagara region council? Quoting from the Niagara Falls Review of March 23, 1979, "Mr. Wells appeared appalled that Fort Erie doesn't have a permanent tourist information centre and promised to bring it to the attention of the appropriate minister?"

While visiting Fort Erie, the minister's predecessor made similar comments a year ago and showed displeasure with the present government policy of doing too little to improve Ontario's tourist needs, in direct contrast to the theme "We treat you royally."

After years of debate in the Ontario Legislature and outside, can the minister indicate to the Legislature when he will announce the tender call, in conjunction with the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Henderson), for the construction of a tourist information centre at the entrance to the Peace Bridge, Canada's largest port of entry at Fort Erie, Ontario?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Here is your chance to say you are already doing it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am already doing it. I quite seriously hope to be able to make that announcement within the next two or three months. I will probably be down there with Gordon Dean to make that announcement at that time.

Mr. Haggerty: Is the minister aware that funds are now available in the Ministry of Government Services estimates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite seriously, I am satisfied that between my budget and the budget in MGS we will be able to find funding to get something substantial up in that area this current year.

CABLE TV SERVICE IN OHC PROJECTS

Mr. Swart: My question is to the Minister of Housing. Will he confirm that he is ending all bulk-purchase agreements for cable TV service for residents of Ontario Housing Corporation units, including the senior citizens? Would he not agree that will raise the cost of cable TV to senior citizens and those others by at least 60 per cent and in some cases as high as 200 per cent? And would he not admit that there is no alternative for the residents but to either pay that huge increase or revert to the rabbit ears because OHC will not construct any new receiving towers? Therefore, will he reconsider that policy and renegotiate the bulk-purchase agreement?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, we have been for some time looking at the bulk-purchase agreements in Toronto and, indeed, in the rest of the province. When the OHC first got involved in bulk-purchase agreements there was a very substantial discount for bulk purchase, which meant 100 per cent of the residents must subscribe to the system whether they wished to or not. As a result of the passage of some years, that bulk rate has climbed consistently to the point that it is now very close to the actual fee that would be charged to an individual who wished to hook into the system.

We have looked at it very carefully from OHC's point of view and we have discussed it with the cable television people. We have looked at the benefits that can accrue to the tenants of OHC, whether they be families or seniors. We have also looked at the fact that there are write-off charges every year that the government, the people of this province, pick up for unpaid bills for cable television to those tenants.

It is the consensus of the board of directors of OHC, concurred in by the minister and by ministry people, that we would go on the individual subscriber position throughout the OHC portfolio. We have discussed it very completely with the various groups, and may I say that there has been some resentment by OHC tenants that they were forced to accept

cable television in their building whether they wished to have it or not, or whether they had a television or not and that they had to pay a monthly charge for that particular service because in the bulk agreement we had with the cable people it was 100 per cent or nothing. We have now decided, because of cost factors and because of resentment by some tenants, that we would go on the individual subscriber rates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

[Applause]

Mr. McClellan: Give 'em hell, Jim.

Mr. Martel: Come on, tiger.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you. I must say—

Mr. Gaunt: This is your chance, Jim; this is your chance.

Mr. McClellan: Have no mercy.

Mr. Conway: The man who put Bill Davis in his place.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —in standing up, you would almost think that I had announced that I wasn't going to run again. I must say I was overwhelmed with the applause.

Mr. Conway: You have to get a federal nomination first.

Mr. Philip: After your free time broadcast on the weekend, you had better not run again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I didn't hear that, but I would be happy to respond to any repartee or interjections from across the floor as I have in the past.

Mr. Conway: What nomination are you looking at now, Jim?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Have you any suggestions?

Mr. Speaker: Order. After the ovation I think everybody would be anxious to hear what he had to say.

Mr. Breaugh: There shouldn't be any interjections from the chair.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I did want to make some comments, off the cuff of course and maybe somewhat far ranging, in regard to a number of matters that are of

interest I think not only to this House but to the members of the community.

I have had some interest as you know, Mr. Speaker, in community affairs.

Mr. Bolan: What happened to our friend up there?

Mr. Grande: Jim, your friends are all leaving.

Mr. Breaugh: Did you ever empty that front bench when you stood up, Jim.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I didn't hear that but I would be happy to respond.

Mr. Turner: No, don't, it wasn't worth it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It wasn't worth responding to? Then I won't respond.

I was saying that I have had some considerable interest in community affairs. As you know, some years back I had occasion to serve in the capacity of Minister of Community and Social Services. It was a very challenging period in my life, I must say.

Mr. Makarchuk: No question about it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I suppose I am still somewhat scarred from those days.

Mr. Conway: I gather.

Mr. Makarchuk: There are a few CASs that feel the same way.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But it really hasn't scarred my mind, I want you to know—

Mr. Grande: I don't think you will ever heal.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —nor affected my—

Mr. Makarchuk: Your psyche.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —my psyche or my personality, no.

Mr. Makarchuk: I didn't think anything could affect that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In other words, I don't have to visit the Liberal leader in a professional capacity.

Mr. Makarchuk: I wouldn't visit him in a professional capacity, either.

Mr. Conway: Do you prefer the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson)?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I do want to say this, though. I was born in what I consider to be a rather normal community.

Mr. Conway: Oh, pray tell, where was that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It was Timmins. I see the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development sitting here—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Good spot.

Mr. Conway: Oh, I don't believe it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and applauding because he is aware of the north and the problems

of the north. Maybe in some of the earlier days we weren't quite as sophisticated as the southerners, and Timmins, as the minister for resources development knows, was somewhat back in the hinterland, certainly in the early part of this century. That really puts some perspective on things, doesn't it? You felt that you lived so far back in the bush that you had to come out of the bush to hunt. But it taught me a few things and one was the concept of a normal community.

In those days we had a community that was made up of all kinds of people. I am not only talking about ethnic background now and we heard something of ethnic background in the question period today. We had people whose heritage or ancestry might have been from any part of the world, and we accepted this. We had people who were of different colours. I am not talking about political colour now, I am talking about the colour of their skin. In addition to the colour of one's skin and the difference in one's language was the difference in mentality. We had people who were very intelligent and some who were not so swift.

Mr. Conway: That seems obvious.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We had some who were mentally handicapped. I see the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk entering the chamber and I don't think that was circumstantial.

Mr. Nixon: Don't bracket me in that statement. I may be overweight. Tell us about the bald ones.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I cast no aspersions on the immense intellectual capacity of that member.

Mr. Nixon: I knew you when you first started in politics. You were ripping off the selected committees.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I just want to say that we had that kind of person in that community—a very intelligent person—and we had, as I mentioned, some who weren't so intelligent. And we had some people who were physically handicapped. We had young people, and we had old people; and we seemed to take all of this in our stride. The citizens of that community were interested in what was going on.

[3:30]

We kept our old people in our homes; many of us did that. If someone was disabled, we helped the disabled, whether that was physically or mentally. It was interesting to accept what I thought of as normal in those days, which turned out to be something in subsequent experience in large metropolitan areas and, I suppose, with the passage of

time. There was an evolution. There seemed to be an urge on the part of larger communities to start taking what I considered was a normal community and to dissect that community and institutionalize so much of it.

If you were young, exceptionally young, you had day-care centres, and then you had nurseries and kindergartens. You had other facilities for persons who were handicapped in one way or the other, either physically or mentally. You had institutions for the elderly. We seemed to take society and dissect it and institutionalize what was a normal society. This, I may say, somewhat troubled me; because I discovered when I was Minister of Community and Social Services that we had literally thousands of agencies that were tending to the needs of these various elements in our society.

I wish the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) wouldn't exist, because he was the critic at that time.

Mr. Breaugh: He still is the critic. Are you still the minister, Jim? He has outlasted you.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I appreciate his political motivation in trying to upgrade the image of his party, and to display a sensitivity for people that is somewhat lacking in larger communities. I applaud the member for that; and if the member for Oshawa wouldn't interject, I think he would accept on behalf of his colleague that type of compliment.

Mr. Breaugh: I'm just trying to help you. Someone should.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Here we had an evolution. We had concerned citizens who would, on an initial basis, volunteer their help. They would perform the actual duties in caring for one. They would enlist the support of their fellow members of the community and be responsible for the carrying out of that particular program. If it was to assist the youth, again I could show you the evolution of the children's aid societies, and there are some 50 in Ontario; societies that were created because of a genuine concern on the part of citizens for the youth of this province of ours; societies which were operated by very sensitive people who raised their own funds and cared for the children who were either unwanted or neglected.

What happened then was what we have seen happen so much of late; and that is, the organizations take on a professionalism. The professional takes over and the volunteer becomes a fund raiser, often relegated to the role of selling tickets.

That type of attitude where you extracted the milk of human kindness and the genuine sincerity and concern on the part of citizens

for their neighbours, troubled me greatly and continues to trouble me. We have, as I have said in the past, taken charity and made it a crown corporation. We have turned the Good Samaritan into a civil servant and we look to the government more and more for funds to keep these agencies going. They are all well-intentioned people and they are agencies that all do good, there's no question about that. Yet in my estimation it is important not only for the developmental services for the mentally retarded but for all services to be de-institutionalized as much as possible, to normalize the setting of people who are not as gifted as others, who suffer some type of handicap.

It was in that regard that I had hoped to take our Developmental Services Act and to ensure that other handicapped persons not covered by any special or specific legislation be included in a new Developmental Services Act so that there could be some equity in terms of funding and approach; some balance.

I noted when I was Minister of Community and Social Services that as the capital funds for all areas except the mentally retarded ceased flowing, there was an inclination on the part of some agencies that looked after persons who suffered both mentally and physically to orient their activities and to accentuate the aspect of mental retardation, so you had that manoeuvring within a system which I didn't think was right nor did I think it was necessary.

The participation houses, for example, are places where I think the person is looked upon as a whole and where funding was very difficult to come by, and I dare say still is. I looked at the problem in terms of the process of normalization; and as you know these were the buzz words, and I guess they still are—deinstitutionalization, normalization, use of the generic services of the community. I know in my own riding of Prince Edward-Lennox there was at one time a proposal to build a swimming pool in the institution apart from the community at Prince Edward Heights and the price tag for that was about \$1,000,000. We had developed a good rapport within that community, a rapport with the retarded that appreciated the differences between the normal community and those who were afflicted by either a physical and a mental handicap or simply a mental handicap.

It was for that reason that I was anxious to see that swimming pool put within the community—at great saving, I may say, to the government, because we now had the community interested. We had the board of education interested; we had the town interested; we had different groups that were in-

terested. Unfortunately that didn't transpire. The government, I suppose, in assessing what became necessary, didn't think it was in a position to spend a much lesser amount of money to normalize that facility.

That is just one example, because one of the biggest challenges in terms of normalization, Mr. Speaker, as you very well know, is to ensure that you have a receptive community. How can you inject into a community people who are not accepted as normal and then expect normalization? It's a process of education, of understanding, of preparing a community. I think that's one of the biggest jobs we face. That's why I mentioned initially my experience in a smaller community as a young man and the acceptance at that stage in my life of a community made up of people from all walks of life, with all manner of abilities and disabilities. It's our philosophy to get back into that particular type of community.

As I indicated, the preparation of the normal community now for that full integration is difficult indeed. If you go to Orillia and look at the problems that community has exhibited in terms of the institution there for the mentally retarded, you will find they're less than receptive. I think they are a lot of well meaning people who have good intentions, but you just can't accomplish the type of normal setting you would want overnight.

I mention that because I feel we have to normalize our own ministry. I felt that change within that ministry had to be made, and I'm seeing it made now as a matter of fact. I'm seeing the rationalization in terms of child care. I just hope we don't create another dichotomy in regard to child care when we get involved in the rationalization of services for the elderly so you develop two—I hesitate to use the word bureaucracies; empires, is that more charitable, Mr. Speaker?—

Mr. Renwick: More accurate.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —within the ministry, so that they never come together—

Mr. Lawlor: How about bureaucratic empires?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and you don't have an overview of the entire service you're trying to provide. That can happen in the field as we decentralize and provide those field offices if we're not careful.

Another area that concerned me was the rationalization of family benefits, general welfare assistance and the federal program. You notice we have at the federal level programs such as unemployment insurance, and the

Canada Pension Plan program with provision for disability payments within that. We have, with old age security, a guaranteed income supplement. At the provincial level we have this broad spectrum of family benefits for persons who are not able to work, people who suffer some type of disability, whether it's permanent disability or whether one is permanently unemployable; I will touch on that in a moment.

In the field again, we have the municipal programs of general welfare assistance, the temporary type of help that is afforded people in true need. I can see where people were lining up, and are, in the municipalities at a municipal welfare office to complete that application process, only to be directed to a provincial office because the person is a likely candidate for a family benefits allowance. I feel very strongly there is considerable duplication and overlap in that area.

I remember attending a number of federal-provincial conferences at which time there was some hope to rationalize these services, except that when I first came on the scene the areas of federal jurisdiction had been carved out of the talks. Instead of looking at the total picture and taking into consideration programs such as unemployment insurance, which covers those persons who are able to work but aren't working, the manpower training or retraining programs and some of the aspects of the old age pension or supplement as they affect the overall welfare picture, these matters had been extracted from the discussions. It seemed to me that what we were really talking about was funding. It was apparent that the funding was to be block funding so that the costs of the federal government were not going to escalate in perpetuity.

[3:45]

I think there has to be a rationalization of the permanently disabled and the permanently unemployable. I wish the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) was here, because she has been particularly concerned about that for a number of years. I would like to see the family benefits program and the general welfare assistance program administered together. This would probably be best done at the local level.

What I'm really saying, and I won't dwell on this particular aspect too long because I know there are other speakers, is that we have to put our whole social welfare system together. Maybe I should say together again, because in my view, at one time we did look at the individual as a whole and as a true part of his or her community.

Within these communities we have seen a breakdown in terms of child discipline. This is a very interesting phenomenon in current days, because it goes right through the system, from the home to what's happening in the churches, the schools and streets. We have had what we call an open society. It seems we've taken the laissez-faire out of the economic system and put it into the social system, so that anything goes. I wonder about that; I think we've made a mistake.

When one looks at the current debate about drug use and abuse and at the desire on the part of many to decriminalize the use of drugs, which is merely a step toward legalizing the use of those drugs, I wonder whether we've lost our senses. I truly feel that if we continue on this path—and one sees it again in terms of respect for the law, of civil disobedience and of openness—we're going to have a nation of dependants.

Then I would wonder what the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) would do with the new candidates for his OHIP scheme when they come through the process of utilizing not only the types of activity that are detrimental to health today, and I could talk about liquor and tobacco, but added to those the legitimization of drugs. In some cases I think we'll see an evolution from the softer drugs to the harder drugs. That is not the whole problem, but I fear opening up this area and legalizing use is going to cause us great problems indeed.

A lot has been said about OHIP. When I am talking about welfare I like to talk about health, because they are so often inter-related; and they account for about one third of the total provincial budget.

If you look at health budgets, running at something like \$4,000,000,000 a year; and if you look at the number of OHIP claims processed, they are something in the neighbourhood of 60,000,000 a year, that's 5,000,000 a month; you wonder again how much of that is overutilization of the system.

I guess I disagree with many of my colleagues when I say we should try a deterrent fee. It has been tried in other places; but I don't look to other places, I think we could look after those who couldn't afford that fee, whether it be \$2 or whatever. It is not a question of the money that \$2 would raise; it is the fact that it might discourage some people who really are just looking for someone to talk to or who have problems of a nature not really requiring medical attention from attending a physician.

I would like to try that. Just looking at you now, Mr. Speaker, relaxed as you are and

seeming to suck in every word, I think maybe you would be in agreement with me.

Mr. Ruston: I thought it was going right through.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, I don't think it was.

Mr. Ruston: He is listening, yes.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is indeed. He always listens and he always understands; and he so often contributes.

Mr. Ruston: Make sure you are in order.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would conjure up all the resources at your disposal, not only as a member of this Legislature but as Deputy Speaker, and assist the Minister of Health in trying to convince people that perhaps we have to take another look at our program.

Maybe we should look at Quebec. We have been looking at Quebec in terms of national unity and other matters; maybe we should look at Quebec in terms of its medical or OHIP-type program as well.

I am truly concerned, if we find the program disintegrating because of the exit of doctors, and I think my friends across the House would agree with me.

Mr. Makarchuk: No, I am buying a one-way bus ticket to Texas.

Mr. Taylor: I don't think that is a realistic approach.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But surely you are in or you are out?

Mr. Makarchuk: Also suggest legislation where they can't sue you to collect the bill and they will all be back in OHIP.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think maybe we should review that schedule of fees. They are much higher, I know, in Quebec. But either a doctor is a member of that program or he is not. If he is not, there is no way his patient is going to recover anything from that plan. It may not be the answer here but maybe it would bear looking at.

I am also concerned in terms of some minor things we do that come out in the media as major events. I am happy, again, to have my colleague the member for Peterborough (Mr. Turner) here, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health, because he has some first-hand knowledge of these matters, especially in his own riding. I know he is attentive.

Mr. Renwick: He represents the hallmark riding.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I'm glad you recognize it as the hallmark riding, but I was mentioning communications. There may be some defi-

ciency in terms of our communications media, I don't know, but the way I sensed things out in the field in my community is people are genuinely concerned, if not afraid, of what is happening in terms of the disintegration of our health services in this province. Now that may be right or it may be wrong, but what I'm saying is there is that genuine concern, if not fear, out there.

The imposition of the \$9.80 co-payment fee for the chronic care patients is an example. I appreciate what has been done to accommodate the people who can't afford that. I understand the revisionism that's gone on in terms of the health program, but you cannot erase the matters that are on the minds of the people. They are concerned that they are going to be harmed in some way; they are going to be rendered penniless, they are going to be victimized or their husbands or their loved ones are going to be victimized by the system.

Maybe that's communication, and poor communication. Maybe once you do something then it's hard to undo it. It may be that when we are talking about programs like that we're really talking about small amounts in terms of the overall budget of the Ministry of Health, which I mentioned was about \$400,000,000.

The figures that have been given to me indicate there would be something like \$24,000,000 saved through this co-payment, of which 25 per cent would go to the hospitals. I don't know, I've been trying to verify that, but if those are the figures we are talking, \$18,000,000, all I can say is it's an awful lot of aggravation and grief and torment on the part of people in this province.

Another area I think could be pursued is the area of prescriptions. I know we're not anxious to take away any services given to people now, but I mention prescriptions because I think there's an obligation on the part of the doctors, the medical profession and the druggists not to unnecessarily prescribe. When they prescribe they should not write prescriptions for patent medicines or aspirin. I've heard of this type of thing happening. It may not be a big item, but I think it discredits the system we're trying to make operate. I think we all want to make it operate. I think we're all committed to the type of protection we deserve, that the people of this province deserve in the way of health care.

Another matter that troubles me, and one I think is of grave importance to the people of this province, is the area of industry. I'd like to talk about tourism in a few minutes,

if I can. It's the approach of management and labour which concerns me.

I know the New Democratic Party have views about this, very strong views I'm sure. I'm sure they're sure their views are correct. I haven't tried to examine those views, but I feel that unfortunately we seem to have taken on a very adversarial position in labour relations. It's developed more in terms of a contest and we paint the bad actors. It can be the unions, it can be management. We seem to lose sight of the fact that it's essential that all the people work together.

I take my mind back to days, and the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) I'm sure would appreciate the earlier days, when some of the problems in the legal system had to be rectified. I'm sure he's familiar with the Fatal Accidents Act and the need for reform in those areas.

[4:00]

If you want to go back to the Hammurabi code of law: "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." We would wonder about that today. In our legal system we have put a price on an eye, a tooth, a leg and an arm. We don't take someone's arm or leg or eye. We try to compensate in terms of money. We feel that's more civilized, and I think it is. But in the field of labour relations, it strikes me that we haven't become and we are not civilized.

Surely a system must be developed whereby we can settle disputes, knowing that there are a number of parties involved besides the striking worker and the management, whether it's the family of the worker, the community or the health of the economy. I feel we have to make a determined effort to resolve this.

I am sure that members across the way have examined it at great length. There were commissions on this type of thing. There was the Rand commission, for example. I am sure they probably wouldn't subscribe to much of this, but at least it was a start in dealing with the matter by bringing it out in the fresh air and trying to establish some credibility in the process. That report was made a decade ago by a commissioner who, I think, had some credibility in the field of labour relations.

I wanted to mention that today because I think as members representing constituencies that are made up of all kinds of people, who surely must have some common purpose of creating a sense of well-being for others and of enhancing our lifestyle, we must take these things, put them on the table and ask how can we resolve these matters.

I know we can't go to countries like Japan or some other country to extract from those environments a system that seems to work

there which we think might work here. I do believe, however, that it's time we explored more deeply the labour relations process so that we don't see the type of polarization that takes place today, the building up of hate on the part of people, a hatred and an uneasiness that permeates an entire community and which is going to be very difficult to discharge. It is going to take a long time to erase those memories from people's minds, regardless of who wins. We talk in terms of victories when we shouldn't be talking that way. Regardless of the outcome, we are going to have that feeling of ill will that I think is so terrible in our communities. I won't mention some of the strikes that are prominent today, but I do feel we have to tackle that area.

When I mentioned industry, I wanted to talk something about tourism because I represent and live in a riding which, as members know, is just a veritable jewel nestled in Lake Ontario. It is just a delightful piece of geography. When God Almighty made that first garden, I sometimes think it was Prince Edward county and that piece of Lennox on the mainland. I invite you all there as tourists.

Mr. Gaunt: Do you suspect that Norris Whitney and his sheep had something to do with it, too?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Well, we have those pastoral settings and a delightful sense of humour that I think no one should miss. I am sure my predecessor, who served my riding so well for 20 years, would be just delighted, if the members were to visit him and his sheep ranch and maybe breathe a little of that good country air; in some of the members' ridings, one can't really appreciate what good air is until one breathes ours.

But the same thing doesn't go for all our waterways. Maybe that is for another day, but I am happy to say they are improving. In improving I think they assist the tourist industry because, again, we were noted, and still are, for our fishing, both on a commercial basis and from the point of view of the angler; good fishing all round.

Of course, in terms of commercial fishing, it is more difficult lately because of the restrictions, restrictions that manifest the fear of PCBs, mercury, mirex, and, maybe, some other things that we haven't measured yet or haven't discovered.

But let me say we are graduating students every year in the sciences, with their sophisticated measuring mechanisms, who will be able to determine new dangers to our health. Then, of course, we can implement new regu-

lations and new prohibitions to further reduce our tourism and our commercial fishing.

But seriously, in the eastern basin of Lake Ontario we have one of the major commercial fishing industries. It is a delight indeed.

Our tourist industry, I think, needs a shot in the arm. I am happy our Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) has become more aggressive in regard to this area. In a recent speech he indicated that steps would be taken to grade accommodation. So that when a tourist comes into an area he will know the type of accommodation he will be getting. I think that's good. We haven't had that in this province.

Mr. Makarchuk: We will be watching the budget.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am sure it won't cost anything or we might not have it.

Something that will cost something is the announcement that the sales tax will be rebated to tourists; I think that could be important to our tourist operators.

I am somewhat concerned about the price of our gasoline—and the fact that gasoline is now being sold in litres instead of gallons. If the Imperial gallon wasn't confusing enough to the American tourist, I am sure the litre will be. But in any event there is supposed to be an education program, or an indication on the pump explaining just how the litre converts into an American gallon.

Mr. Gaunt: Just multiply by five.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That might take away some of their apprehension in terms of the acceptance of costs in this country. As the members know, in the past I have been concerned about our service centres—at least some of those I know. Some have been accused of highway robbery because of ever-escalating prices—

Mr. Makarchuk: Right on.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and I think that's an area that we as a government have some control over; it's an area we must get into. It is not just a question of adding a few folders or brochures about tourism. We could develop along these great highways of ours, centres, stops, or maybe even picnic areas.

Sometimes as I drive home during the week, and at the beginning or end of a week, I note those spots where we have these beautiful vistas often overlooking Lake Ontario. It is rolling country, and down in the valley there is a historic site. We have a tremendous history in our area and I am sure the history that is in some of your areas is a history that is not known, let alone ex-

ploited. We could have a place where tourists could stop off without feeling they are going to be victimized by some huckster, where he could maybe have a large map and see, through this information centre, some of the points depicted on that map, or some brief indication of the history and the heritage of these areas, and little detours where he could drive.

We don't have that now. I hope we do this because I think we could put tourism on a much higher profile in this province if we would do some of these things, which again, in my estimation, wouldn't have to involve a lot of money. The trouble is, as the members know, with government an idea, maybe a small idea, becomes a very big thing. By the time it goes through the machine, it is a major production. I don't look for that kind of a production. I am looking for something more modest and meaningful.

The Minister of Industry and Tourism has indicated he is going to ensure the tourist gets a fair exchange on the American dollar as well. I think public relations is a good thing.

Mr. Chairman—or Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; I see the Speaker has changed in body if not in spirit. I think we have to be very careful when we entertain our visitors in this province that we manifest the good will this province is known for, and that we be most vigilant in regard to imposing more regulations and fees. The announcement of a non-resident fishing licence, for example, of \$35 is something I believe is tragic. I don't think there is any need for that. I think it will do irreparable damage if we start advertising in that way. There may have been, again, a lack of communication on the part of the ministry or the media or the recipient of that information, I don't know. It is certainly not something that would attract visitors to Ontario.

I hope we don't get involved in an angler's fishing licence, either. There has been some suggestion that we have to generate more staff in the Ministry of Natural Resources, provide more fingerlings, more stocking, more management of our lakes, and we then have to attack the angler and extract a fee for that.

Mr. Makarchuk: No, no. You just improve your fisheries regeneration program. You read the reports, Jim. They will tell you the same thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Surely to God there should be something in this province of ours we can do without lining up for a licence.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's right. Put a little energy into that department.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If I feel on occasion I want to wet a line and then realize I don't have a licence in my pocket, I just wonder what the next step is going to be. I would think we are spending as much on maintaining clean air as we are clean waters.

Mr. Makarchuk: Too damned little.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It may be there will be a licence for that next. In any event, again, don't blame the angler for the pollution in the waterways.

Mr. Makarchuk: Right on. Blame the government.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't blame the angler.

Mr. Makarchuk: Put the finger right where it is. Blame the government.

Mr. J. Reed: He is going as far as he can go. Give him a chance.

[4:15]

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If I were to put my finger on anything or anyone in this Legislature, I would put it on the member for Brantford. That's what I would do. That's the only way one could exercise equity.

Mr. Makarchuk: You're totally unfair. You are assigning powers to me that are beyond my capabilities.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I understand he is omnipotent. At least, he indicates that in his committee work.

Mr. Makarchuk: I don't even smoke.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is a man of infinite ability; I read some of the stuff he writes. He is a man with tremendous ambition; I can sense that. In any event, as long as he helps us with our clean air and our clean water, and doesn't assess blame on the angler—

Mr. Makarchuk: What are you getting paid for, Jim? What is the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott) getting paid for?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I wouldn't want to comment on that.

Mr. Makarchuk: Neither would I.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He might question that pay. I can tell the member he is performing more than his pay would represent. There is no doubt about that. I sometimes wonder why one would subject himself to such punishment as to be Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Makarchuk: Well, why doesn't he start doing his job?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It certainly can't be for the money.

Mr. Makarchuk: We are trying to provoke him to act, that's all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is doing the best he can. In fairness, the members know it is a very difficult task, regardless of who might hold that portfolio. It could even be a member of the New Democratic Party or the Liberal Party. I can tell the House, it is not an easy task. Leave politics aside, as the members may do—I was going to say as the members may have done in the past although I don't think so, but hopefully as they may do in the future—and be fair. They know darned well it's a tough job and it's going to be a long process to clean up our environment. I am talking about our total environment.

Mr. Makarchuk: Have you ever considered not messing it up initially?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It took a long time to mess it up; and we are not going to clean it up in a few days or a few years.

Mr. Gaunt: I agree it is a tough job, and it is even tougher for an aging government.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I look at the member and his youthful pose and I just wonder about the credibility of the opposition in that comment. It sort of destroys that remark.

Mr. J. Reed: Are you generalizing?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am generalizing now.

Mr. J. Reed: I hope so.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I was looking at the youthful appearance and vigour of our Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: He got mugged in the corridors, too, you know, the other day.

Mr. Gaunt: By the mandarins. By the mandarins in the Premier's office.

Mr. Acting Speaker: There is a little too much banter going on here. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox has the floor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether you are getting me out of a tough spot, or whether—

Mr. Acting Speaker: I'm trying to get myself out of a tough spot.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I wonder about that. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I did promise I wouldn't speak too long, because there are some to follow me who have a tremendous contribution to make.

Mr. Ashe: Not likely.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I had hoped some time to speak on this whole issue of Ontario's involvement in terms of constitutional change. I see the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) has a resolution, if I am not mistaken,

before the House. I think it is important that we as representatives of our people, of our constituents, have some forum and have a voice in what posture our government is going to take. I hope the government then can get a sense of how the people we represent feel about this very major issue, a most important issue. That type of negotiation isn't performed in the isolation of this House, and I am convinced that it won't be. I am sure we will have an occasion later to debate that. I look forward to that particular debate.

We have a problem in terms of the economic health of this country and this province. We have things happening in our economy that are illusory in a way, that are deceptive in a way, that seem to lull people into a false sense of security. I don't think this year is going to be a happy economic year. I don't think people have begun to suffer as they may suffer, but hopefully won't have to if government and the people have the will and the determination to do something about it. Again, communication and levelling with the people is so important, but I will reserve some comments in regard to that for the budget debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you very much for your attentiveness and almost politeness in keeping not only order in the opposition but the remarks of the members to a minimum. Now, if I may, I would—

Mr. J. Reed: You can have another hour yet.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, I don't want any more time.

Mr. Nixon: You could use a previous speech.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I was anxious to get on to some other things and I keep pulling myself back. I haven't talked about the milk marketing board, I haven't talked about our cheese factories, I haven't talked about our cheddar cheese people, I haven't talked about our mandarins and the bureaucracy, nor the back alleys. I haven't talked about Ontario Hydro, nor have I talked about energy and the policy of the federal government. I haven't talked about the confrontation-type of politics that I am afraid is going to adversely hurt this country in dealing with other provinces and dealing with the federal government in terms of energy.

I haven't talked about those things—and I don't think there's time today to talk about them, because of the speakers who have indicated an interest to speak this afternoon—but some time I would like very much to talk about those and to give examples and to give my views in regard to those areas that are so

essential in the period in which we live. The absence of energy, if one can contemplate it, is just incomprehensible. We don't have a civilization without it. The job—and we have the parliamentary assistant to the minister here—that this government has to ensure a secure supply of energy for the people of Ontario I think is one of the most important jobs in the country today.

I think the biggest problem we have, of course, is to convince the people of this province that we have a problem and if there was ever a need for communication there is a need for communication there. If there was ever a need for provincial policy and provincial strategy and a national policy—not a federal policy where provinces are disregarded, but a truly national policy where you have the consensus, where you have the co-operation of the provinces which have the energy and those who don't have the energy but may have other things—it's right now. We have to do that.

There's a lot of work to be done in terms of good provincial relations and there's a lot of work to be done in terms of federal-provincial co-operation, and in my view we don't get that through confrontation-type politics or confrontation-type dealings. I hope and I am sure that this province certainly will take up that challenge and iron out some of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell on that matter today because I know there are speakers who are anxious to get on before 6 o'clock.

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today for me to respond to some of the things presented in the throne speech on March 6 and perhaps add a few other comments.

Coming from the large rural riding of Grey, I naturally look for items that would be of benefit to agriculture, small business, industry, tourism and senior citizens. I say senior citizens because we have an above-average number of senior citizens in our area compared with other areas of the province and below-average accommodation for them in regard to senior citizens' apartments and homes for the aged.

A Grey county committee started to work on a home for the aged for the town of Durham in early 1975. They found out that in the province the home for the aged system utilizes 28 beds per thousand residents over 60 years of age. In Grey county there are only 17 beds per thousand and in the Durham area, where this new facility is proposed, only four out of every 1,000 residents use a home for the aged. This points out that people cannot use it if it isn't there.

But if it has been proved beyond a doubt that the need is there, which it has, then I think we should move to get these places in place.

I have delivered anniversary scrolls to couples in the Durham area who have celebrated their 50th and 60th wedding anniversaries and also their 90th birthdays. They ask me: "When is Durham going to get a home for the aged and more senior citizens' apartments?" They tell me they are unable to maintain their residences any more and shovel the snow, et cetera, but are forced to remain there because there are no facilities. The villages of Holstein and Chatsworth are other areas that are going through this gruelling process of trying to obtain senior citizens' apartments.

When these are all well-established government programs that don't really cost the government much money and ones in which the community participates, and when it has been established that the need is there, why do we have to drag out these procedures for years and waste a lot of time and money before we get on with the job?

With these homes for the aged in place, it will take pressure off hospital beds as well. I will tell members why a little later. The Ministry of Health wants to keep people out of hospital and is trying to do this by closing hospital beds. This seems to me to be a backward way of taking pressure off hospital beds.

My son veals calves at home on the farm. He has several hospital pens for sick calves. He likes to have one or more of these pens always empty in readiness for an emergency. I have an interest in this business, as the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) has an interest in the hospitals. If I said to Steve that his expenses were too high and he must close some of these hospital pens, he would object strongly. Furthermore, if I forced it, he would have more dead calves.

I just can't see closing hospital beds. Of course, I will admit it is better than closing hospitals. But some people feel the government is still trying to close these small hospitals by cutting beds, putting the hospitals in an uneconomical position and then saying they must close because they are inefficient.

The government had to admit that these rural hospitals were efficient when they tried to close them before. It was consistently proved that they were economical, and much more so than the large city hospitals. Our rural hospitals were operating from about \$70 to \$90 per bed per day while the large city hospitals were operating from \$200 to \$300 per bed per day. We understand the

large hospitals have more equipment, which makes up some of the difference, but not all the difference.

The Ministry of Health feels that doctors are putting patients in hospital beds without a good reason. In our area, it could be that some of these hospital patients could go to nursing homes, if there were any nursing-home beds available, which there aren't. Some of these people might not have reached a position that put them in a hospital, if there were adequate homes for the aged where supervision and facilities would be available to them.

If you were a doctor, Mr. Speaker, what would you do with a person who is living alone who you find is not sick enough to go to a hospital but too sick to be left alone, when there is no room in a home for the aged and no nursing home beds? There's nothing else for the doctor to do but to put the patient in the hospital.

I believe there is money to be saved in the health system, but closing hospital beds is not one of the ways. It is a great concern why we have so many health problems. It is a great concern how to cut health costs. There is one place where we could kill two birds with one stone, and that is with tobacco and alcohol.

[4:30]

It is a well-known fact that alcohol and tobacco are injurious to our health. Anything that injures our health is bound to increase our health-care costs. We could put enough tax on all alcoholic beverages and tobacco to double or triple the cost of the product. This would discourage its use, and all the tax collected could be turned over to the health budget. Advertising of these products could also be banned.

On December 12, 1977, the Ottawa Board of Education passed a resolution, which reads as follows: "Whereas the attitudes of students are deeply influenced by the media, that the Ottawa Board of Education deplore the advertising for alcoholic beverages carried on television and radio networks; that the Ottawa Board of Education invite the provincial and federal governments to take action to correct the present situation; that the Ottawa Board of Education invite other boards of education and separate school boards in Ontario to support this motion."

This resolution was endorsed by the Grey County Board of Education and sent to me. I wrote to the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), the then Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, sent him a copy of the resolution and said I sup-

ported it and felt that such advertising should be banned. The minister's reply to me states: "Interestingly, those jurisdictions which have banned advertising have seen the largest increases in per capita consumption. Any change in our current philosophy of controlling and monitoring beverage alcohol advertising would cost many hundreds of jobs, loss of industry and perhaps only result in increased exposure from US television, over which we have no control."

At the start of the paragraph he says that where they banned advertising there was more consumed; but, before he finishes, he says that if advertising were banned there would be a loss of industry. In my response to that paragraph, I would start with the same word he used: "Interestingly." Interestingly, that paragraph does not make sense.

Mr. Ashe: There is an advertising industry, you know. That's what he's talking about.

Mr. McKessock: Oh, it's not the liquor industry?

Mr. Ashe: No.

Mr. McKessock: Does the member agree that liquor consumption would increase if we banned advertising?

Mr. Ashe: I don't know. If that's what he says, that's what he says.

Mr. McKessock: That's what the minister has stated.

Mr. Ashe: At least I listened to the letter once and knew what he was saying; that's more than you obviously did.

Mr. McKessock: I am glad the member has helped him out in this regard, but there is part of this that is awful hard to understand.

I sent the same resolution to the Minister of Health, and, interestingly, he never replied.

I believe the doctors have to take some responsibility and make some input into how these savings can be made. They are in a good position to know in what areas money can be saved and should come forward with some good advice to the Minister of Health.

I also believe that all doctors should stay in the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. If their fees are too low, then negotiations should take place about the OHIP fee schedule. A user fee could be charged for each office visit or doctor's visit. This could also help in cutting down on frivolous calls.

I am sorry that we seem always to have to react and fight against things that have happened to us that should not have happened to us, such as hospital bed closings and registry office closings. The Niagara Escarpment Act is another thing that should not have happened to us. I am pleased that, after

all the presentations to the government and the Niagara Escarpment Commission and complaints from people in all parts of Ontario about the proposals brought out in February 1978, and the presentation of my bill, Bill 62, An Act to amend the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, the government backed off on the area it was going to control under this act.

Although it is good that the area has been cut down, for those of us who still live in the area under these controls not much has changed. We hear rumours that the final plan—and I am glad the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle) is in the House—when it is put before us later this year will be more acceptable. It had better be, or the government will have a bigger fight on its hands as this plan comes down to the wire.

I fail to see how this plan for the Niagara Escarpment area will ever be acceptable until it is turned back to the local municipalities to control through their own official plans and zoning bylaws. This could be done right now: disband the Niagara Escarpment Commission and stop this useless waste of money and duplication of planning.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: You don't mean that, do you, Bob?

Mr. McKessock: I do mean that, sir. I have here a newspaper article headlined "Maloney Justifies Firing Investigator." Interestingly enough, he has been hired by the Niagara Escarpment Commission. I hope this isn't where the government picks up all its personnel—from among people who have been fired because they have had extensive police investigations done on them. In the statement, Maloney says after he read the police report on Mr. David Cossett, "I was even more alarmed. The public would have been outraged if I had kept him in my employ." Members know my objection to the things which have been happening in the Niagara Escarpment. We wonder if this is where the government obtains its staff.

I might also mention that last Friday night at a meeting in Warton of the Northern Ratepayers' Association, at which 400 people turned out, they were just as alarmed as they were one year ago. It is too bad, and I certainly hope this new plan will soon be before us in a much transformed way from what the proposals were last year. Cutting back the area was fine, but for those of us who still live in the development control area, really nothing has happened.

I receive letters from people who say they don't know who to support because it seems

all three leaders are in favour of the Niagara Escarpment Act. To be fair to both opposition parties, I must point out that in 1973 when this act came into force, it was supported only by the majority Conservative Party.

The NDP did not support it because they didn't think it was strong enough. It is a lucky thing this country was developed before the NDP party and some of these environmental groups were around.

Mr. Makarchuk: The NDP is not the NDP party, which is being redundant. Let's be accurate: New Democratic Party or NDP, not NDP party.

Mr. McKessock: I apologize. It is lucky this country was developed before the NDP and some of the environmental groups were around—

Mr. Makarchuk: If we had been around you would still have some of the country left. As it is, it is owned by somebody else. You have sold the damned thing.

Mr. Ashe: If you were in power, we would still be back in the horse and buggy days, I agree.

Mr. McKessock: This country would never have materialized.

Mr. Makarchuk: At least you would own the horse. Right now it is owned in New York.

Mr. McKessock: We would still be in the bush and—

Mr. Ashe: I would rather have it owned in New York and be able to drive it.

Mr. McKessock: —no one would have been allowed to cut a tree or build a log cabin.

Back to the party leaders: I was at a public meeting in the St. Lawrence Centre in Toronto the night it was jammed to the rafters with environmentalists and Toronto folk. The NDP leader was there together with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, the minister in charge of this whole mess for the government, the Liberal leader (Mr. S. Smith), and Mr. Gertler, who dreamed up some of this protection plan back in 1963. We have been spending needless millions of dollars on the plan ever since.

Of the three party leaders that night, the Liberal leader was the only one who stood up and said we must support the landowners and their property rights, and he was booed for doing it.

The NDP would take away all property rights.

Mr. Makarchuk: Baloney.

Mr. McKessock: This country was built on property rights and ownership of land.

Mr. Van Horne: They don't draw many votes in Grey county, do they, those NDPers?

Mr. McKessock: Call it tradition, call it culture, call it whatever you like, but do not destroy our country by dismantling the pride we have in ownership of property and the expected and cherished rights that go along with it.

Mr. Makarchuk: Like who owns our manufacturing industries, who owns our oil industries, who owns our resources? How about answering that question, if you want to talk about the country?

Mr. McKessock: In Grey riding, we're more concerned about our land.

Mr. Makarchuk: Look after your own selfish ends, is that what you're saying?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. McKessock: When you have a Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act that infringes on your rights, then it's up to you to defend them.

Mr. Makarchuk: How come you don't defend the takeover of resources?

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Grey has the floor. Will he please ignore the interjections and proceed.

Mr. McKessock: The members have seen what the Conservative government wants to do to them. They brought in the act at a time when they had a majority government, when very little could be done to stop them. The 1975 election slowed them down, and 1977 made them choke. If they would just choke once more and swallow the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, we could proceed with some sense of accomplishment.

I notice in the Niagara Escarpment Commission's latest issue of Cuesta—

Mr. Makarchuk: Who has to pay for the escarpment?

Mr. McKessock: —the chairman, Mr. Ivor Mullin, is still saying: "We welcome your comments and we value your input; let's hear from you." They've heard plenty from us but they don't listen very well. Their own advisory committee, set up by the commission and comprising people felt to be knowledgeable and fair about the subject, told them to scrap their proposals before they were made last February 1978 because the advisory committee knew they were not acceptable. To my knowledge, the commission members have never met face to face with their own advisory committee but only through staff. They seem to want to keep a certain distance between the Niagara Escarpment Commission

and their own advisory committee. "Let's hear from you," he says. They still have hope that from somewhere out of the Niagara Escarpment will come some supporters.

Now I'd like to switch to agriculture. I'm sorry the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) isn't in the House; he was here a few minutes ago. Out of a 28-page throne speech, four small paragraphs were devoted to agriculture. If that shows the emphasis this government puts on agriculture, it is very small. Agriculture has always been regarded as the backbone of our country but it won't stay that way unless some attention is directed to it.

Ontario has always been a leading province in agriculture but Quebec is gradually leaving us behind. Most of us free enterprisers do not like many handouts and subsidies. But what do you do when a neighbouring province gives all kinds of incentives to farmers and allows them to update their facilities and become more sufficient? It happened with milk. We in Ontario are complaining because we don't have enough milk quota now, although we did not fill our quota a few years ago. That allowed Quebec to take some of it.

We used to be the Canadian leaders in hog production. Because of low-interest loans and capital grants to Quebec farmers by the Quebec government, Quebec is now the leading hog producer in Canada. One year ago the Ontario agriculture minister, at the southwestern conference in Ridgetown for Ontario pork producers, said Ontario hog producers should consider expanding their enterprises. He noted that Canada now imports large amounts of pork. He regretted that Ontario was no longer the largest producing province. He said Quebec killed 131,500 more hogs last year than Ontario. While the minister was saying Ontario should consider expanding, Quebec already had given its farmers the means to expand. They responded, pushing Quebec into number one position in pork production. They moved from a 72 per cent self-sufficiency in 1974 to 105 per cent now. [4:45]

Where would the government get the money to support agriculture the way it should? It could start by shifting a little and putting first things first. It could take the \$6,500,000 used to subsidize the Ontario Racing Commission for starters. Right now Quebec is giving grants of \$20,000 to a farmer who wants to get into the feedlot business. I don't like grants but if we want to maintain the industry and have our farmers competitive with Quebec farmers,

then we must see that we have the same opportunity.

Mr. Makarchuk: Ford has no reticence about accepting grants and I don't see why you should worry too much.

Mr. McKessock: Right, I am glad the member brought up that point. The government was not long in giving Ford Motor Company \$28,000,000 to keep the car business booming in Windsor and in Ontario and make it competitive with the US. Is agriculture not as important in Ontario as the Ford Motor Company?

Mr. Makarchuk: I agree with you.

Mr. McKessock: We must keep a close eye on agriculture in Ontario both in the farmland preservation area and in our production units. If we are going to have a tile drainage program that gives six per cent money to some farmers to tile drain, we must see that enough money is available so all farmers who tile drain receive this money. We cannot credit ourselves with a program that only helps some. I believe in equal opportunity for all and this is not what we have been getting. If we are going to have a dairy herd improvement program to test and record milk production in herds, we must provide this service to all who want it and not just to some.

I would like to talk about industry and small business for a while. The same thing applies here. If we are going to give grants to Ford Motor Company to expand in Windsor, we had better be prepared to give grants to Kroehler furniture company in Durham to expand. If we are going to give grants to Reed Paper to install pollution control equipment, then we had better be prepared to give grants to Peppler-Sklar in Hanover to put in pollution controlling cyclone systems that the Ministry of the Environment is pushing for. We must not lose sight of the fact that these small industries are just as important as, or even more important than the large ones. If anything crippled Peppler-Sklar in Hanover, which employs 365 people, everyone in town would be affected from the barber to the tax collector. I doubt if Windsor would have fallen if Ford had not built its addition there.

We must remember also that at least 60 per cent of our jobs are in the area of small business. Eighty per cent of the jobs created last year were from small business enterprises, businesses employing fewer than 20 people. Seventy-two per cent of all jobs created in the last eight years have been created by such small enterprises and these figures are from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. This proves how im-

portant small business is and how we must encourage and support it.

The section in the throne speech on tourism, another important part of Ontario and Grey riding, was two short paragraphs, mainly on the "We treat you royally" program, a program that nobody seems to care too much for. What has it done? It has made a lot of lapel buttons. They say this year they are going to train 25,000 tourism employees on how to treat people. I feel the resorts in Grey are already treating people royally and would rather have seen the 10 per cent tax dropped off meals in restaurants over \$6.

I would like to say a few words about our so-called energy problem. I am quite sure we do not have one. We could be self-sufficient in energy if we wanted to without any trouble. We have enough farmland to grow energy crops unless we allow our farmland to get paved over. Methane gas production from manure could make most farmers self-sufficient. We could make more use of the wind and sun. As for nuclear power, it appears to be unlimited.

It is unfortunate that the government has spent so much of our money on nuclear power and gone so far beyond our needs. If I were the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) or the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller), I would not cry about it too long but would take steps to sell it, even if incentives had to be given to do this. Here we have power we cannot store, sitting there ready to be used, costing us money whether we use it not.

I am one of the eight per cent who heat their homes electrically, and I like it. My wife likes it even more; there is no dust, no drafts, even heat in each room, or different heat in each room if you prefer.

Mr. Martel: And the price is right.

Mr. McKessock: Yes, it costs a little more, but it is better. You drive a better car at a little more cost, too.

Does it not make sense to give a \$500 or \$600 grant to those who would install electric heat? It turns something that is sitting idle into a money-maker. You start to use that energy and get paid for it; you will not be long getting your \$600 back, and then it is gravy.

Before I close, I want to come back to another issue to do with senior citizens. We need some form of subsidized taxi service in our small towns and villages to allow senior citizens to get to the stores, doctors' offices, et cetera. I am thinking of small places such as Palmertson, Harriston, Clifford, Chatsworth and Dundalk, where the population ranges from 500 to 1,800 people; they are not large enough to support a full-time taxi.

Surely, when the Toronto Transit Commission is subsidized to the tune of \$105,000,000 a year, there could be a few dollars to help the senior citizens in places like Palmerston get to the store.

Mr. Speaker: It has been a pleasure for me to respond to some of the things in the throne speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Applause]

Mr. Warner: Almost all my colleagues applauded. I will have to work on that.

Before I begin, I realize that all members of the assembly would want to indicate that the throne speech should in no way reflect upon the integrity and good office of the Lieutenant Governor. She is a fine person; I have had occasion to meet her, and I know she would not wish in any way to be held responsible for the speech we had to endure.

I might also say before I begin that I certainly appreciate the reappointment of yourself as Deputy Speaker, and I would like to say to the Speaker, who is not with us at this moment, that I also appreciate his reappointment.

New Democrats across this country fought for some long time to bring good medical health care to the citizens of this country. Both at the federal level and throughout many provinces my colleagues in the New Democratic Party fought hard over a long period of time to wrestle medical care away from the private interests—those who viewed it as an opportunity to make money—and to bring instead a program which said that every person had the right to proper medical care and that it was a social responsibility of the government to provide medical care.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that when we finally got it, when we finally convinced the Liberals in Ottawa that they had to bring in the program, it was written into the agreement that universal access must be guaranteed. We progressed in Ontario along those lines and, until a little while ago, we had almost reached that stage where we could say with some pride that we had a public health program which was available to every citizen and was available with equal access to all. Now in the last few months we see that universal access is being threatened.

In fact we see that the very existence of a medicare program in Ontario is being threatened. And for what reason? It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, and you know it as well as I do: Because those private interests are sharpening their talons; they are sitting on

the sidelines ready to pounce at the very opportunity when our public program disappears and they once again can enter into the insurance market and once again assure us that some citizens in Ontario will not have access to the health care program: health care at a price; health care to the highest bidder.

It is quite interesting, I had several calls on the weekend from my constituents. One gentleman in particular phoned and said, "You know, I believe in the private enterprise system. I have no quarrel with doctors offering their services to whoever can afford to pay the extra amount. That's fine. They are perfectly free to do that in my opinion, but not in our publicly-funded hospitals. Surely I, as a citizen, when I go into that hospital, can be guaranteed that the fees I paid for OHIP, through my premiums and taxes, will cover the services. I, as a believer in private enterprise," he said, "do not understand why that should be allowed to occur in the public hospitals."

Of course, I said, "I agree with you completely. I don't understand why the government is allowing this. I have no idea why they would do such a thing; but they have." This man gave me his case of having attended the Scarborough General Hospital where he required the services of an anaesthetist—I always have trouble with that one, but Hansard spells it properly so I don't have to worry.

Mr. Van Horne: Just call him the gas man.

Mr. Warner: Because all the anaesthetists are opted out at Scarborough General Hospital he received a bill. He has no choice. He cannot select an opted-in anaesthetist because there isn't one. He received a bill. He was incensed. How was it that someone could use publicly-funded facilities, after he has paid his premiums and after he has paid his taxes, and then get a bill? I don't understand it either.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read you a suggestion: "Commends to the attention of the government a system of negotiating fees and utilization rates concurrently, so as better to promote the two objectives of quality care and cost containment without economically penalizing medical practitioners.

"If, for example, the government were to negotiate a multi-year agreement with the profession, incorporating a substantial increase in fees in exchange for a commitment to hold constant the level of utilization [decelerate the revolving doors] both these objectives could be achieved. To ensure cost containment the fee increases for subsequent

years could be made contingent on the utilization performance in the first year.

"Such a scheme has now been successfully and amicably negotiated in Quebec and seems to be working very well on the basis of early anecdotal reports. It appears that such a scheme would address the legitimate concerns of the medical profession over the level of fees, as well as the need for responsible cost control by the government. If so, the vexing trends in medical practice and in opting out might be reversed or at least mitigated."

[5:00]

Did I make that suggestion? Sounds reasonable enough to think that I would have made such a suggestion. That suggestion was put forward and agreed to by the members of the New Democratic Party, the members of the Liberal Party and the members of the Conservative Party who were sitting on that select committee on health-care costs; there was unanimous agreement on that suggestion. The committee, also unanimously, went on to say that: "User fees—" and that's what the extra billing is—"by definition shift costs to those who are sick and therefore undermine one of the basic foundations of the scheme. The committee contends that, to further penalize those who are sick, usually a condition beyond the control of the patient, would have a very adverse, compounding effect upon what are already unfortunate circumstances.

"In summary, having weighed all the evidence presented to it very carefully, the committee concludes that user charges for medical care are inappropriate at this time. Since supplementary charges by opted-out physicians are a form of user charges, the committee is concerned about recent increases in the rate of opting out, particularly in some communities where most physicians have exercised this option. The committee is sensitive to the underlying causes of the dissatisfaction of these physicians and urges the government to reconsider the mechanism for establishing the level of benefits under OHIP."

Committee members, including the Conservative members of that committee, were unanimous. We saw that we have a serious problem in the province with opting out, and we have a serious problem with access to our medical care system. The committee put forward a reasonable solution to the problem; a solution which is being used currently in the province of Quebec, and used successfully.

What was the government's response to this? Nothing. The Minister of Health refused

to take part in the debate on the select committee report. He was given the opportunity; he was offered time in the debate, it was to be set aside for him to participate, and he refused. He again refused in the House, under questioning, to consider seriously the suggestion put forward by the committee. It appears to me that the committee's work was a waste of time.

The committee had excellent counsel. It had the use of economic specialists, people who were specialized in medical economics. It had the use of top officials in the Ministry of Health. It had the undivided attention of several members of this assembly. It applied itself for quite a few weeks, and came up with a pretty comprehensive report and a very reasonable suggestion as to how to handle the current problems; and they are serious problems.

They are serious problems, because unless we solve them the public health care system we fought so hard for is going to disappear, there is no question about that. When one examines the facts; when one examines what is happening in our system, how access is being denied to those who cannot afford to pay; when one looks at the change in the regulations allowing doctors to bill not only in their office but to use the public facilities in order to extra-bill—to have their cake and eat it too—then one knows that our health care system is under attack.

Now we are into the political forum where we can do nothing else but fight, opposition against government, fight hard to retain our public health care system. The shame of it is that a select committee of this assembly, with representation from each of the three parties, sat down and in a spirit of co-operation examined the problem and came up with some reasonable suggestions; and this government, particularly the Minister of Health, in a cavalier fashion tosses those reasonable suggestions aside. Instead, it decides to kowtow to the private interests. I suppose the minister will receive an award from London Life at some point as they wait for the day when they can bring in their inequitable solution.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you very plainly that I will not rest until we have rewon public health-care coverage for the people of Ontario. It is a right; it's not something that's open to the shop. When one runs a public hospital or operates a doctor's office, it isn't like running Mr. Submarine. It's just not that kind of business. It's a social responsibility and one which this government should be taking seriously.

I know as well as any member of this assembly that the doctors have concerns. I

understand some of those concerns. After all, I not only sat on the committee but I went and personally visited two hospitals and spent a couple of days there talking with the doctors, the nursing staff and the patients. I got a much better and deeper understanding of the problems which physicians face.

Certainly, I would be very upset if I had done work and wasn't repaid for three months. That's what happens to a lot of physicians. They put their bills into OHIP, and because the government doesn't know how to run a computer system it's three or four months before they get back their cheques. That's a legitimate concern of a doctor and it should be of any person who is paid a salary. I understand that. I also understand that in this age of computers the government should know how to run a computer system.

Mr. McClellan: You should get Allen Gordon to show you how to run it.

Mr. Warner: What's interesting is that when one examines the health-care system in the province of Saskatchewan, one finds that under similar circumstances most doctors aren't unhappy. One of the reasons they're not unhappy is that within a couple of weeks of putting in their submissions they get paid. Their system is so well refined that a doctor can see a patient and opt in, and see the same patient the next day for a different matter and opt out, go through the billing system and receive his cheque within a couple of weeks. No wonder the doctors in Saskatchewan are happy.

Our doctors in Ontario would be happy too if they had the benefit of that good government scheme, but they don't. Instead, they have a fumbling government which doesn't know how to run a computer system.

They're not hollow words, Mr. Speaker, I sat watching in awe as officials from the Ministry of the Treasury battled with officials from the Ministry of Health over whose figures out of the computer were correct.

Mr. McClellan: They don't even know how many subscribers they've got.

Mr. Warner: Do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? When we talked about those people who would be eligible for premium assistance, the Ministry of Health told us in round figures that there were about 1,000 people who were eligible for partial premium assistance; but the Ministry of Treasury in the same government said 163,000 people. As it turns out under scrutiny, the people from Treasury were right. The people from Health didn't know how to run the computer.

That's one of the reasons the doctors are so upset. They call it bureaucratic harass-

ment. Why they say harassment is that unless that claim is settled within six months the claim is denied. The physician may have entered his claim on time and may have provided what he thought was the correct information, but through the government foul-up in the computer system he ends up by having his claim take six months and then be disallowed so that the work he did is not credited. No wonder they're upset.

The reason the committee proposed taking a look at a multi-year contract with the doctors is that we understood clearly from the doctors that because they haven't had what they view to be a sufficient increase in the rates they have decided to see more patients. In our common language, that is a revolving-door medical practice. If the rates don't go up for visits, just get more people through the office. They feel they have to do that.

We said: "Fine; why don't we enter into a two-year or a three-year contract, with the second year being dependent upon the utilization rate of the first year? If the utilization rate doesn't go up, you will get an increase in your rates. If the rate does go up, you won't get an increase in your rates. Fair?" It was fair to the doctors in Quebec, it works there.

But oh no; that can't even be considered by the Minister of Health. He won't even discuss it in this chamber, as I challenged him to last week. He prefers instead to evade the question and to cater to the private interests.

The minister should no longer enjoy the confidence of this House; that's for sure. He's made a botch of this whole thing, from start to end. The result of it is that in some communities in Ontario they don't have the luxury of a choice. In some hospitals, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, there isn't any choice.

He had the audacity to stand in this House the other day and say the patient will have the choice if he insists. I ask him to put himself in the position of a patient lying in a bed in the hospital waiting surgery when the anaesthetist comes in and says: "If you insist we can get an opted-in anaesthetist, except there aren't any in this hospital. I'm sure if you insist and lie here for a while we'll find one from some other hospital."

That is total nonsense; that isn't going to happen. A patient isn't going to insist on his right for an opted-in doctor as he lies in his bed waiting for surgery the next day. The minister doesn't even choose to be reasonable.

What bothers me as well about the hospital situation is that because of the cruel cuts which have taken place the hospital staff are forced to work under some extraordinary circumstances.

I was astonished, quite frankly, when I visited Scarborough General Hospital on Friday, February 23 of this year, and spent six and a half hours there, to learn that, on average, each day there are 275 patients in the emergency ward to be dealt with by a handful of staff and that they are dealing with them in cramped quarters. When I say cramped quarters, I'm talking about the total emergency facility space being smaller than the space of this chamber in total. That includes operating rooms, the X-ray facilities and the waiting room. The supervisor in charge of the total emergency service has a broom closet, a real broom closet, with the world's smallest desk placed in it.

The conditions under which that staff are operating are absolutely phenomenal. If that's not bad enough, the chief nurse in charge, Ms. Nora Murphy, the supervisor of emergency services, told me it has reached such a crucial situation in Scarborough General that she is afraid that one of these days she is going to misplace a patient in the emergency ward.

There are so many people that they cannot handle them. When they come in they are assessed quickly and sent off to different places, some to X-ray, some to the operating room and some to be seen by a specialist. She said: "We have too many people for the space and not enough staff. I am going to misplace a patient one of these days."

During last year more than 100,000 people came through the emergency doors of Scarborough General Hospital. Many of those people had to wait in the corridors on stretchers. Many of them waited six, eight and 10 hours for help. Many of those were elderly people, because Scarborough General is forced to serve the needs of elderly people from nursing homes from as far away as Stouffville and Port Elgin, down into the southern portion of Scarborough, and out into Pickering and Durham, and into the York region. Those elderly patients, if they do not have a truly emergency situation, will wait six, eight, 10 hours to get help.

[5:15]

It's not the fault of the staff. The staff was more than diligent. The staff was more than cheerful in the way it went about its business. The doctors, the nurses, the nursing assistants; all of them were trying to

move as quickly as they could and cover as much territory as they could.

I guess the real crunch for me came when Ms. Murphy said she'd been at the hospital 21 years—she was there at the time when the hospital was run by the sisters—and over this period of time the worst change she had seen, because of the cruel cuts of the government, was that no longer was there time for tender, loving care by the nursing staff.

Some members may think that's not important. They may think that's something frivolous. Unless you've been in a hospital as a patient trying to convalesce, you can't really appreciate what "tender, loving care" means. It's that extra attention from a nurse to find out if you are comfortable. "Would you like some reading material? Do you need a visitor? Have you had a visitor for a while? Would you like someone from the clergy to come and visit you? Is there something we can do for you besides the purely medical treatment you're receiving?" That's not possible any longer at Scarborough General—

Mr. Hennessy: Tender, loving care.

Mr. Warner: —nor, I doubt, anywhere, including Thunder Bay, because of the hospital cuts, because of this government's activities.

Mr. Hennessy: More so.

Mr. Warner: That's not the worst. This visit, I remind you, was on February 23. As of April 1, Scarborough General was being ordered to cut back a further three quarters of a million dollars.

I don't know where they're going to cut. There is no plush carpet to roll up. There are no fancy chairs to get rid of. I saw all of those administrative facilities. Do you know where they're going to cut? They are likely to close down one of the operating rooms one day a week.

Do you know what that does? That cancels electives; which in turn means that someone, at 10 a.m. on the morning he was going to go into the hospital, will be phoned at home and told: "I'm sorry, despite all the arrangements you made at work, the arrangements for day care, and your psyching yourself up for this operation, don't come in today. We don't know when you should come in, but we'll let you know." That's what's going to happen. It happened about 300 times at Scarborough Centenary Hospital last year. It's likely to happen more often this year.

It's obvious that I, or any member of the opposition, could go on at great length regarding the public health-care system, because I feel very deeply, as I know mem-

bers over here do as well, that this system for which we fought so hard is under attack, and that unless we maintain our vigilance, unless we're able to confront the government directly, that system is going to disappear.

Mr. Ashe: Don't worry about the money; easy come, easy go.

Mr. Warner: While the member for Durham West has absolutely no concern for the public health-care system, while he's rich enough to pay the bills—

Mr. Ashe: Give it away.

Mr. Warner: —his constituents aren't.

Mr. Ashe: No. I'm worried about my constituents; that's the difference. They pay the taxes too.

Mr. Warner: As long as I can breathe I'll fight for a health-care system, because it's a basic right and because it's a necessity in this society. No matter how hard this government punishes the health-care system, I'll fight and I'll fight, and this public will be heard.

Mr. Nixon: As long as you draw breath.

Mr. Ashe: Hurray, hurray.

Mr. Hennessy: For God's sake don't fight Rotenberg, that's all.

Mr. Villeneuve: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I do want, first to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the speech from the throne. I'd like to say that we have the addition of two very capable representatives in the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson) and the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Ramsay).

I do want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for the way you keep order in this Legislature. Sometimes it is not easy, but nevertheless you meet those responsibilities very well, and so does the Deputy Speaker.

A lot has been said about hospitalization and OHIP. I happened to turn on the television a few weeks ago. The President of the United States was making his address on the state of the union to the Senate and Congress. He spent a great deal of his speech assuring the American people that his government would do everything possible to keep down the cost of hospitalization.

They are not, in that rich country, covered the way we are here. It is quite easy to criticize and find fault. It is costing us almost \$11,000,000 a day. Yet, some of these people who fought so hard to keep down the OHIP costs to the individual are now demanding that we have better services. In any business you have to tailor your costs to your means.

We would like to be as humanitarian as they are. Nevertheless, hospitalization costs

are very burdensome on all taxpayers in this province.

I have a slip here. I spent nine days in Toronto General Hospital. I asked for my bill because there had been a lot of discussion and I was curious. I waited for a week or two before I got it. It didn't cost me a cent. I happen to be in that golden age group, I do not pay any stipend. The rate was \$206.55 a day; for nine days that amounted to \$1,858.95, but it didn't cost me a nickel.

On top of that, because I happen to be a member of the Legislature, as is every other member, I am covered by London Life with semi-private protection. That bill came to another \$99.00. All I had to pay was 40 cents a day for the use of the telephone—\$3.60.

I just tell you about that, Mr. Speaker, to give you a general idea of what the actual costs are for people hit with sickness. That could be higher today. Admittedly, the cost is not as high in rural hospitals because they don't have the same facilities that hospitals in Toronto have. Still, it is a very costly business.

It is very true that we are all concerned because doctors are opting out. I have spoken to doctors in the rural communities. They are well satisfied because a small municipality has a medical centre. They talk matters over and say: "We will charge you a fair rate. We should get more, but you are performing a service in the community that we need. We will spread it on the taxpayers."

Mr. Nixon: Usually the doctors own it.

Mr. Villeneuve: They are reasonably well satisfied. I do know they may be a little slow. That is new to me—it wasn't brought to my attention about the bills coming in—but I know they are very happy that they don't have to collect most of their bills themselves.

Admittedly, in an urban area like this where you have specialists with high rents to pay, who have to pay increased salaries and one thing and another, there is an understandably serious problem. But the minister is working with the OMA and trying to resolve it as best he can.

I heard the member refer to Quebec. Let me say they can force their people and say: "Here, you've got to do that."

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Villeneuve: But that has not come about in Ontario. We are still a province of free enterprise where we have the right to worship and do as we like as long as we're within the law. That does not always exist in Quebec in that manner.

Mr. Nixon: They have compulsory church in Quebec?

Mr. Warner: They worked out a deal with the doctors.

Mr. Villeneuve: That's quite all right, but at a much higher rate than we pay here. That may be some of the fault, but where does the money come from? It's costing over \$4 billion a year right now.

Mr. Warner: Less than the United States.

Mr. Nixon: The federal government pays that.

Mr. Villeneuve: They put in their share, but they equalize it across the country. In Newfoundland it's a lot cheaper than it is here, as the member knows—

Mr. Nixon: We're better off than they are there.

Mr. Villeneuve: They take the average right across, so as a result our dollar shrinks every way, percentage shrinks as well.

But I'm not finding fault; it's a wonderful service. Limited as it may be according to some, it's still perhaps one of the best services there is in the world today.

Mr. Warner: Fight to keep it there.

Mr. Villeneuve: Some find fault today with community services.

Mr. Nixon: Probably yours.

Mr. Villeneuve: But no matter what service there is, once the government takes the initiative to try to serve the public they demand; they demand more and more, but when it comes to an increase in taxes they become furious. Whose fault is it today if there is an enrolment falloff in the schools? Who are you going to blame, the government, because the people are not raising the families they did?

Mr. Worton: No, the pill.

Mr. Nixon: What have you done lately?

Mr. Villeneuve: We are caught in a position where the costs are going up, and yet I think it's about a four and one half per cent increase the school boards are given to settle with their teachers this year. There's not one board I know of that has settled within that percentage range. So again, somebody has got to pay the difference and the poor taxpayer is going to be involved.

In these times it is not easy to govern at any level, whether municipal, provincial or federal. We are all prone to find fault. But some of us who lived in the depression will realize we are living in a great country; it is a happy world as far as this country is concerned, with not too much trouble. Yet there is more discontent in households than there ever has been. The poor are trying to live like the rich; there's no distinction. Every-

body is driving good cars; they've all got the facilities in their homes they need; whether they are bought on credit cards or anything else, nobody does without. But when it comes to having to pay, that's a story that's altogether different.

Mr. Warner: Come on, Osie; 25,000 in poverty right now.

Mr. Villeneuve: I'm not going to dwell on this too much. I think the government has taken a sound approach to the economic problems that are confronting not only this province but this country—

Mr. Warner: Should take a sound beating.

Mr. Villeneuve: I think a government that's been in power—they may say that we're tired and old, sometimes we can't deny that; but you compare this province to—

Mr. Nixon: Not you, Osie.

Mr. Warner: Decrepit; decrepit, worn and senile.

Mr. Villeneuve: —the rest of the governments in this country and you can understand why 50 per cent of the immigrants who came to Canada since the war have come to settle in Ontario. Something has attracted them here. It wasn't because it was a Conservative government, it's because it was a good government; that's what attracted the people.

Mr. Warner: If this government keeps it up they will ask to leave.

Mr. Hennessy: Because of loving care.

Mr. Warner: Punishing everyone.

Mr. Villeneuve: I have different things to speak about, but one thing I do want to speak about is the dairy industry in general. I'm not being too critical because, after all, I have 160 of the best dairy farmers in my constituency who enjoy a very valuable market in the city of Montreal. They ship their milk daily there and have been doing it for 70 years.

[5:30]

I also have another 80 or 85 who ship to industrial plants, but the federal government—and rightly so—has voted so much money for so much production of industrial milk across this country. Agreement has been made for a certain allotment. That was set in 1971. I'm not blaming anybody in general, but we never had too much of a problem in eastern Ontario until the new chairman of the dairy commission in Ottawa came on the scene.

The gentleman's name is Mr. Choquette who was a very valuable organizer for the Liberal Party in Quebec. They like him there, and I can understand that.

Mr. Nixon: We should have made him chairman of Hydro.

Mr. Worton: He had an axe to grind.

Mr. Villeneuve: Facts are facts.

Mr. Nixon: It was terrible of those Liberals to do that.

Mr. Villeneuve: We agreed in 1971 on the overall picture of industrial milk production in Canada on a total allotment of 443 million pounds of butterfat. Admittedly, there was no doubt that that had to be revised because a surplus was created. The federal government lost millions of dollars and just had to place the surplus in storage and sell it off at a very low price on the world market. In April 1977, the figures were revised. I want to give this here so that members will understand exactly what I am trying to say.

Mr. Nixon: We will listen.

Mr. Villeneuve: Ontario came into this system in 1970, the same as Quebec, which is the major producer of milk. Quebec had for its share 196,800,000 pounds butterfat. Ontario had 148,000,000 pounds butterfat. That was later revised. Admittedly, in eastern Ontario, we had very poor years in 1972, 1973 and 1974.

Mr. Nixon: We voted a lot of money to help you.

Mr. Villeneuve: In the case of our producers who were in pool one, that milk was transferred to supply the needs of the city of Toronto, which was fine. That was the best market, the best return and the most essential place to look after in diverting that milk. But the pool two shippers who shipped their milk for use as industrial products were penalized for it because that was used against them when the revision came in 1976. Strange as it may be, Quebec province kept building their herds and kept building their production in spite of going over their allotted production, they still were given a far more favourable consideration when this revision was made. Of all the millions of dollars that were spent to support butter and to support skim milk, 80 per cent of it was caused by overproduction in one province, Quebec.

I am not at this time trying to divide this country. Goodness knows, we are trying to bring it together.

Mr. Nixon: No, they are all good fellows.

Mr. Villeneuve: But facts are facts. When this revision was made, Quebec was cut from 196,800,000 to 177,600,000 which meant—and this is what tells the story—their reduction was 9.6 per cent. In Ontario our production declined from 148,800,000 pounds to 116,000,000 pounds butterfat, or 32,800,000

pounds butterfat, which is a reduction of 22 per cent.

The provinces in the west—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—produce less than 15 per cent of the total production, while Quebec and Ontario produce more than 80 per cent, but they were cut 27 per cent, Saskatchewan 37 per cent and Alberta 32 per cent.

Production in the Maritimes only amounts to 15,000,000 pounds butterfat altogether, and their quotas were revised very little—they were just about the same. They have enough for their own consumption.

What I am coming to is this: We have processing plants in eastern Ontario that closed last year. A plant in Gananoque which employed 80 people could process 1,000,000 pounds of milk daily. The firm that owns that plant bought a plant in Rouyn-Noranda, Quebec, opposite northeastern Ontario. They are operating that plant, which has a capacity of 1,000,000 pounds when the full milk flow is on in the summer. Every pound of that product is manufactured and diverted to the city of Toronto to supply the Ontario market, and not one pound of that milk is produced in Ontario.

Our cheddar cheese factories are crying for milk. Cheese plants are operating at 49 per cent of their quota capacity. You cannot do that indefinitely in any kind of business, because operating expenses are going up, irrespective—the costs of hydro, oil, labour and everything else—operating costs of every kind are going up. But if you have a lesser amount to process, it means the finished product cost you more per pound.

The result is that we are putting the few small operators that are left to the wall. They are going out of business.

This is an independent report and this is what it says about the dairy products. I say to the Ontario Milk Marketing Board that they have some responsibility in this. They made this deal.

When we talk about the dairy industry, let me tell you why I speak of the cheese industry as being so important. Back in 1904, Canada exported 234,000,000 pounds of cheese, and more than 90 per cent of that was manufactured in Ontario. Eastern Ontario has never gone away from the manufacture of cheese; east of Toronto is where 90 per cent of it is produced. But since November and until Saturday, which was the end of March, we have had trucks that were hauling milk from St. Claire, Quebec, which is 25 miles west of Quebec City. In other words, so that you will understand it clearly, it is like leav-

ing the Ontario-Quebec border at the east end of my riding, right at the border, coming to Toronto, and going back every day, trucking milk; and yet we have people with no quota. The plants are operating at 30 per cent of capacity in order to supply the chain-store outlets here or lose that market during winter months.

That has been the situation for the last two years, and that is what is important. We have dropped 16.2 per cent in the production of cheddar cheese; Quebec's production has increased by 15 per cent in 1977 and 1978. I heard the member for Grey (Mr. McKessock) talk about the hog-raising business. What he said was very true. It may be true the farmers who wanted to go into dairy herds were given cheap money during those years to increase. I am not denying that at all, but when a rule is made and we agree to that on a national basis, on a percentage, what I want is a fair deal for the people I represent.

I am concerned. Mr. Speaker, let me give you a few figures. In 1966 when the marketing board took over, we had 16,221 producers in Ontario. Today we have 12,254 a decrease of over 24 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: How much more milk?

Mr. Villeneuve: Just a minute. In Quebec in 1966 they had 12,987 producers; today they have 24,984, an increase of 94.4 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: They had a Liberal government down there most of the time.

Mr. Villeneuve: Very true, and they had a Liberal government that was looking after their friends in Ottawa as well, if you want to be political.

Mr. Nixon: The federal Liberals thought we wanted atomic plants.

Mr. Hennessy: That's your boss. Don't talk about your boss.

Mr. Villeneuve: Let's give the facts. I am going to give a few facts the member is not going to like. This milk subsidy is a wonderful thing to the milk producers of Ontario. Nobody is going to deny it. But let me tell you this: Of the \$1,331,333,000 that was expended from 1971 to 1977, over 50 per cent of that—in other words \$667,973,000—went to Quebec.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Typical.

Mr. Villeneuve: I just want the members to know that. It is over 50 per cent. Ontario received \$426,886,000 which is 32 per cent. According to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck), our percentage of payment in the form of taxation in one way or another

to the federal government is 42 cents on every dollar. If you figured out the whole volume it cost Ontario \$130,000,000 more to receive that amount of money in that period of six years than we got out of it. So that is how it works there.

Butter: Quebec has averaged 130,000,000 pounds of butter per year. The consumption is roughly around 10 pounds per capita. They have 6,250,000 people, so the members can figure where the surplus has gone: to the Canadian Dairy Commission. Ontario averaged 78,000,000 pounds of butter per year. At 8,300,000 people, we are still importing butter. We still have two million more people to feed than Quebec.

It is interesting to note that over 80 per cent of the butter and skim milk powder purchased by the Canadian Dairy Commission in seven years was produced in one province, Quebec. All we are asking for is a little fairer deal for our people who can supply the milk, taking into consideration population and the market needs of our own province. After all, surely a farmer is entitled on a fair and equal basis to have a right to market his product on his own market. That is being denied the industrial shippers of eastern Ontario.

In 1976-77 and 1977-78, when Mr. Choquette appeared on the scene—

Mr. Rowe: The villain.

Mr. Villeneuve: —of the skim milk offered to the Canadian Dairy Commission, of the total of 239,100,000 pounds, 81.4 per cent was produced in Quebec in 1976-77. In 1977-78 the total Canadian production was 237,000,000 pounds of skim milk powder; the portion of percentage that was sold to the Canadian Dairy Commission was 82.5 per cent from Quebec.

[5:45]

When we have establishments that have to go to northwestern Quebec to buy plants to supply the market in case they lose it here in Ontario, and we cut down the production of cheese by 15 per cent because there is no milk allotted for it, something is wrong.

I am not trying to denounce the other fellow for getting everything he can, but I like to see fairness. An Anglo-Saxon couldn't get up and say what I am saying, because they would say over there that he was a bigot, but I will say it, because I am representing the people in my area. It doesn't matter whether it is a Frenchman, Scotsman or Englishman; when he hasn't got the dollars in his pocket, that's a different story. He is quite all right, and willing to go

along, but he doesn't want the other fellow with his hand in his pocket all the time.

I could talk about the DREE program, but I am not going to bother about that, because we will have an occasion, perhaps, shortly.

Mr. Gaunt: Go ahead.

Mr. Villeneuve: Well, if you want it, I'll tell you. Last year over \$160,000,000 was spent in Quebec and \$25,000,000 in Ontario. What is it going to be this year? Perhaps I shouldn't say that; the agreement is not signed yet. They have cancelled ARDA. We are hoping to have the agreement signed for drainage and so forth, which we need.

Mr. Nixon: Look at all the federal dollars in our atomic program.

Mr. Villeneuve: But here's something that's worthwhile looking at. The reason I say that is that we have industrial shippers, and so have Huron, Perth, Grey and Oxford.

Mr. Nixon: Concrete mausoleums.

Mr. Villeneuve: Those are the counties that are adversely affected with pool two shippers, as we call them. But I have one message for the milk marketing board: It now has control, with pool one, of 85 per cent of the total production of milk. Take the whole family into pool one, and see that they all get fair treatment, that the poor do not get the crumbs, that they are all treated alike—provided they produce the right kind of product. They are equipped to do that.

(This is very interesting: the total consumption of dairy products in terms of milk has declined by 22.6 per cent, comparing the five-year average for 1972-76 to that of 1952-56. This decline has been primarily the result of steady decrease in apparent consumption of fluid milk, which was more than 30 per cent less per capita in 1976 than in 1952.)

I have no fault to find with those well-established farmers who have enjoyed that market and produced. But they are living in an ivory tower. Nobody can get into that market unless there is a shortage, nobody in this province. They are protected. They also produce industrial milk, and almost 60 per cent of the milk they produce in pool one fluid is skimmed down to two per cent or skim milk, which causes another 4,900,000 pounds of butterfat that is taken from the industrial shipper in the members' areas and in mine.

The result is that of the 2,200 or thereabouts—2,179, I believe—of pool two, according to the last figures, in terms of quota that means 60,000 pounds MSG apiece. Let me tell the House, there are a lot of farms in

my area where, although it wouldn't solve their problem, it would resolve a lot of their financial burden if they were only given that opportunity to increase quota.

I repeat, with factories that are operating at 30 per cent, hauling milk with a round-about as far away as 580 miles, and farmers who cannot sell it and these trucks going by their door—something is wrong. I do not blame the Canadian Dairy Commission altogether for it. The milk marketing board has performed a very wonderful service in general for the dairy herds and the dairy farmers of Ontario. But they did not do the job for the industrial shipper that could have been done. I will go that far.

I read this: "The per capita volume of fluid skim milk apparently consumed in 1975-76 was about eight per cent of the volume of partly skimmed milk. Per capita consumption of skim milk powder has remained relatively stable over 25 years. The five-year average is varying between four and a half to seven and a half pounds per person.

"On the other hand, some dairy products have shown trends towards increase in apparent consumption over the 25-year period. Per capita disappearance of both cheddar and process cheese has increased 140 per cent."

Based on the five-year averages for 1972-76 compared to 1952-56, we are allowing that industry to go down the drain. I do not blame the people of Quebec. They are building a plant that will process as much as 50,000,000 pounds of process cheese. In Ontario last year we had six applications for renovations to already existing plants or permits to build new ones. They were turned down, every single one of them, because there wasn't a sufficient supply of milk to go around.

I can only say we want justice; fair treatment. That is all we are asking for.

In 1976, cheddar, apart from that used as an ingredient in the manufacture of other food products, constituted 23 per cent of the total cheese consumed, and process cheese about 39 per cent. The remainder was under other varieties of cheese made from whole milk and creamed cottage cheese. Although relatively small in amount consumed, it has shown a generally steady increase over the past 25 years. Ice cream also has shown a generally increasing consumption trend over the years, although consumption appears to have stabilized at about two and three quarter gallons per person annually during the most recent years.

I know a number of young farmers who have taken over their farms from their

fathers. We force them to become modern, to renovate their buildings. The result has been that they have thrown away the cans to meet the requirements—which is good; it is producing a better-quality product. But instead of \$15,000 when they bought modern milking equipment and got the milk house built and they had a contractor come in to make an estimate on modernizing the barn, nine times out of ten he told them to forget about renovating the old buildings and to build a new barn.

They talked to their bankers and their bankers said, "Go and see the Farm Credit Corporation about this. You are milking 30 cows; they're the people to deal with." In good faith the Farm Credit Corporation agent came out and said, "If you want a viable operation you should try to increase your herd to 50 cows," which was sensible. But he has ended up with \$70,000 to \$75,000 of a mortgage yoked around his neck. His father was perhaps old-fashioned, careful, shrewd, did not want to go in debt, but told the boy, "If you want to take it over, take it over."

These people have got a quota of 200,000 pounds. Some of them have 225,000 pounds as their quota. They are begging to try to get more. They can produce more. They can grow all the feed they need in order to try to meet those obligations. We need the products right here in our home market, yet they're denied the opportunity to produce. We've gone down 24 per cent in total numbers in the last 16 years in milk producers. We're not producing the amount of milk we did then, but we didn't drop according to the numbers because, as the members know, there are better herds and there's better management.

Mr. Nixon: More water.

Mr. Villeneuve: There's more money coming in. Let's admit the truth. They're feeding better and getting more production. Nevertheless, they're the people for whom I feel sorry. The well-established farmer who's been going on for years never had it better. Let's admit the truth.

I talked to a beef cow man the other day—it wasn't a beef man—who sent a holstein cow to Montreal and came back with over \$1,150. He didn't know what to do with the money. He didn't need it too badly. That's generally always the way.

Mr. Nixon: He could save it to pay taxes.

Mr. Villeneuve: He didn't need it too badly, not compared to some.

We all know, in fairness, those days are not going to last forever. The market is here

now. These people have the opportunity, if given a reasonable increased amount of milk quota, which I believe in all justice and fairness they deserve because the product is sold here.

The situation is this: I spoke to an exporter two weeks ago and he told me if they had aged cheese, which they haven't got, they could sell 1,000,000 pounds to Britain. It's not to be had in Ontario. They were told in Ottawa to go to Quebec. They said, "We want Ontario cheese." Our name has been established there since before I was born for producing top-quality cheese, yet this is what's happening. That's sad enough, but I repeat, we have not got a system working

that gives a man who's trying to meet his obligations and is willing to produce the milk a chance. The processors are crying for it, and hauling milk in that's costing them \$3 more per 100 pounds by the time the transportation is paid than it would have cost them to buy it here from the milk marketing board. A revision has got to be made. I say the responsibility is with the Ontario Milk Marketing Board to represent the industrial end of the dairy industry as well as those who enjoy the fluid milk market.

On motion by Mr. Gaunt, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday April 2, 1979

Point of clarification re physicians opting out of OHIP, Mr. Cassidy	601
Nuclear plant safety, statements by Mr. Parrott and Mr. Elgie	601
Road construction, statement by Mr. Snow	604
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. J. Reed, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Cassidy	605
Multicultural development branch, questions of Mr. Baetz: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy	607
Job creation, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Cassidy	609
Transportation of hazardous substances, questions of Mr. Auld, Mr. Parrott and Mr. Snow: Mr. B. Newman	609
Inco dispute, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Martel, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Laughren	610
PCB report, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Gaunt	611
CBC Connections program, questions of Mr. Baetz: Mr. di Santo	611
Tourism, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Eakins, Mr. T. P. Reid	612
Employees' health and safety, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Mackenzie	612
Welcome House, question of Mr. Baetz: Mr. O'Neil	613
Activities of WCB ethnic co-ordinator, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. McClellan	613
Four-death crash, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Stong	614
Niagara River pollution, questions of Mr. Parrott: Ms. Bryden	614
Tourist information centre, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Haggerty	614
Cable TV service in OHC projects, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Swart	614
Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. J. A. Taylor, Mr. McKessock, Mr. Warner, Mr. Villeneuve	616
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Gaunt, agreed to	639
Adjournment	639

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
 Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Baetz, Hon. R. C.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
 Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Housing (Ottawa South PC)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
 Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services; Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
 Rowe, R. D. (Northumberland PC)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Stong, A. (York Centre L)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)

Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 14

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, last Friday I undertook to advise the House of the design differences between the United States light-water reactor of the type used at the Three Mile Island, Pennsylvania, nuclear generating station and the Candu heavy water reactor used by Ontario Hydro at Pickering and Bruce.

At that time, I also undertook to report back to the House on various nuclear regulatory safety matters raised by some members.

Since then there have been suggestions that there is an immediate need for a review of nuclear reactor safety standards, and I would like to comment on these suggestions as well.

As honourable members know, there are a number of basic design differences between the Three Mile Island type of reactor and the Pickering and Bruce types of Candu reactor. I do not propose to deal with all these differences (although I am attaching schematic drawings which depict the two systems); rather, I propose to deal only with those differences that appear to be directly related to the difficulties being encountered at present.

It is important to keep in mind that at this point we do not know precisely what caused the accident. What we do know, however, are some of the consequences of that accident, and it is in that connection that we can compare the design features of the two reactors.

As honourable members are aware, there were early leakages of radioactive gases. One design feature of the Candu reactor which is fundamentally different from the Three Mile Island reactor is the vacuum containment system which exists at the Pickering and Bruce plants.

This vacuum containment system creates negative air pressure within the reactor building which causes the inside air pressure to fall below the outside air pressure. This means that, even if some radioactivity were

released from the reactor, leakage would be inward. Radioactivity would thus be prevented from escaping to the outside environment.

A second problem that occurred with the Three Mile Island reactor was fuel damage and resultant overheating of the fuel rods. While fuel damage could also occur in the Candu reactor, there is another fundamental difference in the design of the two reactors which provides added protection to a Candu reactor. In the case of a Candu reactor, the reactor core would cool itself as long as there were water in the boilers; even if all the pumping systems failed, the water would circulate naturally.

In addition, the Candu reactor is not as likely to suffer severe fuel damage because the fuel, natural uranium, is dispersed in 380 pressure tubes in the Pickering reactors and 480 pressure tubes in the Bruce reactors; these tubes are surrounded by cool, low-pressure heavy water. The result is that the uranium bundles are not in close proximity to each other. On the other hand, the Three Mile Island reactor fuel of enriched, highly radioactive uranium rods is in a dense configuration within a single pressure vessel. It should also be noted that the pressure tubes of the Candu reactor are horizontal and that the heat transfer system is above the fuel core.

A further feature of the Candu reactor is that there is a large volume of moderator water in the calandria which provides additional protection in case there is a need to cool the fuel. Even if the normal coolant in the tubes is lost completely, the presence of the cool moderator makes a so-called meltdown of the core extremely unlikely.

A third problem which occurred at the Three Mile Island reactor was the accumulation of a hydrogen bubble at the top of the pressure vessel. The Candu reactor does not have this type of pressure vessel. In fact, if hydrogen or other gases were produced in a Candu reactor under similar circumstances, the gas would be dispersed in the water transport circuit and could easily be removed.

These, then, are the relative differences in the design features of the two reactors

which are relevant to the major problems of which we now are aware. It would not be appropriate to speculate further until we have more information available to us. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have a scientific assessment team already in Pennsylvania and, as I will indicate later, we have been informed by the president of the Atomic Energy Control Board that his officials will participate in a full-scale review of the problems that occurred at the Three Mile Island reactor once conditions return to normal.

I would now like to turn to the questions which have been raised in the past few days concerning nuclear safety regulatory matters. These seem to fall into two broad areas: (1) the reliability of the emergency core cooling system and (2) the need for a review of nuclear reactor safety standards.

It has been alleged that certain internal working documents of the Atomic Energy Control Board (AECB) provide clear evidence that the emergency core-cooling system (ECCS) of Ontario Hydro's nuclear generating stations is not "satisfactorily reliable" and that the Inter-Organization Working Group (IOWG), of which Ontario Hydro is a member, is proposing to lower the safety standards for licensing of nuclear reactors.

Neither of these allegations is correct. In both cases the documents are being misinterpreted.

In the case of the ECCS, the issue being addressed in the documents is the ability to prevent fuel-sheath damage. Given present technology, Ontario Hydro and the nuclear industry cannot guarantee that such damage will not occur in every conceivable situation.

To protect the public in the event that a problem should occur, Ontario Hydro designs and builds into its nuclear plant a very effective containment system. AECB safety requirements are met by Ontario Hydro. What Ontario Hydro and the nuclear industry do is to build to the highest standards possible.

As for the lowering of safety standards, that allegation is simply not true. To clarify this matter, I am tabling today copies of two documents. The first is a paper prepared by the chairman of IOWG, explaining the basis for the proposed new standards. The second is a paper prepared by Ontario Hydro discussing the proposed new standards.

I might also draw to the attention of members that last November the AECB issued for public comment the entire report of the IOWG.

It has been suggested that the select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs be specifically charged with the responsibility of investi-

gating the matter of nuclear safety and be given permission to sit concurrently with the House so that it might begin work immediately.

First, let me make it clear that the government has no objection to the select committee investigating nuclear safety matters. However, the government sees no particular need to charge the select committee with this responsibility since, under its terms of reference, the select committee is already charged with the responsibility for examining Ontario's nuclear commitment, including:

- the performance and reliability of nuclear generating stations;

- the responsibility for, and the standards relative to, the safety of nuclear generating stations; and

- the environmental impact and health considerations related to nuclear power.

Quite clearly, if the select committee wishes to review nuclear safety matters, it may do so.

It has also been suggested that the select committee should begin sitting immediately. There is merit in this suggestion.

The timing of such a review in the context of what happened in Pennsylvania, however, is something which should be considered carefully.

I can advise the House that over the past few days we have been in touch with the president of AECB, requesting whether his board would be undertaking a review of Canada's nuclear safety standards in the light of the accident with the US reactor.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record a letter of today's date from the AECB president on this matter. It is addressed to the deputy minister, and it says:

"In response to your inquiry yesterday and to our earlier discussions last weekend with respect to a review of Canadian nuclear safety standards in the light of the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear power (plant), I wish to confirm the actions which are currently under way and planned.

"Recognizing the emphasis that we place on the prevention of accidents, and the complementary efforts that have been made in establishing effective emergency plans, the actions that have already been initiated are considered to be an appropriate means of ensuring that the public interest is served. It is important that these efforts not be hampered by a hasty misdirection of resources, and I have cautioned against taking any steps which could be counterproductive.

"There is available in the public record a wealth of information on nuclear safety, arising in part from the Saskatchewan in-

quiry headed by Mr. Justice E. D. Bayda and the Ontario Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning, chaired by Dr. Arthur Porter. The voluminous submissions and transcripts of hearings, as well as reports issued by Messrs. Bayda and Porter, constitute an impressive account of the arguments posed by persons on both sides of the nuclear debate.

"What is essential at this time, recognizing the significant differences between the design of Canadian and United States nuclear power stations, is an in-depth review of the Three Mile Island accident once the facts are known. In this regard, we have been in daily contact with the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the board's staff as well as nuclear safety experts in Ontario.

"Hydro and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited are constantly reviewing the information being provided. It is important to note, however, that the information provided to date by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is very preliminary, and neither the commission nor the board is yet in a position to identify the lessons to be learned from the accident. Until such time as definitive information is available, a meaningful analysis of the accident is not feasible.

"From the outset of our consultations with the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the commission has responded very favourably to our request that an in-depth review of the Three Mile Island accident be conducted with a view to sharing our respective knowledge. This, of course, is in accordance with our long-standing arrangements with the US on a bilateral basis and on a multinational basis under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the nuclear energy agency of OECD. As you might well expect, US authorities are of the view that the Three Mile Island accident is of more relevance to other US nuclear power stations of the Three Mile Island design and to similar stations abroad because of the fundamental differences between that design and the design of Candu stations. I might also point out that nuclear safety experts in other countries have often commented upon what they consider to be the uniqueness and comprehensiveness of the Canadian approach to reactor safety.

[2:15]

"On a more immediate basis, a scrutiny of the very extensive analysis of postulated accidents described in the safety reports prepared by the board's licensees will reveal that extensive, defence in-depth measures have been taken to prevent the Three Mile Island type of accident and, thus, to ensure

a high level of public safety. As you know, these safety reports are available for study by interested persons.

"In conclusion, and without prejudging whether or not a formal public review should be held once the facts of the Three Mile Island accident are known"—

Mr. Sargent: What a snow job this is.

Mr. Ashe: You don't know what he's saying anyway.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —"we are continuing to assess the information being relayed to us by the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As the investigation by the commission continues, we intend to ensure that all relevant factors are taken into account in our own assessment and to require Ontario Hydro and other licensees to examine the applicability of lessons learned thereby to Candu nuclear stations. I fully expect that US authorities will be equally interested in further examining the applicability of Canadian safety principles to the prevention of accidents such as that which occurred at the Three Mile Island nuclear power station."

Ms. Gigantes: Especially once we get into them.

Mr. Sargent: They were built by different firms. How could they?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That was signed by Mr. J. H. Jennekens, President, Atomic Energy Control Board.

The key issue is whether enough information is available at this time in order to have a meaningful review. We will be pressing AECB for that review to take place in a timely manner and have requested that our own experts be involved. We have been assured that they will be.

Once that report on the reasons for the Three Mile Island accident is available, it would seem appropriate for the select committee to assess its implications for Ontario. Until then, it would seem to be premature for the select committee to become involved in such an examination.

Honourable members are aware that we have a scientific assessment team in Pennsylvania. This team includes the co-ordinator, Dr. Arthur C. Johnson, who is executive co-ordinator, technology, of the Ministry of Energy, and a nuclear physicist. The members are: Dr. J. Harry Aitken, chief of the radiation protection service of the Ministry of Labour, who is a radiation physicist; Dr. K. Y. Wong, supervisor, central health physics services, Ontario Hydro, who is a chemist in radioactivity; and Mr. R. J. Kelly, who is the section head of the reactor safety group of Ontario Hydro and a reactor safety engineer.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: There is absolutely nothing out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister want to tell us when they went down there; when his team went down there? When did they go down?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable minister may continue.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The press release would indicate that. It was released on Sunday. When that team returns within the next few days I would suggest that the select committee may wish to get a first-hand report from its representatives.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, may I assure you and, through you, all members of this House and the people of Ontario, of the safety of the Candu system.

LEGAL AID TARIFF

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am today announcing the government's decision to increase fees paid to lawyers for services under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan.

Mr. Martel: Four per cent.

Mr. Makarchuk: Now we'll never see Albert Roy. Albert Roy will be gone forever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where is Albert today?

Mr. Mackenzie: What's the limit? Four per cent? What's the increase? Four per cent?

Mr. Cassidy: What about hospital workers?

An hon. member: What about jurors? What about people serving on juries?

Mr. Martel: Is that four per cent?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Just ignore the interjections, unless they're declaring a conflict of interest.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Laughren: Are they allowed to opt out of this plan?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: At the same time, I am announcing a number of administrative changes in the plan which are designed to ensure the most effective and efficient use of the public funds we allocate to this important program.

The new legal aid tariff represents the first increase since 1973, and in fact this long delay might suggest consideration of more regular reviews in the future. Calculated over the period since then, it represents an increase of approximately four per cent a year and an additional cost for the 1979-80 fiscal year of \$2,000,000.

Mr. Van Horne: Just give us the total.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: During the same period of time, I should say, the federal contribution to this plan has also been increased significantly. The new tariff is effective as of April 1.

For the six years the tariff has been unchanged costs faced by lawyers, like the rest of us, have of course risen substantially—

Mr. Mackenzie: Where did you start from?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —in relation to the four per cent annualized increase the government and the Law Society of Upper Canada have approved.

Mr. Van Horne: You get enough now. How much more do you want?

An hon. member: You are bankrupt now. How much more are you giving away?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I know members of the Legislature and the public will make comparisons, and properly so. In this regard, it is worth noting in the six years legal aid lawyers went without an increase, the cost of living rose 55 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: That's quite a case you're pleading.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think by these yardsticks, the increase is modest indeed, and reflects the continuing dedication and public interest tradition of members of the legal profession who participate in the plan.

Mr. Swart: What is the total percentage?

Mr. Martel: I see all the lawyers are clapping anyway.

Mr. Nixon: All the lawyers are applauding.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am tabling the new tariff under which some case payments will increase while others will decrease.

Besides these changes, there are a number of essential features of the new tariff I want to bring to your attention.

An hon. member: Give us the total.

Mr. Nixon: Will the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) sit still for this?

Mr. McClellan: Are lawyers able to opt out of the plan?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The fee levels on the criminal side of the old tariff were based solely on the court level in which the case was tried. If a lawyer elected to have a theft case tried in county court, he or she would be paid more than if the case were tried in provincial court. The new tariff replaces this system by fee levels based on seriousness of offences. There are four categories, ranging from those punishable by life imprisonment to those punishable on summary convictions.

Although the old tariff incorporated some block fees, the new tariff extends the block fee principle to more high-volume offences, making the lawyer's fee the same no matter how long the case took in court. This is a particularly significant area of cost control.

The new tariff proposes three levels of fee payment for both civil and criminal cases based on the actual experience of the lawyer in trial work, as opposed to a system based solely on numbers of years at the bar. It is anticipated that this system, by recognizing the expertise and efficiency which more experienced lawyers bring to bear on a case, will encourage experienced counsel to continue to offer their services to legal aid clients.

The new tariff provides the machinery for a standard form of account information, which will greatly assist in the assessment and payment of accounts particularly in the area of preparation for trial. One of the most significant areas of control is the application of a formula for the number of hours of preparation time for which a lawyer will be paid. Firm guidelines for allowed time for preparation are imposed. While my prosecutorial responsibilities as Attorney General would have made me reluctant to propose such limits in criminal matters, I was pleased to respond to this most responsible initiative from the law society.

In civil matters, the new tariff adopts a uniform schedule of payment which is applicable to most matters, abandoning in most cases the different fees now paid based on the level of court in which the matter is tried. A second change involves the increased control which will be placed on open-ended certificates through time limitations which will apply to lawyers at each stage of the litigation process.

Additionally, in family law matters, the new tariff reflects the significant changes brought about by the Family Law Reform Act.

The law society, which administers the plan, came forward with a new tariff proposal about a year ago. I told the law society's annual meeting in October that the cabinet had agreed in principle to a tariff increase, pending the development of mechanisms to ensure the most effective use of the available funds.

Mr. Nixon: I'll bet that was a split decision.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As a result, a working group of officials of my ministry and the law society met weekly for several months to review various options.

I am pleased to report there has been agreement on four important improvements. The first involves the establishment of a research bank. Since the plan was established 11 years ago, individual lawyers have done an enormous amount of research in preparation of their cases. The research has been charged to the plan, yet, once completed, it usually remains in the lawyer's file.

It is clear, as the plan has handled approximately 350,000 cases since its inception, there has been obvious duplication of research. The law society is now establishing a research bank to tap this resource material, build the amount of it and provide it to lawyers on legal aid matters and, for payment of a fee, to lawyers on private practice cases.

Mr. Nixon: You won't have to search a title every time it changes. How will you make a living now?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As a result, we expect a substantial reduction in the cost to the client for research.

The second improvement involves the use of paraprofessionals in case preparation. The law society is now working on the details of a pilot project in Metropolitan Toronto, involving the use of investigators and social workers in the preparation of cases. It is clear that lawyers spend a great deal of time performing non-legal tasks which could be performed better, or at least as well and more economically, by specialized investigators and social workers. The pilot project, details of which will be announced in the coming months, will determine whether it is feasible and an efficient use of funds for the plan to pay investigators and social workers for some of these tasks now performed by lawyers.

The third important change involves the establishment of an objective point system for the creation of a two-level criminal legal aid panel. This is distinct from the payment-by-experience element of the new tariff and will be tried on an experimental basis in York county. The right of the accused to select his or her own counsel is a cornerstone of the plan. However, in some cases it has become increasingly illusory with passing time. For example, at present there are more than 1,400 lawyers on the criminal legal aid panel in the Metropolitan Toronto area alone.

To compel an accused charged with a serious offence, who has no familiarity with lawyers, to choose a name from that list without background information to guide that choice amounts to little more than freedom to make what could be a mistake. The consequences of such a mistake fall not only on the accused, but also on the taxpayers

who bear the increased cost of inefficient representation. The two-level system will ensure a basic level of competence among all members of the legal aid panel, while at the same time identifying by objective criteria those criminal lawyers who are best equipped to handle serious cases.

Mr. Nixon: QCs and non QCs.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I mentioned earlier, the government and the law society have agreed to a system that would for the first time enable the plan to pay experienced lawyers at higher rates. The new tariff includes three scales of payment for most of the services which lawyers provide to legal aid clients.

Mr. Nixon: I want to be chairman of the appeal board.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Lawyers having the equivalent of four years, practice in criminal or civil litigation would qualify for the second highest scale and lawyers who qualify at the second level and, in addition, have a total of 10 years' litigation experience would qualify for the highest scale rate. For example, where the basic rate is \$42, a lawyer at the second level would qualify for \$48 and at the third level for \$54.

Mr. Nixon: It is still a great sacrifice.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: But it should be remembered that all of these rates are reduced by 25 per cent when the plan pays the lawyer.

An hon. member: We surrender. Just send us a memo.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The fourth point is also designed to ensure efficient use of funds. The law society has agreed to monitor very closely the process under which tariff rates can be increased in the discretion of a taxing officer in cases of particular seriousness or difficulty.

It is important to remember when dealing with the tariff that lawyers involved in the plan do accept an automatic 25 per cent deduction from all rates. This is done as part of the legal profession's contribution to legal aid and it represents a dedicated public service worth millions of dollars on behalf of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: A great sacrifice.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I appreciate that the former leader of the Liberal Party does not share the total enthusiasm—

Mr. Nixon: Stick to your notes. Just read it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) does with respect to the importance of this plan.

I would just like to say that as in most other matters when there is a conflict between the former leader of the Liberal Party and the member for St. George, I have no difficulty in agreeing with the member for St. George.

Mr. J. Reed: Now what about the general practitioner?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: This is done as part of the legal profession's—

Mr. Ruston: Is that the best you've got to offer?

An hon. member: You are repeating yourself.

Mr. Speaker: You see what happens when you stray from the prepared text.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: In conclusion, I should remind the members of the Legislature that it was Mr. Justice Martin who, as a member of the bar of this province, spoke of the legal aid plan during its infancy as "boldly and imaginatively conceived."

He said: "While modifications may from time to time take place, it may be confidently asserted that it is capable of making a great contribution to the administration of justice and it may well be a landmark in man's never-ending search for justice."

Mr. Van Horne: We want justice. We want you to sit down.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The new tariff modifications I have announced are part of the process of evolving the plan to better serve the public and is evidence of the government's continued commitment to providing our citizens with the finest legal aid system in the world.

Mr. Nixon: And to look after you.

[2:30]

ORAL QUESTIONS

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I will turn away from my first thought of having a question about legal aid and why they don't pay the lawyers in QCs since they don't cost as much, and direct a question to the Minister of Energy based on his very important statement today.

Would he not agree with me that it would be irresponsible if we waited until the American review of this special accident were completed, or if we were to wait for certain misinterpretations the minister referred to in his statement to be cleared up, before we took the responsibility as members of this House to re-examine the safety of the reactors that we have built and that are operating, and

that we are building and will be operating in the province of Ontario?

Might I ask him if he would suggest to his cabinet colleagues and to the Premier that the terms of reference of Dr. Porter, our royal commissioner in this matter, be amended so that he might work with and advise the select committee, which already has as its terms of reference the safety of these devices, so that we can without delay work in concert to make a recommendation to this House as to whether or not we agree with the minister's statement that these devices and these mechanisms are safe and that they should proceed to be operated and to be built in this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I think it is within the competence and the jurisdiction as presently given by this House to the select committee to look into the safety aspect. From what I read I think the honourable member might agree with that. As for when the committee might meet, I was speaking to the co-ordinator, Dr. Johnson, an hour or so ago and our group will probably be returning towards the end of this week, because it would appear that there isn't anything further that can be learned there immediately, although we will continue to be in close touch, through AECB, with the regulatory agency, and Hydro may still be doing some sort of advising function to the utilities there because of some other electricity supply problems they have.

I would think that it might be worthwhile for the committee to hear from that group when it returns and decide the course later on. I think there is something to be said, though, for tying in a review of the safety procedure with whatever lessons may be learned from the incident at Three Mile Island.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: The minister would recall the apprehension that he must have felt, and certainly that we all felt and continued to feel over the past weekend. Would he not think that a special reference by the House to the committee and also putting us to work together with the royal commissioner in this special area—since it has been indicated that he does have a large store of information, and it has been further indicated that he does not have all of the information that he has asked for from Hydro, even on the safety measures as well as the power planning work—would he not think that we are lax in our responsibility if we as a House and the members opposite as a government do not make such a special reference?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the select committee indicated yesterday that the select committee has the report with Dr. Porter's—I guess they aren't recommendations; Dr. Porter called them something else—observations of the results of the hearings, some 300 or 350 hours of hearings that his royal commission had on this matter, and Dr. Porter might well be of assistance to the committee as a witness, or some of his staff might be, but it didn't seem necessary to have him seconded to that committee.

I would only comment that Dr. Porter's own royal commission that is currently holding hearings, some rather important ones, having to do with the need for additional transmission in southwestern Ontario. His target is to report in the fall—I believe about the beginning of October—and, speaking as Minister of Energy, I am rather anxious to see him complete his task, which now has been under way for almost four years, I guess.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order and a supplementary.

My point of order is for the information of the House. Since the committee has a responsibility to proceed with this, it is just a question of the timing of it as to whether we do it in the summer or whether we do it more immediately. As quickly as I can co-ordinate it with the staff of the committee, there will be a meeting of the steering committee of the select committee to take all these matters into consideration.

My supplementary question to the Minister of Energy: I would like some clarification, if I could get it, as to what extent, if any, the Ontario survey team is being restricted in getting firsthand information as to what happened in the Pennsylvania tragedy. Am I correctly informed that the Ontario team is excluded from firsthand observation, as is being provided to all the representatives of the American-style plants from around the world, and that all it has is access to the daily briefings of the news media? If that is the case, does it mean that we are not going to get direct information from our survey team but, rather, we will have to wait until we can get it from whatever the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the United States provides to the Atomic Energy Control Board in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I suggested that the committee might want to meet with the team was that I am not in a position to answer that question definitively. I know they have been giving us reports which appear to me to have a fair amount of information in them; but exactly

who they have talked to, I am afraid I cannot give the honourable member that information.

Mr. MacDonald: Are they excluded from firsthand observation and taking secondhand accounts from whoever is briefing the press daily?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as firsthand observation in the plant itself is concerned, I am not sure whether they have been in the plant, but I do not think they are in the plant every day.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why is the Minister of Energy avoiding the prospect of seconding Dr. Porter as a consultant to the select committee? Why would the minister downplay probably the one person in Ontario who, first of all, has a wealth of information in his possession; who, secondly, has gained a very strong element of trust among the general public; and who, thirdly, will not be subjected to the vagaries of political posturing and political stances—

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, for heaven's sake, where is your political courage?

Mr. J. Reed: —which is what happens very often, and even when we attempt to be constructive, on a select committee.

Ms. Gigantes: What were you elected for?

Mr. J. Reed: Just let me finish. My friend can have her day when we meet.

Ms. Gigantes: Shame on you.

Mr. J. Reed: Why would the minister avoid doing that, knowing that Dr. Porter is so important to the reassurance of the people of Ontario?

Ms. Gigantes: Because we asked for political responsibility. Leave it to Porter, he says!

Hon. Mr. Auld: Again, I indicated that, speaking as the Minister of Energy, I am anxious to see his royal commission complete the whole task that it was given. But if one is to listen to the chairman of the select committee, who is aware and who, with his staff, has seen the observations that Dr. Porter has made, it would seem that any specific information or advice that he might give might well be given as a witness, even if it was for a week or two, so that he can continue with the hearings he is currently holding.

There may be those who, in the light of his statement that I mentioned yesterday about Hydro having the best system in the world, would say that he was not completely unbiased.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: At 3 p.m. on Thursday the minister told the House that he had a team down in Harrisburg. I checked that at four o'clock, and I

accused the minister of misleading the House. He apologized and said he had no team down there at that point.

Why does the minister tell us today that it took three days more, or almost a week after Harrisburg started, to get a team down from Ontario Hydro? Is this an example of how the minister is looking after our interests here?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I indicated on Thursday that I had unintentionally misled the honourable member because I was told that Hydro was monitoring it very carefully and I interpreted that as meaning they had somebody there.

We put together the team after some discussion with the other ministries. We had to make some arrangements so they would be able to meet the people whom they needed to meet to find out what was going on. I believe they left either Saturday night or early Sunday morning; I know they were there Sunday.

RYERSON FINANCING

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Premier, if I might have his attention for a moment, about the financing of the Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, which is certainly an institution and facility very dear to his heart since many of his political and administrative cronies are on the board.

What response can he make to the president, who has laid before the public the grave concerns that he has as to the continuing efficacy and usefulness of the institute, since its budget has been cut back to the point that it must withdraw from many of its programs which have been proved to be useful and popular; and since the institute, rather than the universities, is gathering more students and requires additional support?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the acting leader of the Ontario Liberal Party is certainly right when he suggests I have a certain affection for that great institution, which is well served by distinguished members of the board—none of whose names come immediately to mind—and by a president who was an excellent critic on educational matters in this House and generally supportive of the government on most issues.

Mr. Martel: Hardly. Now that is insulting.

Mr. Cassidy: It is misleading the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What does the member mean, it's misleading the House?

I would only say to the acting leader of the Ontario Liberals—listen, have you seen

the signs in Scarborough West, how they have changed? They do not say "Canadian Liberal" or even "Ontario Liberal"; they say, "Stuart Smith Liberal."

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Tit for tat on the editorializing. Now back to the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, how is he making out at Birchmount Collegiate at this hour?

Mr. Breithaupt: Very well.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to tell the acting leader he got more applause than his leader will get at Birchmount.

Mr. Sweeney: The people at Ryerson will be very interested in this answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ryerson will be very interested, because what perhaps—

Mr. Speaker: The question is, is there any money for Ryerson?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I do not think that is quite what the question was, Mr. Speaker.

I am informed—and I have to put it in that way—I am informed that Ryerson met the minister on March 13. The institution is coming back to see the minister fairly soon. I think perhaps what has emerged is that they are in the process of finalizing a submission to the minister. She told them prior to her departure for a few days that they would meet some time this month. So that is where it stands.

They are preparing a submission, which probably will have to involve the advisory committee on university affairs, or whatever the structure is, to see whether there should be some alteration in the weighting formula. But the institution itself is in the process of preparing an updated submission to the ministry.

Mr. Nixon: Would the Premier not agree that it is a tragic mistake in policy and administration, which he must share with his policy minister and the various Ministers of Colleges and Universities, that Ryerson would be treated as an institution just like the others, when obviously it stands alone in this province, not only in its mandate, but also in the role that it has played and will play in the education of the young people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted to hear the acting leader of the Liberal Party suggest that it is a unique institution. I can recall debates in this House, which he will recall even better than I do, when he was trying to relate Ryerson as being the same as most of the other community colleges. He will remember that discussion well, I think.

[2:45]

Mr. Nixon: Do you want that clarified, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no. We do not have time. There is also something to be said as one is developing a formula that there is a certain—

Mr. Nixon: As usual, you stood in the way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, we were right about the colleges and you people were wrong. You wanted the transfer courses and you wanted BA courses. You were all wet, and history has proved us to be correct. You know it. Even Walter—

Mr. Nixon: You went to Florida to find out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, no, I went to California. I never got to Hawaii, unfortunately.

Mr. Nixon: You are still wrong.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am no expert in these formulas, but I think that has to be taken into account as well as the maturity of Ryerson. In other words, they have been an established institution for a longer period of time with perhaps—and I emphasize perhaps—more alternatives in the terms of administrative procedures. I don't know.

All I can say to the honourable member is that the institution is coming to meet with the ministry. We do recognize—more than members opposite do—the unique characteristics, the great contribution, the calibre of its graduates and the role it plays in our educational system and in the economy and society of this province. Members opposite will never get me to say anything but kind words about Ryerson and its president.

Mr. Nixon: How much money do we pay for it?

Mr. M. Davidson: Kind words and no money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Money is another problem.

Mr. Cooke: Supplementary: Since Ryerson has been making its case to this government for quite some time now and since this government is supposed to have a commitment to manpower training and to the educational system's training people for specific jobs, why can't the Premier give a commitment today to fund Ryerson adequately before it is too late? The student ratio to faculty has already increased dramatically over the last few years. Where is the government's commitment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The fact that Ryerson is still not only doing an excellent job, but has been for the past number of years indicates that our policy really hasn't been too far off the mark. I really think that's fair.

Mr. Cooke: In spite of your policies.

Mr. Warner: Why are you punishing them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the honourable member that we have had requests for money from institutions from other parts of the province, though not the same as Ryerson. The leader of the Liberal Party for today is suggesting it is unique. I agree with that, although I would make a pitch that Sheridan College, which happens to be physically located in the great city of Brampton, could also do with certain additional funding for capital projects, et cetera. They are all unique.

Mr. Foulds: What's wrong with the local member?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Nothing is wrong. They have problems too. Everybody wants more money. Our task is to treat—

Mr. Laughren: Even the lawyers.

Mr. Van Horne: Why don't you give it to them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I hear rumours that members want more money on occasion, and I understand that. I would only say to the member in reply to his supplementary question, that my answer really is the same as I gave to the acting leader of the Ontario Liberal Party. The ministry will be meeting with Ryerson. We are quite committed to its continued existence. I can assure the honourable member it will continue to exist. Not only that, it will provide a quality educational program.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary: Is it possible for the Premier to draw into such a meeting with the ministry, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman), in view of the fact that that minister is prepared to fund industry in this province to create employment, when the public may be very concerned to learn just how many trained personnel we are bringing into this country because we lack that kind of trained personnel here who could be trained at Ryerson?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Why couldn't the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk have asked that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am the last one to get into any debate as to just what the scope of Ryerson's responsibilities may be. But I would point out to the member for St. George that a good number of those classifications of personnel that we lack in this province at this moment in terms of skilled trades really would not emerge from the kind of courses that would be offered at Ryerson in any event. I am saying a goodly number.

If there is a shortage of machinists or tool and die makers, whom some industries are now seeking, I am sure the member for St.

George understands that Ryerson is not the kind of institution that provides that type of training. As to whether or not the minister—

Mr. Makarchuk: How come you closed the machinists' training school at Burtch then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to the honourable member that is a separate, distinct and totally different issue—a totally different issue.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A totally different issue.

Mr. Renwick: New question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member for St. George that I am sure the Minister of Industry and Tourism would be delighted to attend such a meeting, but I really think the issue is, as I sense it from the press report and my brief discussion, arriving at a weighting that takes into account the total course availability at Ryerson—whether it does have some distinguishing characteristics that are different from the other colleges of applied arts and technology, what its relationship is in terms of the level of funding with our universities. This is something the committee has always been grappling with; we haven't achieved perfection.

I have no objection to the minister attending. I say with great respect—he is still here—I am not sure whether he could help that particular situation, but certainly I will suggest to the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) that she invite him. She is a very obliging person, and I know he will be delighted to attend.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question for the Minister of Energy arising out of his statement today and his statements in the House over the course of the last few days.

In view of the fact that the report of the Inter-Organization Working Group, which the minister referred to in his statement today, recommended among other things a fourfold increase in emergency limits of radiation exposure for members of the general public; a further tenfold increase in allowable radiation exposure if this new limit was uneconomic to meet; and recommended that regulatory limits on radiation exposure should be removed entirely, depending on the calculated probability of certain nuclear accidents, will the minister now direct Ontario Hydro to suspend its support for any such weakening of Canada's nuclear power plant

standards until we know just what happened in Harrisburg last week?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, this is a little complicated but I hope that I can explain it by reading this statement by the chairman of that group. This has to do with the proposed change.

He said—and I will be as brief as I can: “However, for assessing the consequences of postulated accidents a more comprehensive and realistic approach has been proposed.” That is how the chairman describes it—“a more comprehensive and realistic approach.” “In particular, failures have been categorized in six classes instead of two, according to their potential consequences and for each category an upper limit of acceptable frequency of occurrences has been proposed.

“The proposed values are such that the estimated risk resulting from each category of accident is equal to or less than the risk associated with normal operation of a nuclear plant. For an individual living near the plant this risk is lower than one in a million to contract a fatal cancer, an imperceptible increase above normal incidence.

“The risk of an event is estimated by combining the probability of the event with its consequences.” In other words, stricter standards for the more probable incidence and less strict standards for the very improbable incidence, which meant an increase in the anticipated radiation of, I believe, a maximum of 25, which was sort of across the board, to a maximum of 100 for the least probable and something like five for the most probable.

There is a scale which shows this both ways, but it is a little hard for me to describe.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister not aware that the Rasmussen report in the United States, which was the bible of probabilities about nuclear accidents taking place, has had its support withdrawn by the leading American nuclear agencies and that the accident in Harrisburg was also the kind of accident whose probability was so slight that it should never have occurred? Will the minister therefore agree to tell Hydro not to go along with any change in nuclear power plant standards, any weakening of nuclear power plant standards, until we know what happened at Harrisburg and until we have had the opportunity to reassess all the calculations about probabilities, since the calculations of probabilities that were made last summer by that working group, the Atomic Energy Control Board, must now be considered as no longer realistic or workable?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Ontario Hydro has one member of that working group, which I believe consists of eight people. Four are from the Atomic Energy Control Board, one is from Hydro and I believe the other three are from other utilities which are involved.

I should also remind the leader of the third party that Hydro in many cases exceeds the Atomic Energy Control Board's standards. They meet every one of them and in some cases, they exceed them. I just finished reading at some length the standards that were applied by AECB and Ontario Hydro in their plants which would prevent the kind of apparent accident that took place in Pennsylvania.

Mr. J. Reed: When the minister is considering the request of the leader of the third party regarding standards, would he make sure the consideration of standards be made in connection with the Canadian technology, understanding the parallels the leader of the third party is attempting to draw between the two technologies do not really fit—

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, come on now.

Mr. J. Reed: —and if there are problems with the Candu system they'll be a different set of problems—

Ms. Gigantes: Do you know how they do their probability studies?

Mr. Swart: Radiation is the same.

Mr. J. Reed: —and they won't have very much relationship one to the other?

Mr. Laughren: Weakened standards.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That's a very easy question to answer. As we all know, there's a great difference between the two systems. Consequently, the probabilities we deal with—

Ms. Gigantes: Why don't you put him on the Hydro board?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —are no doubt not all the same as those in the US or other systems.

Mr. Cassidy: Whether Hydro has one member out of an eight-man working group, or seven members of an eight-man working group, surely the minister recognizes that Ontario Hydro has by far the bulk of the Canadian nuclear power program and, therefore, quite legitimately the bulk of the concern of the public in Canada over what may be happening with nuclear power stations is going to be concentrated here in this province.

Why will the minister not agree to tell Hydro it must not support any weakening of nuclear power plant safety standards until we know what happened in Harrisburg? Why is he stonewalling the Legislature and why can't we have that assurance from this House to

the people of the province of Ontario who are very concerned about what may happen with the nuclear power plants in this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I thought I had indicated the report of the chairman of that working group really indicates the standards are being increased rather than weakened.

Mr. Laughren: For your own credibility, you should say yes.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question to the Minister of Health, in the absence of the Premier. In view of the repeated statements by the Minister of Health and also by the government of its commitment to retaining universal access to medicare, can the minister explain how that commitment will be implemented when in the community of Stoney Creek, 18 of the 24 family physicians have opted out of OHIP and three of the remaining six GPs are refusing to accept patients transferring from opted-out doctors?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Again, if the honourable member hasn't had a chance to read my statement of last Thursday, I would be glad to send him yet another copy. I think I made it clear that if there's any indication people are in fact not able to obtain the services, the Ontario Medical Association have agreed to assist in enforcing the principles outlined last Thursday, and to look at any particular case.

Ms. Gigantes: Only the OMA knows for sure.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can tell the member that to my knowledge I have not received any indication from any citizen in that community that they are finding a problem, but certainly, we'd be prepared to put to the medical association any particular problem, as per the agreement we announced last week.

[3:00]

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: In the first place, can the minister table the information he promised two weeks ago about the degree of opting out by surgeons and other specialists in various hospitals and communities across the province?

In the second place, can the minister explain how the agreement announced last week, which dealt with access to insured service in hospitals, is going to benefit people in Stoney Creek whose primary care is provided by family physicians practising in the community? Is the minister saying that people are going to have to go to hospitals and be insistent in order to get medical care? If that's the case, how does that square with

the cutbacks now taking place in hospitals which the minister is trying to encourage?

Mr. Warner: It's a mess.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As the honourable member knows, the latter is certainly not the case. In point of fact, "cutbacks" is a most inappropriate word to use.

Mr. Mackenzie: There were 15 more pink slips yesterday at the General.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: A shifting of priorities is more to the point. This philosophy has been advanced by everybody in this chamber: that is, that the priorities need to shift to take account of the changing needs in health care.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In point of fact, in that community, as in other communities, people travel back and forth between Stoney Creek and Hamilton and other communities for medical services.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What I'm pointing out is that there has been no indication—

Mr. Warner: In other words, the government is not going to do anything, right?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —whatsoever that anyone is having any difficulty getting access to services.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is not going to do anything, eh?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I understand the motivation of the member in trying to create a problem where there isn't one.

Mr. Warner: They fall into quicksand and the minister gets them a bathing suit.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: Did the minister have the opportunity to hear the president of the Ontario Medical Association speaking on a Sunday evening radio program broadcast in the city of Toronto? He indicated that he was not, on behalf of the association, going to stop counselling members of his association from opting out of the plan. Did he this morning hear that same person on a CBC radio broadcast? This time, he said he wasn't aware of any possible mechanisms by which the arrangement introduced into the House by the Minister of Health on Thursday, regarding supplying opted-in services within the hospital sector, could be arrived at. Has he a response to either one or both of those statements?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I didn't hear the broadcast this morning, Mr. Speaker. In that regard I can reiterate that what was agreed to last week was that the medical association

and the hospital association would begin discussions immediately to arrive at an overall mechanism. I can tell the member that the hospital association has written to all of its members, through its chief executive officers—

Mr. Cassidy: Only for the hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —indicating to them very clearly what had been agreed to—by the hospital association, the OMA and the government—to reinforce and restate the basic principles of the plan.

As regards the Sunday evening program, I heard most of it at home. I can't recall verbatim that particular section but it seems to me the answer was more along the lines that they are not engaged in a program of encouraging opting out.

While I am on that point. Apparently in my absence yesterday, while I was in Sarnia, there was a question raised about the sending out—

Mr. Cassidy: Just sending out kits.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —of some particular kit. I did check on that this morning personally. I was told that the kit is only sent out on solicitation. It is not sent out on an unsolicited basis.

Mr. Cassidy: That's not true.

Mr. McClellan: They just happened to have it lying around.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I certainly take the word of the chairman involved—

Mr. McClellan: I guess it was put together by accident.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —but I can tell the members, that in answer to direct questions I've put that they are not involved in an active campaign of promoting opting out.

GLANBROOK LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Cunningham: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. In view of the request by citizens and council participating in the landfill hearings at Glanbrook to have those hearings held under the 1975 Environmental Assessment Act, will the Minister of the Environment be supporting their request to cabinet? Is he fully aware that these citizen groups have made this request in order that they can have an opportunity to review the mix of alternatives to landfills so often publicized in the press?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I am aware of the request. I think the member knows the request was put to the advisory committee. Until we have some response from that committee—I believe by Thursday or Friday of this week

—I really wouldn't want to suggest that I have come to a firm conviction for or against the request. I will listen to the argument. I will try to have an understanding of what the advisory committee recommends, and then I will formulate an opinion. Until then, I think I will keep an open mind.

Mr. Cunningham: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask if the minister would not be compelled to see that this particular request might be a landmark decision in so far as the continued abuse of the Environmental Assessment Act is concerned. Is he aware that this proposed landfill site represents the largest site in the province, would be located on acres of valuable farm land and would be situated directly on the headwaters of the Welland River; and is he prepared to assist these citizens with their request before cabinet, or could we rename the Environmental Assessment Act the Environmental Exemption Act?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will respond to the last part. That is not a very valid question, because it is just not so.

I would think the member might also wish to have assessed the alternatives to landfilling. The member might also wish at some time to put forward the suggestion that I would support wholeheartedly, that we have one hearing on landfill sites. What we have gone through is a long Ontario Municipal Board process and now an environmental hearing. I am not very happy to see those two necessary hearings; I think they should be combined in one. I am sure the Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett) is aware of that and has sympathy for that point of view.

I think those are the immediate concerns. There is no doubt in my mind that the concerns of the citizens have been aired and will be aired again. The terms of reference that the Environmental Assessment Board considers in such a hearing vary very little, whether it's under the Environmental Protection Act or under the Environmental Assessment Act. I think they have been most generous in listening to the concerns of the citizens; I am sure they will continue to do so. If they were very significantly restricted by the present hearing, I think it would make a considerable difference. Surely the member would agree that the assessment board has been most generous in its interpretation of what could be heard under the Environmental Protection Act.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. In his state-

ment today, on page six, he notes that Ontario Hydro "builds into its nuclear plants a very effective containment system." Is the minister aware of the quarterly technical reports on the Pickering generation station which indicate that a leak in the wall of the reactor building went undetected for 18 months; and is he aware that, according to the same technical reports for the fourth quarter of 1973, "losses of containment occurred four times in the quarter as a result of air-lock and seal failures," and that, again according to the same technical reports, "air-lock failures at Pickering have been a continuing problem"?

If the minister is aware of all those, how can he say that the containment system which Hydro builds in is "very effective"?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I guess in all plants there have been the kinds of problems one expects in one-of-a-kind operations. There have been a number of times, as the honourable member is aware, when some of the reactors have been shut down because of things that occur and are monitored constantly and then are fixed. I simply repeat what I am informed by Hydro, and what Dr. Porter himself has said, that that system is a highly effective one.

In addition, of course, the other part of the system, the cooling part, is quite different from the US operation. It really has three cooling elements to it, and any one of them will keep the uranium from superheating.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary: Is the minister aware, given the rate of failures that have occurred in the containment structure at Pickering, that in order to achieve the rated level of safety the containment building would have to operate now for several hundred years with no failure?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I learned a long time ago not to try to answer technical questions to which I did not have the answers. I will certainly find out about the matters the honourable member raised and report back.

CHEST DISEASE CASES

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Last week the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Pope) asked several questions regarding lung cancer among gold miners in northern Ontario and bronchitis among railway workers.

Mr. Conway: The independent member for Cochrane South.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I welcome that degree of independence from members on this side of the House. I suspect it will happen over on that side soon.

Mr. J. Reed: It will if we form the government.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I confine my hopes to that side.

Regarding miners, as I am sure the member knows my ministry is concerned there is a possibility that work in mines in northern Ontario may contribute to the development of lung cancer. Because of the possible relationship between the development of lung cancer and exposure to substances in the work place, my ministry, in conjunction with the Workmen's Compensation Board, is conducting a major study of miners.

Through examination of health records of some 16,000 uranium miners and some 30,000 non-uranium miners, we hope to be able to answer the question of whether the increased lung cancer rate evidenced in Timmins and Kirkland Lake is related to work in gold mines or to some other factor. I hope the study will be completed by late 1980.

The draft report entitled Cancer Mortality in Selected Northern Ontario Mining Communities, by Dr. Wigle, mentioned by the member in his question, will be used by our research staff during the course of this study.

Concerning Dr. Vingilis's statement to the member for Cochrane South, regrettably his comments were not qualified and thus were open to misinterpretation. Scientists have for some time been concerned about the effect on workers of substances found in hard rock gold mines. However, as I indicated, there is as yet no substantial body of research evidence that positively links lung cancer to work in gold mines.

In connection with the member's question about chronic bronchitis arising from diesel fumes inhaled by railway workers, I have been advised by the Workmen's Compensation Board that to date they have had only one claim regarding diesel fumes and bronchitis among railway workers. That claim and that issue are currently under review by the board.

A final matter regarding bronchitis and smelter workers raised by the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is currently under consideration by the board as well and I will pass along information to it as soon as it is available.

Mr. Pope: I would ask two questions of the minister in response to his reply. The first is: in the meantime, while the study is being completed, will the Workmen's Compensation Board and the ministry review all existing and past claims of miners in northern Ontario involving silicosis and lung cancer with a view to maintaining these files on record, should their studies show a relation-

ship? Secondly, while there may only be one claim currently on file with respect to diesel fumes and chronic bronchitis, will the minister review all previous claims that have been turned down by the Workmen's Compensation Board relating to chronic bronchitis, bronchial problems and asthmatic problems to see whether or not Ontario and the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Board will not now follow the jurisprudence of the Quebec Workmen's Compensation Board and recognize these kinds of problems as being associated with diesel fuel?

Mr. Mackenzie: It is not just northern Ontario either.

Mr. Pope: I never said that.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Don't limit him that way. I am surprised the member would want it limited that way. He had a broader interpretation of it.

I will be glad to discuss both of those issues with the board and report to the members.

Mr. Peterson: Since the minister has had the decency to respond to the member for Cochrane South within a week, when is he going to answer a considerable number of other questions, one of which I put to him about a month ago and which he promised in his beneficent and usual charming way to take under advisement?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a supplementary.

Mr. Peterson: When is he going to respond to that particular question?

Mr. Speaker: That is not a supplementary.

Mr. Peterson: Of course it's a supplementary.

[3:15]

Mr. Wildman: Is the minister aware that on a number of occasions in the past miners in northern Ontario, after receiving their yearly chest X-rays, have been advised by Ministry of Health doctors that they should not return underground but have also been advised by the Workmen's Compensation Board that their lung condition is not yet at a stage which is compensable and therefore they do return underground?

Is the minister willing to look at this situation now to determine that if a miner is advised not to return underground because his health might get worse he might advise the Workmen's Compensation Board that it should be doing something about providing compensation to these people, so that when they work above ground they don't lose pay as a result of that advice from the Ministry of Health?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: If the member is advising me there's some discrepancy in the information being given by the board, I'll be glad to look into it. I wasn't aware of that before. Thank you.

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Energy, also on the nuclear business, but on nuclear wastes. Is the minister satisfied that the program for disposing of nuclear waste by AECL, particularly in underground repositories, is a safe one? Can he indicate what input Ontario, through his ministry, has had in assuring the people in the area where these repositories may be, particularly places like Atikokan and Ignace where they might be drilling for such repositories, that this is safe and there is no danger to the inhabitants in the area? What input has he had in this program?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that the control board has a program of public information and consultation prior to selecting a site for an experimental facility, a chamber in a certain type of granite, far underground. I believe that it has adopted the present system as a result of the somewhat unfortunate approach that it had originally taken, I guess in the Bancroft area.

I can't say in detail what input our ministry has had in the establishment of the new process which they are undertaking. I think they have indicated to all the members whose ridings might be affected by some of the prospective sites how they propose to approach those communities, and I understand that all the members who have seen their proposal agree it is a good approach.

As far as the technical feasibility of what they are doing, I am not in a position to comment because we have not been directly involved. They have the expertise and the research, I gather, to do this. What they are proposing is an experimental operation in the first instance. Most people who are involved, I believe, agree that the information on which they are basing their experimental operation seems to be reliable, but again it will be a pilot project, as I understand it.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The minister is right in that we have been approached by AECL. I wonder if the minister is prepared to go on record and to assure people that the information that is being presented by AECL is correct, that he as Minister of Energy representing the government of Ontario is satisfied that all necessary precautions are being taken and that this sort of approach to this problem is feasible? Can the minister table in the

House what Ontario's responsibility is in the disposition of this nuclear waste, and whether his approval is necessary for the sites, or the transportation and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First of all, the Atomic Energy Control Board is the national agency that has the responsibility of setting the standards. I can only say that to the limited knowledge we would have of the factors involved, the standards they have set are acceptable. We do not second-guess them because they have the responsibility.

As far as our involvement is concerned, I would say the only involvement the province has on a site would be one that would relate to zoning if it's in an organized municipality. I assume what they are doing is a type of mining. If they are doing it in crown land, obviously they will have to get authority from the province either to purchase that land or to lease it.

Mr. Foulds: Is the minister not aware that he is a partner in that endeavour according to the agreement his predecessor signed last year—I believe it was in June? Is the ministry not yet aware which sites they have decided on to drill, whether that is Hydro land or crown land in Ontario, as they have decided on four sites? Is the ministry not in a position to reveal what those four sites are?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It's quite correct that there is an agreement and they will seek our approval before they actually establish one. I cannot tell the honourable member because I don't believe they have decided which of their priority sites they propose to establish.

HEALTH QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I would like to ask the minister if he's now in agreement with the position put by the Boyden Medical Centre, and I take it also the Krever commission, that a questionnaire proposed to be used by his ministry was in effect a violation of the Ontario Human Rights Code and a violation also of the Health Disciplines Act? Why would the ministry be asking questions such as, "Does your doctor care whether he hurts you during an examination?" and "Is your doctor's main interest to make as much money as he can?"

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If I can remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, and I will check into this—by the way, I think the honourable member, in connection with a question he asked last week, was going to send me the name of a particular—

Mr. Breaugh: I have.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Sorry, I haven't seen it.

If my memory serves me correctly, and I will check, that part of that proposed questionnaire was one of sort of an attitudinal survey. It is some time since I looked at anything on this, but I believe that was discussed with the Boyden group as a possibility for a questionnaire. I don't believe it was supposed it would actually be used until there had been some consultation. I will check to be sure but I don't think there's any such distribution of questionnaires going on.

Certainly we would wait until we heard from Krever on that matter. We certainly don't intend to do anything at all to put ourselves in contravention of health disciplines or any other type of confidentiality sections. In fact, from time to time I get criticism from some of the members around here that I don't send them enough information when they make inquiries because of the confidentiality provisions imposed on us in answering inquiries even from MPPs.

Mr. Breaugh: Supplementary: Did the ministry in fact use that questionnaire at the York Community Centre Clinic?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will check that. I was not aware of that. I will check to see whether that is the case.

DAY-CARE POLICY

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Will the minister say when he will release a new policy consultation paper for day care, a policy paper he said last fall would be ready by January of this year?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, a group of people within the ministry have been working for several months now in the preparation of policy recommendations that would then be considered for incorporation as part of a government policy in the area of day care. The work has been progressing well but perhaps not as quickly as we might have anticipated last fall. I am hoping the background work will be completed and policy consideration given to the recommendations before this summer.

Mr. Blundy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it true the new policies will propose a loosening of the skill requirements for day-care supervisors so not even those who are in charge will require an early childhood education certificate?

Hon. Mr. Norton: It is impossible for me, Mr. Speaker, to respond to that and indicate

what the recommendations are because much of the work being done at this point is at a staff level. I am certainly not aware of any specific recommendation to that effect.

I wonder whether the honourable member, and I realize I can't ask him a question, is expressing some concern relating to one of the recommendations that is part of the policy paper on standards currently under discussion. In that paper there is some suggestion, and it has given rise to some expression of concern on the part of some people, that we ought to be looking towards some criteria of competence as opposed to strictly certified qualification in certain areas of child care. That may be what gave rise to that concern, I can't be certain, but that is part of the paper that is publicly being discussed at the present time.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, may I have another comment on this matter?

Mr. Speaker: You may have a question, but not a comment.

Mr. Blundy: I have a question. Most of the community colleges in Ontario have many students in early childhood training courses or education courses. These people, in my opinion, are being trained for this type of work. What does the minister think this sort of person should have over and above, or instead of, early childhood training education?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very presumptuous of me to purport to know precisely what experience a person ought to have, but I should think there are areas of experience and so on that might well be important supplementations to some formal training at the community college level. That would be a great asset to persons working with children, whether they be in an early childhood education setting or elsewhere.

Mrs. Campbell: Or whether it is a grandmother.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I know some grandmothers who are pretty competent in dealing with young children.

CABINET AUTHORITY

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. The question requires a simple yes or no answer.

Mr. Samis: You won't get it.

Mr. Conway: Chief Justice Warner.

Mr. Warner: I would like to know whether the Attorney General would sign this letter that is being sent to him and reads:

"To the Honourable Joseph Clark, MP, Leader of the Official Opposition, House of Commons:

"Dear Mr. Clark: I have been deeply disturbed by recent reports that you favour cabinet having the authority—"

Mr. Rotenberg: The answer is no before you go any further.

Mr. Warner: "—to break the law. I wish you to know that this government will not countenance placing any person above the law. We in Ontario are proud of our tradition of an English law system dating back to the Magna Charta where it was written, 'No free man shall be in any way molested and we will not set forth against him unless by the law of the land.'"

Will the Attorney General sign this letter?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Well—

Mr. Conway: Yes or no.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —I don't know what Mr. Clark has said in this respect.

Mr. Foulds: Neither does he.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes or no.

Mr. Warner: You should resign as Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I can assure the members of the House that no one in this government would countenance law-breaking by anyone, whether it is a member of the police force or any other member of the community—

Mr. Makarchuk: Including your leader, including Joe Clark?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —or, indeed, any member of the government.

Mr. Conway: He doesn't even know who Jean Pigott is. Don't expect him to know about law.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: That is our position; it always has been our position.

Mr. Makarchuk: Will you convey those sentiments?

Mr. Cassidy: From the Ontario Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I haven't had a chance to discuss with Mr. Clark what he has said. I am sure the opportunity will arise but I certainly don't intend to correspond with him until I know what, in fact, he did say.

Mr. Conway: Claude, will you tell Joe who Jean Pigott is?

Mr. Speaker: A point of privilege; the member for Algoma.

Mr. Wildman: I just wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of privilege and the honourable member knows it.

[3:30]

PETITIONS

MINISTRY OF HEALTH ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Lawlor: We will take another crack at it.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to standing order 33(b) of the Legislative Assembly, the undersigned members of the assembly hereby petition that the annual report of the Ministry of Health for 1977-78, tabled October 23, 1978, be referred to the standing committee on social development for such consideration and report as the committee may determine.

Let me tell the Minister of Health that, among other matters, Lakeshore might just come into focus.

MOTIONS

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services stand referred to the standing administration of justice committee for consideration not to exceed 10 hours.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Nixon moved first reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I can understand why you had some difficulty in introducing the bill; it's not in its proper form.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this bill was prepared with the assistance of a group of students from Wilfred Laurier University, who also consulted with the House experts in drafting bills. Any imperfection in the actual form is entirely my responsibility, not theirs, but they were anxious to have it introduced. It deals with amendments to the Insurance Act which I know, sir, you will be glad to peruse as you read the bill.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS DECLARATORY ACT

Mr. Mackenzie moved first reading of Bill 36, An Act to declare the Application of Certain Parts of the Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the application of

parts IV, V, VI, VII and VIII of the Employment Standards Act, 1974, to domestic servants. These parts are concerned with employment standards relating to the hours of work, minimum wages, overtime, public holidays and vacation with pay. Section 3(f) of Ontario regulation 803/75 currently prevents these parts of the act from applying to domestic servants. The purpose is clearly to give coverage that doesn't now exist to domestic servants in the work force.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Stong moved first reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1979.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: This bill recognizes the hospital pharmacists as a separate bargaining unit under the Labour Relations Act.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Gaunt: In response to my friend from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), I will leave all of the esoteric matters to a later time; to a more appropriate time. I do, however, Mr. Speaker, want to pay tribute to you on this occasion for the excellent way in which you conduct the affairs of this House and protect the rights of all of us here. I want to say to you, sir, that it is not an easy job. I congratulate you for your evenhandedness in conducting and carrying out the affairs on behalf of all of us in the chamber.

I also want to pay tribute to the new members, the newly-elected members in the House—my colleague across the way from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Ramsay) and also my colleague from Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson). I certainly congratulate them on being elected, as I have already done privately. I can't say that I wish them a long tenure in this House. I must be fair. But their contribution to the affairs of the province will, I am sure, be noted and will indeed advance the cause of fairness and justice. I do welcome them and pay tribute to them for joining the "club of 125."

I was interested in the remarks of my friend from Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A.

Taylor) yesterday. It was a good speech. I was slightly disappointed. I was hoping my friend would give us some new insights into Hydro; about the mandarins in the Premier's office; about the tentacles extending from the Premier's office into the Minister of Energy's office and on through to Ontario Hydro. But I didn't get that. Perhaps at a later date we will be treated to that particular exposé.

Mr. Havrot: Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Gaunt: I was hoping the member would recommend that the office of the Premier, which has on the door, "Office of the Premier," be changed to include "Office of the Premier and Chief Executive Officer of Hydro." I think, really, that's the way my friend feels and that's the way I feel. I think we have some evidence to support that.

In any event, I am supposed to be speaking on the throne speech. I am going to be rather parochial and deal with matters related to my own area, for the most part, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit that. Really, when I read the throne speech there wasn't much I could bite into in terms of what this government was going to do other than what we already knew. I think the throne speech itself could be described as an ode to an aging government. I think it's fair to say, at least from this side of the House, that the government's senility is only exceeded by its tenacity.

Mr. Conway: They're all asleep over there.

Mr. Gaunt: Having said that, perhaps I can dismiss the throne speech and its content and wait for the budget document which my friend from Muskoka is going to bring down on April 10.

Representing as I do an agricultural riding, perhaps I should just make a few brief comments about the farming situation as I see it currently. As always, farmers are certainly concerned about input costs, the costs they have to pay for the products they have to buy in order to run their business. It has been reported that twine this year, for instance, is going up another 25 per cent and this represents well over a three-digit increase over the last three years. That is certainly an item which farmers have to have and yet they are confronted with these ever-escalating costs.

Fertilizer is another important input cost. Fertilizer is a very important ingredient in terms of farmers and the crops they grow and their total operation. Indeed, it's part of the green revolution; it's really a cornerstone of the farm efficiency story.

Mr. Nixon: We've got nobody but Gene Whelan looking out for us.

Mr. Gaunt: Fertilizer continues to be one of the most effervescent farm items, both in relation to supply and price. In nitrogen products urea is in demand in the export market, but anhydrous ammonia prices are very much depressed. Hence urea will be in tight supply and we expect prices to be up about 15 per cent from last year, according to the UCO brief which was presented to our caucus yesterday.

Mr. Nixon: That was a good brief.

Mr. Gaunt: Anhydrous ammonia, I understand, will be about at last year's price or up slightly. Apparently ammonia and nitrate is expected to be up marginally, with manufacturers hoping it will be up enough to cover the increased cost of natural gas.

I think that overall the result is that more than 20 per cent of the North American ammonia producing plants are going to be shut down. With the situation in North America complicated as it is by the supplies of natural gas from Mexico and Russia and Saudi Arabia being made into ammonia and put on to the world market at prices that will not allow the North American manufacturers to cover their raw material costs, it certainly makes for a very interesting and perhaps difficult pricing period, not only for the manufacturers in this province and in this country but also for the farmers who are subjected to ever-fluctuating prices for that important commodity.

As my friend says, the fluctuations have, in recent years at any rate, always tended to be upward and this has created some real difficulties for farmers.

Farm machinery, of course, I needn't mention that. It's very easy to walk through a fall fair or exhibit these days and dream about what it would be like to farm with at least \$200,000 of machinery sitting around within about 200 feet.

[3:45]

It is a problem about which we are concerned as farm people. It is a problem that is not going to be easily resolved. It is a problem that all of us are worried about. It is a problem about which we are all concerned and have to cope.

Let me turn now to the matter having to do with the Ministry of Natural Resources and, specifically, the district office in Wingham. I believe this is a very important district office. It is staffed by a very competent director and group of employees under his charge. But I believe it could and should become even more important if the boundaries of the district were changed both to the north and south, although more to the north would be the more appropriate. That

is one office where the Premier does not have his tentacles and where the mandarins do not have any authority.

I propose to the ministry that the boundary be altered to the north to take in the townships of Greenock, Kincardine, Bruce and Saugeen to coincide with the electoral boundaries. The four townships would total 374 square miles.

The fact of the matter is that the Owen Sound district, to the north, is overworked; and the Chatham district, to the south, is overworked. It makes abundant good sense, to quote my former colleague from Downsview, to give up some territory in the Owen Sound district to the Wingham district and some responsibilities in the Chatham district to Wingham so that the workload is more equal, making for better performance and delivery of service to the public. In short, it would enrich the program delivery end of the organization. That is really what it is all about.

Further, in terms of geographic location: The Wingham office is located in the northern part of the district. The district currently goes to Stephen township in the south, and so it would make good sense that it should go 50 miles to the north, which would then give it a very central location smack-dab in the middle.

Earlier, I mentioned the workload; so let me cite some comparative figures for the five districts. Wingham has a budget for 1978-79 of \$775,000 and operates one provincial park, with a full-time permanent staff of 21. Owen Sound, to the north, has a budget of \$2,702,000 and operates five provincial parks, with a permanent staff complement of 69. Chatham, to the south, has a budget of \$3,161,000 and operates eight provincial parks, with a full-time permanent staff of 72. Aylmer has a budget of \$1,095,000, with a permanent staff of 32. Simcoe has a budget of \$1,641,000, with a full-time permanent staff of 32.

Wingham has the lowest budget and the smallest permanent staff complement of any in the district. Yet the Wingham district has the greatest potential for growth in forest management of any district in southwestern Ontario, because it is only 25 miles from the Greenock Swamp, an area of 3,167 acres for forest management. This forest area has been designated by the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority. Wingham has been more involved in the Greenock Swamp study than any other district. It is only natural that the Wingham office should be in charge of that area, particularly since the swamp is 60

miles from Owen Sound but only 25 miles from Wingham.

As a matter of fact, the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, at its annual meeting this year, passed a resolution suggesting that management of its Greenock Swamp forestry property should be switched from the Owen Sound office of the Ministry of Natural Resources to the Wingham office. The suggestion was that it was proving more costly for men and materials to be brought in from Owen Sound when Wingham was closer.

The Wingham district is already into Bruce county, and so my proposal would give Wingham roughly half of Bruce; the rest would be in Owen Sound. It would also mean that Wingham would have three provincial parks and Owen Sound would have three as well.

Mr. Conway: If Jimmy Auld doesn't shut them all down.

Mr. Gaunt: That's a much better distribution of the workload.

I am glad to see my friend, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld), in his seat. I hope that these comments will be heeded. I ask the minister to look at this particular proposal closely. I am hopeful that the necessary boundary changes will be made. I'm quite prepared to pursue the matter further in estimates but I'd like to ease the work of the Chatham district. I suggest that the Wingham district could also handle the operation of the primary provincial park at Grand Bend. That's worth considering and I ask the minister to do so.

Mr. Conway: You mean the minister who closed all our parks down.

Hon. Mr. Auld: It seems to me that I have heard about this before.

Mr. Gaunt: Good. I am glad the minister is looking into it. Perhaps by estimate time you will have a report and we can discuss it further. Because I think there are some good points to be made in favour of altering those boundaries, as I've suggested.

Mr. Conway: Leave some of my parks open, Jimmy, please.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to turn now to the matter of the hospital bed cuts, particularly as they affect my own area—particularly Wingham.

At present it appears that the government doesn't seem to know what its aims are in terms of institutional care, only that there is an overall surplus of active treatment beds in the province and too many patients in active treatment beds. But to many people it looks as though we're seeing cutbacks in hospital

bed allocations before any expansion of alternative facilities. Budget methodology does not, at present, recognize relative efficiency of hospitals.

In the Wingham and district hospital, the average length of stay is below the provincial average—8.7 days as opposed to 9.7 days for the other 31 hospitals in the same category, that is the 100 to 199-bed hospital size. Its occupancy rate is 78 per cent; that's the optimum for a 100-bed hospital, as per the government guidelines. The bed allocation formula pays no attention to the average per-patient cost of treatment a hospital provides.

The ministry's own hospital statistics for 1977-78 shows the standard ward rate for active beds at Wingham as \$95.72. That is well below the rates of other, larger hospitals in the area. For instance, University Hospital, London, at \$220.05; Kitchener-Waterloo General Hospital, \$130.38; Victoria Hospital, London, \$192.83; and McMaster Medical Centre, \$341.66. It makes little sense to care for patients in the more expensive hospitals when Wingham is well equipped, as it stands now, to do so. And that's quite apart from the extra travelling costs involved—ambulance transportation and family visiting, and so on.

Wingham's gross operating costs per diem for 1977-78 were \$117.89. This figure is below the average gross operating cost for all 10 groups of active treatment hospitals, regardless of size.

Wingham and district hospital has been saving the government money by consistently operating efficiently, within a given limited budget, in the period January 1, 1973, to March 31, 1978. The Ministry of Health liability over the period rose four per cent over the actual cost increase. A total sum of \$228,921 was returned to the Ministry of Health. During the same period productivity rose each year.

While the ministry denies that efficient hospitals are being penalized, while those that are inefficient are being rewarded, the fact remains that the methodology which imposes a \$12,000 per excess bed constraint does not address itself to cost efficiency and cost effectiveness of all Ontario hospitals.

The minister, in a letter dated March 16, in response to an earlier letter I wrote him on March 1, indicated, and I quote: "I cannot agree that the efficient hospitals are being penalized while those that are inefficient are being rewarded. The budget adjustments related to surplus active-treatment beds were applied on a province-wide basis, and each hospital centre was treated in exactly the same way. It is considered that this is the

most equitable method of distributing the limited funds available."

There is no question that the formula was applied on a province-wide basis. My point is that this very fact brings inequities into the system; and the fact cannot be denied that the ministry has been penalizing the efficient hospitals in favour of the inefficient, insofar as the constraint of \$12,000 per excess bed is concerned.

Wingham is considered to have a surplus of 14 beds and so would be penalized by \$168,000; if it were not for the ministry's commitment that no budget would be cut below the 1978 level, this would have left the hospital more than \$33,000 under the 1978 level.

It is hard to see how it can possibly be denied that the ministry's simplified methodology militates against the efficient hospital. It does, and it penalizes the efficient; no other conclusion is possible under the circumstances. Yet there are many other factors involved which bear witness to the total inadequacy of reducing health care to formulae on the number of beds per 1,000 people.

Some communities in this province, including my own, have ageing populations well over the provincial average: 12.9 per cent of the population in Huron—it is 13.3 per cent in Bruce—is aged 65 or over, compared with the provincial average of 8.6 per cent. It is obvious that we are facing an ever-growing utilization by those aged 65 and over. In 1968, Wingham and District Hospital statistics revealed that the 65-plus population represented 25 per cent of all active admissions. By comparison, in 1978, they were 32 per cent of active admissions and, furthermore, utilizing more than 50 per cent of all active days of care.

It is unlikely this trend will either level off or reverse itself and, therefore, because of the high incidence of active treatment of those aged 65 and over—not to mention the high incidence of extended-care and chronically ill patients in the community—bed closures will cause an imbalance in occupancy.

At present, there is a serious lack of designated chronic beds at Wingham. There is a total of 39 chronic patients in the hospital, 33 of whom are over the age of 65, but only 18 designated chronic beds.

Another consideration is that certain communities face large influxes of tourists during the summer months; as a result, hospital admissions swell in the summer. It is not at all clear how the ministry, in calculating its bed allocation for each hospital, takes into account admissions of persons from other parts

of the province or other parts of Canada, or from the United States, in determining a hospital centre's referral population.

The active-treatment bed allocation methodology guidelines issued by the data development and evaluation branch of the Ministry of Health and dated November 1978, does not outline how the tourist complement is taken into account in calculating the referral population of a given hospital centre.

[4:00]

My legislative intern, Margaret Evans, whose work I must acknowledge publicly, has done a great deal of work and research in this particular matter and when she called the ministry to try to determine its method of calculating and allocating a waiting figure for a referral population with respect to those from other parts of Canada or the US, the information was very vague. I suspect that the ministry really doesn't have any firm way of determining what that figure should be. It's more of a by gosh and by gum calculation than any scientific or well-thought-out weighting formula.

The minister has indicated that the reclassification of surplus active beds to chronic care will be considered in those areas where there is a demonstrated need. However, in the meantime, apart from the 10-bed cushion for hospitals with fewer than 100 beds, there is no easement of the reduction on a prorated basis for hospitals which cannot reduce beds and/or staff to meet the dollar reduction imposed with effect from April 1.

I still don't know how the ministry is going to handle the matter having to do with the allocation where a hospital hasn't got an agreement from the ministry as of the April 1 deadline to switch some of the closed-out active-treatment beds to chronic care. And, where that \$12,000 per bed penalty is being assessed now, I wonder how the ministry is going to revise that when each hospital board, as I think is going to be necessary, comes in to the ministry and sits before the ministry and the minister, trying to sort out what its new revised designations are going to be in terms of a switch from active to chronic beds.

Is the ministry going to levy the penalty and make the hospital pay the penalty from April 1 until the switch is made if indeed it is made, and then refund that money? Or how is that going to be handled? We don't know that. I think the minister should clarify that point.

Surely before beds are cut, the Ministry of Health has a responsibility to have in place alternative forms of service of equal benefit.

Yet alternatives that do exist, such as nursing home care, home-care programs and so on, are totally inadequate. At present, there are only seven pilot chronic home-care programs in the province and there are insufficient active home-care programs to meet the needs of many communities facing cutbacks in hospital bed allocations.

I mentioned last Tuesday in the emergency debate in the Legislature the situation facing Huronview, the county home for the aged in Huron county. At the moment, 292 beds are being occupied out of a total of 310, of which 148 are for patients who require extended bed care, that is to say, at least one and a half hours of nursing care per day; 78 are for those requiring some nursing care and only 66 for those capable of totally caring for themselves. In addition, there are 27 people on the waiting list, 14 of which require extended bed care. The point is that for all practical purposes the home for the aged is now being turned into a chronic hospital.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It's the same in Fort Frances.

Mr. Gaunt: If the county home is to be returned to its original purpose, more chronic hospital beds have to be designated in the county and more nursing home beds approved.

Mr. McKessock: Right on.

Mr. Gaunt: Given the ministry's attempt to close several hospitals a few years ago, it is not surprising that there is a basic mistrust of the ministry's motives. It is easy to see the current reductions as the first step in a chain of bed cuts that will eventually force small hospitals to close by making them too inefficient to operate.

People are asking themselves whether the ministry will stop at its current formula of 3.5 beds per 1,000 referral population after 1981. This fear and suspicion was expressed by one of my constituents in a letter addressed to the minister. He said: "Your bed cutting policy is a devious means to an end. The cost of operating a lab, physiotherapy department, kitchen or a whole hospital for a continually decreasing number of beds will become prohibitive. What will be your Health ministry's final decree? Closure."

Smaller hospitals lose their visibility as they become unable to support ancillary services such as surgeons and specialist consultants. Specialists only retain their high level of specialty skills through practice, which emphasizes the fact that hospitals such as Wingham must maintain their current bed levels to attract and allow specialists to prac-

tise their skills in the care of sick and injured.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It's the same at LaVerendrye in Fort Frances and in every small community in the province.

Mr. Gaunt: I am sure it is. The problem really is that this government doesn't understand small and rural communities across the province. The council members of the township of Ashfield, an area served by Wingham and District Hospital, have expressed their concern that if Wingham and District loses its viability, Ashfield will be unable to retain its "three dedicated doctors of the highest calibre" in their area. Incidentally, I should add that the doctors to whom reference is made there all reside in the town of Lucknow and practice there and those doctors service the township area of Ashfield.

This fear has been echoed by the township of Culross, which states in a letter to the minister that the Wingham hospital has always served it very satisfactorily and has helped keep a resident doctor in the immediate area. I feel that with the forecast cut-back in beds over the next three years, they stand a good chance of losing their present doctor to a larger centre, thereby creating travel problems and so on for patients.

The only way for hospitals facing a \$12,-000 reduction per surplus active bed from its base budget to avoid an operating budget deficit is to close down a number of beds and cut back on personnel, even if at present the occupancy rates of these beds is high. The shortfall between the provincial allocation of funds and the increased operating costs at Wingham is likely to be as high as \$200,000. Avoiding a deficit for Wingham would mean a loss of between 10 to 15 full-time equivalent jobs, not a small matter in a small rural community.

The area served by Wingham hospital—north Huron, south Bruce—is subject to severe snow conditions each winter which make travel not only dangerous and difficult but at times impossible due to road closures. While severe weather conditions make it difficult to reach the Wingham hospital, travel to a more distant hospital—that is to say London, which is 120 kilometres away—is simply out of the question.

In addition, Wingham is located at a busy junction of highways 4 and 86 which connect the metropolitan areas to the south and east with the vacation and recreation areas that lie to the north and west of Wingham. Travellers from London, Sarnia and Windsor and American visitors who cross at Detroit and Port Huron utilize highway 4

summer and winter as they travel to the Bruce Peninsula, the Blue Mountain ski area and/or make connections for the ferry at Tobermory.

Travellers from the golden horseshoe area travel highway 86 to the resorts and cottages along Lake Huron's shore or turn north on highway 4 to enter the Georgian Bay tourist region. In the 1977-78 season there were 119 traffic injuries requiring hospitalization at the Wingham and District Hospital. This tourist traffic, coupled with the daily school bus traffic—3,163 pupils are bused to and from school daily—makes the possibility of traffic accidents a very real and grave concern. With large numbers of people moving through the area on weekends, traffic pressure becomes greater, resulting in the increased likelihood of multi-vehicle, multi-injury type accidents. With the depleted bed complement, it is not unrealistic to foresee loss of life as a result of limited facilities.

A great many of the hospitals serving smaller, rural communities were built through the efforts of local people. The pride and loyalty in these institutions is born out of community contribution to the original construction and, later, expansion and improvement.

Hospital care involves physical, spiritual and emotional aspects. Proper personalized care can be provided in a local hospital—and provided best in a local hospital.

The kind and personal attention the patient receives in a smaller hospital is rarely matched by the coldly efficient city hospitals. As put by the board of governors' brief to the minister: "May we remind you, Mr. Minister, with all the respect your office commands, that such ministerial edicts tend to destroy man's group relationships in which lies the greatest sense of personal and community responsibility. This is inherent in rural, community living."

Incidentally, that brief will be submitted to the minister this Friday. The Wingham and Goderich hospital boards are meeting with the minister this Friday, April 6, and hopefully some of these matters can be resolved at that time.

It is not that people are questioning the complexity of health care in this province or the need to curtail unnecessary spending. There is no doubt that a positive move toward preventive health care is essential. We should be looking at ambulatory care facilities, such as community health centres, as an alternative to costly, acute care hospitals. In fact, hospital officials at Wingham have, for some time now, been discussing with ministry

officials the possibility of setting up a health centre in Wingham.

At present there are 29 health service organizations across the province in which traditional fee-for-service practices have been replaced by salary and capitation payment methods. Unfortunately, the future viability of these health service organizations is uncertain, because no long-term financial commitment has been made to them by the ministry.

There is a need to re-allocate resources away from acute care hospitals to alternatives that can operate at much lower cost. But only if alternatives are in place, such as home care, domiciliary care, nursing homes, extended care hospitals, rehabilitation hospitals, convalescent hospitals and self-care hospitals. We don't have enough of them now. In this way, Mr. Speaker, we would be replacing one with the other. So during the transition people would not be denied the service or their rights to adequate medical services.

For the reasons I cited, I cannot accept the Ministry of Health's program. I think it is short-sighted and inappropriately researched. It is causing untold anxiety for people throughout this province who are concerned about losing jobs, or who are concerned that if they get sick there won't be a bed available for them. Medical staffs throughout the province feel that their ability to treat patients and deliver a first-class health system is being threatened.

I urge the minister to reconsider.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat saddened by having to participate in this debate this afternoon; in particular, over the kind of issue that is before this House—the issue that has been, I think, put forward by most members who have participated in this debate so far. I anticipate it will also be put by many other members before the debate is completed, because we have a major problem on our hands. It is the kind of problem that we would rather not have.

[4:15]

In many things that we discuss in this House, we are discussing something that perhaps inconveniences someone, or treats someone unfairly, or deals with income distribution, but in the matter of the health care policies of this government we are dealing with something far more serious. It does indeed deal with all of those things. It talks about someone facing an inconvenience, or facing a delay they would perhaps rather not face. It talks about economic whacks at people who are least able to afford that

kind of a whack. Chronic care fees are an example.

No matter how politely we might want to deal with the matter, we can't get away from the basic notion that in the field of health care at some point in time, with some examples, people are going to die because services are not provided. I have heard on a number of occasions the Minister of Health slap the opposition members on their little hands for daring to suggest this is true. I suppose if we wanted to retain within the chambers of this House a degree of polite awareness with one another, we wouldn't talk about this because it is not just embarrassing to the government, it talks about things that no normal, civilized human being would want to talk about. That is people dying, or, if they don't die, then at least people being very sick and not getting the kind of care this society can provide those citizens. There isn't any nice way to put that. I know it probably causes the current Minister of Health to throw up each and every day before he comes into this chamber. That is too bad. All he has to do is change the policies of his ministry and of that government to solve his own personal health problems.

I want to deal with—not at any great length but to make the point—the matter of the hospital cuts. I listened again to the Minister of Health say, "Well, these are not really cuts. Everybody gets the same dollar amount as they did last year." Not true. People are trying to take the same hospital dollar allocations this year and provide the same level of services they did last year.

They can't do that unless there is at least an increase in there to show something to reflect what inflation is doing to everybody's pocket-book. It has just the same effect on a hospital budget as it does on the personal expenses of the members of this House or the general population at large. It is for real. It costs more money this year to buy the same goods or services purchased last year. If he says everybody got the same dollar amount this year, I don't care how he slices that, he is taking money away from programs that are very necessary.

The other thing that immensely disturbs me about the approach of this government is it is extremely simplistic. I grant a bed-ratio formula sounds impressive. It sounds as if some very smart person, skilfully trained in the art of medicine, has devised a simple formula which will work in all cases. It won't. It doesn't. It causes very severe problems.

It has been my pleasure in the last little while to spend some time visiting many of the hospitals that will be hit worst by this

kind of a cutback program. Unfortunately, they are concentrated in the northern parts of this province and in the rural parts of this province. I readily accept that in many parts of Ontario—to be specific in the urban centres, in Metropolitan Toronto—it is possible for the ministry to close down some wards. It is possible for the ministry to close down some beds. It is possible for people to get on a TTC car—pay a little more—to get to medical services. It is possible for them to take half an hour and go in an ambulance to another hospital if one is full. All of that is happening.

We have had occasions in this House where we have explored the rather ridiculous situation of ambulances picking up patients, trying one hospital for space, not finding it, trying another one, and trying a third. That is happening in Toronto. I am sure, this afternoon, but it is possible for that to happen here. If one cannot get in this hospital, one can go across town and get in another one.

That is not possible in the northern part of this province and in many of our rural areas. That is why this dumb, simple, stupid and mean formula is wrong. It does not recognize there are many parts of this province that are not south of Bloor Street and do not have the kinds of options available for example, within 10 minutes walking of this House. It ain't there. You can't get there from here.

It also does not recognize that to change a place from a hotel into a hospital requires some equipment, requires some staff, requires some training and some financial obligations. Then you have made it into a hospital. It isn't just a place providing bed service; it is a hospital where you can get reasonably decent treatment. You need that core of financing to make it a hospital.

For example, when I walk down the halls of the Smooth Rock Falls Hospital, the minister can open or close all of the beds on that floor; it makes no difference. If they need them, if there is an accident in that community of 4,500 people, they will open them up. The minister can't close a ward in the Smooth Rock Falls Hospital, because there is only one ward. He can't cut the nursing staff in half, because there is only one nurse; and there are only two doctors. There are very serious ramifications all through the north.

I spent some time in Sensenbrenner Hospital in Kapuskasing. It's a fine little institution. If the ministry had been active in putting community programs in place, if the ministry was prepared to fund a chronic home care program in Kapuskasing, if they were even to go so far in their wonderful free enterprise spirit of getting things done

as to see that there were chronic care beds in private nursing homes in Kapuskasing, the minister could understand how accommodations could be made. We are told that alternatives are possible. They are not possible in that hospital.

That is basic hospital care, with a lot of problems that are familiar to many of the hospitals in the north about training and keeping nursing staff, about attracting physicians to the area, of seeing that they get the use of specialists. But it also lives with the very real fact that is true across most of northern Ontario, which is, there isn't any chronic home-care program; there aren't many chronic care beds in that hospital. There isn't any alternative to the use of active treatment beds, which is very expensive—\$130 a day to look after chronic care patients. There isn't any other place to go.

If this ministry wants to go up to Kapuskasing and decide that a number of very good and workable programs that have been tried out in many other parts of Ontario ought to be applied to Kapuskasing, then we can talk about making some cutbacks in the hospitals. But until it does, it is taking away the only source of care in that community. There is a serious problem there. And it runs through Kirkland Lake and Little Current, New Liskeard, Haileybury, Espanola, Chapleau, Hearst—you name it. And here are all the cutbacks that they are looking at. Cutbacks that can't be made. They can't be made this year, and they are looking at even worse situations over the next two or three years, except that the ministry hasn't had the courtesy to really tell them what is going to happen then.

We are embarked, for some reason—and it is beyond me as to why—on a program of cutting back on services that are needed most. We are embarked on a program of identifying communities that have minimal health care now, and hurting them more than any other. I don't understand it. I would like to find an eloquent word for it, but there isn't one. It is just plain dumb. These are highly-paid civil servants in the minister's office sitting around down here deciding what they can do to make the Treasurer of Ontario happy, and doing it, and damn the consequences.

I'll bet there isn't a member of this House who isn't in the process of arranging for his local hospital board to come down to Mecca and pay the little trip to the minister's office. Why the hell are we doing that? Why is it our responsibility to look after that? If the government wants me to be

the Minister of Health, make me the Minister of Health and I will be happy to carry out those kinds of programs. Why are members parading in here? Why are all these people being dragged down from across the province of Ontario to plead at the minister's chair for some common sense? Why do they have to do that? I don't know.

I give this minister one small iota of credit. He is not as stupid as his predecessor who actually went to those communities and tried to convince them in their home bailiwick that this was a sane and rational idea—I think frankly it was more likely a lack of guts and brains. But at least this minister didn't do that. No. In this case, he brought them all down to the Sheraton Centre—at government expense, I take it—to let them hear the bad news in friendly circumstances. That was unfortunate, because that, I think, denied the reality of the situation. It is apparent to me, at least, that this Minister of Health is not prepared to look at that. He may well have seen the same hospital wards that I have seen, but he isn't prepared to react, in my view, in even a sensible and rational way.

The bed-ratio formula—Mr. Speaker, for once in my life I am at a loss. I don't have a loss of words; I do have a loss of words that I can use in this House. I am afraid that is about the point I am at with this minister. This program makes no sense. This bed-ratio formula clearly was picked out of the air by a civil servant and applied unilaterally across Ontario; it does not fit, and the minister knows it.

Frankly, I am pleased to see that, at least with a slight battering on the back of his small head, he is backing off. In Brantford he is backing off. In a number of other places I see he is saying, "Well, maybe I didn't really mean it in quite that way." But the announcements were quite specific—hospital by hospital, cut by cut, almost line by line.

The initial provision of health-care services in many parts of this province is at a level it has never been at in some years. In communities that were just beginning to have their little general hospitals, which they put together brick by brick, where many of their citizens went out and attracted physicians and nurses and raised money through the local organizations to buy equipment for those hospitals, citizens are seeing the hope that they would have decent medical care go down the drain because of the act of this minister. I think that is ruinous.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to select material to use in this address today, particularly when

I have said that I want to focus mainly on the Ministry of Health. I cannot tell you one single thing that the Minister of Health is doing these days in any field under his responsibility that makes much sense to anybody. I do not want to go into the details because I will do that at another point in time, and I know that individual members want to bring up the cases of their particular hospitals and what he is doing to them.

Let me switch, then, and talk about this other matter that has been raised about doctors opting in and doctors opting out, how much doctors are being paid and the latest front-page story on who filed what tax return last year. There are problems in all of this which I think we all recognize. I do not think there is a member in this House who can provide, publicly or privately, a simple motion that will make all the doctors happy in Ontario, that will see the patients get proper medical service and that will see that the \$4,000,000,000 that we spent last year on health care was well spent. Nobody has a single, snappy little thing to do that will solve all these problems.

I think we are done a disservice by this minister, though, when he attempts to polarize the opposition in this House, to oversimplify and to deny that there is a serious problem. Last Tuesday, when I sat in this chair, the Minister of Health said: "There is no problem with doctors opting out. None." That was one of the few days when I have seen the Premier of this province watch one of his ministers hang listlessly on the vine and not run to his rescue with one of his great interjections. On that particular day the Minister of Health was up for the entire question period, blowing in the wind; and, for all of his staff, he had no answers to anybody. I sensed that at least on that occasion the Premier of Ontario was embarrassed by his boy wonder; he left him there.

On Wednesday, I understand, there is something called a cabinet meeting around here. Some place, in some magnificent offices adjacent to the Premier's office, the most important decision-makers in Ontario gather. Apparently last Wednesday somebody discovered that there was a problem with doctors opting out of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan and that the boy wonder had better do something about it or they were all going to be in a jackpot. Maybe Eddie Goodman was there; I do not know who these powerful people are.

At any rate, on Thursday I watched the same guy who told me on Tuesday that there is no problem—never mind Peterborough, with

68 per cent of them out; never mind Stoney Creek, Amherstburg or any of the other examples, there is not a problem. On Thursday, not only was there a problem but, of course, this kid also had the solution.

I would have thought the Minister of Health in this province was responsible for the provision of fair and equal access to the system. On Thursday, though, I found out that, while there was a problem, that really was not his ball of wax. In fact, the Ontario Medical Association was going to help him out, and it was going to be assisted in its task by the Ontario Hospital Association. Both are very distinguished groups, I must say; both, I am sure, are very concerned about health care in Ontario. But neither one of them was elected as Minister of Health in Ontario.

When we ask what the Minister of Health himself is doing about this, the answer is zero—not a thing. Others are doing that for him. Frankly, I do not know how they are doing that, and neither does he. I do not know the details of the provision of medical service under that new program, which was announced so grandly last week, and neither does he.

[4:30]

Mr. Wildman: Neither do the doctors.

Mr. Breaugh: Neither do the doctors. I suspect that what we have so far is the recognition that times are tough, things are bad and somebody better do something. It won't be the Minister of Health. It will turn out to be the OMA and the OHA and their problem. I see there are some unfortunate disputes entering into the picture already. The Ontario Hospital Association, I am told, says that doctors have to provide that service at the OHIP rates inside the hospital and outside the hospital. From statements I've read by the OMA, that isn't the way it read that agreement. There may be some complicating factors.

If one has a problem, there's now one Zenith telephone number one can call in Ontario. I sure wouldn't want to be manning that telephone because there's going to be a multitude of problems rolling into that one little red telephone.

I think there is a need for serious discussion now of alternatives to the fee for service basis. I spend a fair amount of time discussing the matter with doctors these days and I see their argument about filling out those little billing procedures, sending them down to the nearest OHIP office and waiting to see if anybody is going to process that claim this week and waiting six to eight weeks or four to five

months to get payment for work they've done. I see arguments over what the bill should be. I see doctors showing cute little forms where there is a minor error on filling out the form, but the whole claim has been rejected in the process. The doctor has to have the accountant fill it out and send it back in again. I understand their frustration with that system.

I could not give to the public at large or even to my own little self a rationalization of the OHIP billing procedure. I understand the premise was cost control. But I don't see how one can control costs if one doesn't have the authority to pay or not to pay the bills that come in. They don't have that. I'm not sure that what we have in place really isn't anything but a massive paper-shuffling routine, somewhat akin to what they do at football games in the United States at half-time where they have card shows. I don't see anything of a productive, positive nature in that whole billing process. I support the doctors in their frustration with it and on the insensitivity with which doctors are dealt with by OHIP itself.

That's further complicated by the fact that this government has embarked once again on another one of its famous cutback programs, and part of the people cut back are the people processing those claims. It's taking longer and longer to get the same little billing process to work because there are fewer and fewer people working in the system. I understand their frustration.

Let me put this as delicately as I can. I have less concern about someone who's making \$55,000 a year and trying to battle inflation than I have for my industrial workers averaging \$13,500, thank you very much, and battling inflation. I'm not saying I'm not concerned; I'm saying that the degree is not quite there.

I sympathize with them in having to fill out all the income tax forms in order to claim their car as an expense and office overhead and all the staff and associated problems. Those are very complicated things that I don't have to worry about. I'm saying it's tough to recognize that the prime, the number one wage earner in the country is having difficulties with inflation. I understand that, but I put that on a scale with my unemployed, with my pensioners, with my students looking for a job, with my organized workers and with my unorganized workers in my own constituency, and I'm running a little short on sympathy there.

What I don't see is much of an active campaign on the part of the ministry to deal with those problems. I don't see any alternatives being put forward. We put out a little

green paper last year where we discussed a number of alternatives we thought were workable and rational notions.

Having met with medical associations around Ontario, I understand there are a lot of doctors who insist, for some reason that escapes me, that the fee-for-service system is the only way to go. In fact, while they might have taken an oath at one time to provide medical care, there is creeping into all of that a belief that many doctors are medical businessmen, with overheads and all the things that any other business has, and that they are really attracted by the profit motive.

I also understand there are many physicians in the province who simply want to practise medicine and want to do all the things that everybody else wants to do. They want to feed their families properly and see that their kids have a good education and live in a decent house. Primarily, their concern is to practise medicine—to do the thing that took so long and, so many years in school to become qualified for. That's their basic concern. A secondary concern is their income.

There are others, I would agree, who may have different priorities. But most of the doctors I know—and I have to say this as I trust them with my life, so I am not afraid to trust them with my pocketbook from time to time—are medical practitioners first and wage earners second; it is of lesser consideration to them. I would go so far as to say those are the good doctors. I'm not sure there are any really bad doctors out there. I suspect that doctors are no better and no worse than plumbers, auto workers or anybody else. There has to be a percentage in there who aren't as noble as most of them would like them to be, but most of them are working long hours, trying to do a difficult job which is becoming more complicated and requires more and more skills as time goes on, and feeling incredibly frustrated, particularly by the dealings with this ministry.

That's a serious problem. I would like to see some alternatives put out. I don't think it's beyond the capability of the ministry's staff to offer an option which would allow doctors to receive a base salary for providing certain services under certain circumstances. The ministry could certainly talk about hours of work and the number of people doctors serve. It seems quite possible to me that the minister could negotiate a salary, for example, for the general practitioner in the province of Ontario which offers economic security to that person and which dispenses totally with the OHIP billing process and the fee-for-service arguments that enter into the picture.

Though there was supposedly an approved rate negotiated last December, I am aware that there are many doctors in this province who still don't know what that approved rate is. In fact, the OHIP office doesn't know it either. They simply tell the doctor to bill at the previous year's agreed-upon rate and somehow, somewhere, an adjustment will be made and he'll get his money. That's a ridiculous way for the ministry to go about its business.

Members will have to excuse my trade union bias in all of this but I'm not totally convinced how to go about negotiating an approved rate and, once the negotiation is set, settled, signed, sealed and delivered, then how one would figure out how much it is. If I ever negotiated a contract for a group of people and said, "Sign here first and accept the agreement now and later on we'll tell you how much you're getting," I think I would be ridden out of the room on a rail. But that's what happens between the ministry and the OMA. I'm not sure how one gets to the stage of having negotiations and arriving at an agreement and then people decide whether they're in or out of the agreement. I don't understand that. I don't understand how OHIP can change the rates after it has struck an agreed-upon rate. I don't understand how OHIP was given the latitude to make adjustments in that that are sometimes minor and sometimes major. That's well beyond my frame of reference when I talk about negotiating a settlement.

There are serious problems concerning doctors, whether they're in or out of the plan. We have still not resolved the difficulties in the northern part of this province and in many rural parts of southern Ontario of attracting and keeping doctors. I know, for example, we talked about putting in medical schools in the north at Laurentian and Lakehead Universities. We have never gone past that stage.

I have talked to doctors who work in the north and I find that many of those people have needs which they state in more important terms than how much money they make. They need to have connections with medical society, with people who are practising medicine around them. They need to rub shoulders with and go to conferences with and confer with specialists in particular fields and other people in the medical community. That's difficult to do in rural Ontario in the south and all across the north. Those problems are serious, and I don't see that the minister is doing very much even

to recognize the problem, let alone finding any kind of an answer.

Those are a number of things. Let me close off my comments on the doctors and whether they're in or they're out. I start from the premise that doctors are part of this society in which we live. When society collectively decides it needs a socialized form of medicine in this province, then we should be prepared to pay for that. And we do pay for it. We pay through our income tax, through our premium system and now through extra service costs. There's the use of Chargex cards in doctors' offices, which runs to about 18 per cent in interest rates on fees for medical services these days. The public pays 90 different ways for good health care. Sometimes they get it and sometimes they don't. Sometimes they don't have access to the system.

My basic premise is that doctors belong to this society and should be included in the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. I am prepared to be eminently reasonable about all of this and say there may well be occasions when doctors, for whatever reasons—which I do not have a short list of now—should be allowed to opt out of the plan. Sure, why not be reasonable about it?

My concern is not whether we lock doctors into a system or whether we allow them to work in and out of the system at the same time or totally out of it. My concern is with the patients of Ontario and the taxpayers who pay for the system. I am not interested in infringing upon the rights of a doctor to practise medicine as he or she sees fit. I am only concerned with whether the people of this province get good medical care, period. I am not dogmatic about how that care is provided or how the doctors are paid.

In Saskatchewan, where we brought in socialized medicine many years ago, doctors still can bill inside the system or outside the system. In discussion with their health officials, they said: "This is not an academic, second-year university discussion. What we are concerned with is providing good medical care to the population of this province." That ought to be the end result of all of our deliberations about doctors.

I am stymied by the current minister's absence of ideas and even his shirking of responsibility in this regard. I do not know why he is doing that, except that on occasion he is shown to be a little jittery in answering questions in this House. I understand full well that, when he decides to do some things, he often tramps upon the establishment's toes, whether that is a recognized and worthwhile group of people like the Ontario Medical

Association or the Ontario Hospital Association. I understand his temerity to take those people on, but surely his prime interest ought to be to see that the people of this province get a good return for their tax dollar and, more important, that the people who need health care get it. I do not see him reacting to that.

Let me deal with one other matter which is a little close to my heart; it is one which I raised in the course of the estimates just last fall and which we seem to have great difficulty coming to grips with in this province.

There is a thing called an HSO. In the usual way this government operates, we couldn't call it a community clinic, because that is what it is; we have to find another name for it. So they called it a health service organization. There are 29 of them around Ontario. They are surrounded by an aura of mystery. The description of them is one that I think every member of this House, even the current Minister of Health, supports: We have an integrated group of people providing social and medical services in a small clinical setting; it is not a big urban hospital but something that people can relate to. It serves a community that is identifiable and, where the needs of a community are different, it can provide different kinds of services. We are not hidebound by whether it is the Ministry of Community and Social Services or the Ministry of Health that is providing this service; we simply identify what is the need and provide it as best we can.

Oddly enough, in this model too, most of the doctors and professionals providing care are on salary, which is the cheapest form of medical care, from a doctor's point of view, that we know of. For less money they are providing, in my view and in the view of a great many people, as good or even better care than you can get by any other means of payment. I am beyond myself. Why would the minister pick on the cheapest and best form of physician providing care to a patient and freeze their salaries? He did not disagree with this in the course of the estimates. Why pick on them? It is clear that he has picked on them. In correspondence that we have raised during question period, and in matters we raised subsequent to that, it was pointed out that he has frozen their salaries—never mind the four per cent increase or six per cent increase, he has frozen them.

In previous years the general agreement has been that, if the OMA fee schedule for general practitioners goes up 6.71 per cent we will transfer that to those doctors who are on salary. It seems quite a reasonable thing

to do. Now they are saying, "Unless you have a contract that forces the ministry to provide that kind of pass-through funding, you don't get it." That seems to me a strange attitude on the part of this ministry.

[4:45]

On the matter of freezing those salaries, I should note that the minister seems to be a little short of information. When I asked him the original question, he said it wasn't their policy. Yet, clearly we have a letter from the Boyden clinic where that has been the policy stated by an official of this ministry dealing with HSOs. We have this matter—and I raised it in the question period today—of surveys.

There are funny things going on. One would think if we had these HSOs in operation around Ontario we would naturally be interested in evaluating them; and of course we all are. The question is how do we evaluate them? The ministry has struck upon a unique little scheme. They send a couple of people down to these clinics and they sit there and then ask people as they come in to the clinic to get treatment to answer a questionnaire.

Why in the world would a Minister of Health, of all people, ask questions like, "Does your doctor care whether he hurts you during an examination?" That's like, "When did you stop beating your wife?" There isn't a good, sensible answer for that. The other question: "Is your doctor's main interest making money?" Who can answer that? I don't know.

I go to a very friendly doctor. He's an opted-in physician or he wouldn't be my doctor. I think his prime concern is providing good care to me and the members of my family. I'm aware that he likes a few niceties of life and that he'd like to be able to support his family rather well. But I certainly don't think he wants to hurt me when he examines me—or that his prime interest is making money. This one is fairly good at the stock market, I'm told. He probably makes more money off that than he does off the practice of medicine.

But those questions put in that form by our Ministry of Health are an insult to the medical profession. I'm never affronted by people who insult others. I get my share of insults, and if I can handle them others can. I certainly think the Ontario Medical Association and all of those doctors can certainly handle a little roughness around the edges. But I am concerned that there appears to be a concerted effort to hassle these community clinics. It's beyond me why.

The minister freezes the doctors' salaries, except when he's got a contractual obligation he can't get out of it. He puts this kind of questionnaire out to them, gives them a week's notice and says "We'll be in next week to put that questionnaire out to your people." This one, the Boyden clinic, got their lawyer onto it and went to the Krever commission. The lawyer and the Krever commission agreed that those questions were in violation of Ontario laws and couldn't be asked. So the minister backed off; but it had already run the questionnaire in two other community clinics in Toronto, agreeing they were in violation of the Human Rights Code, agreeing they were in violation of the Health Disciplines Act, but they'd already done it anyway. That seems to me to be a strange thing.

There appears to me to be almost a constant harassment of these HSOs. Even though the minister agrees it's a nice model and a good idea and it ought to work—and in fact it works very well—they still are harassing them.

Let me run through some of the problems we have uncovered in these HSOs. Basically you must understand, Mr. Speaker, the notion is that a group out there has to identify its community, decide what kinds of services it wants to provide, find a place, get the staff to provide the service. That seems to me to be a pretty tough job for any community group to do, but 29 of them have managed to do it. I would have thought quite frankly it was more properly the job of the Ministry of Health to do that kind of identification of need, and what the catchment area is and do the setup. In this province, apparently, it's not. I don't know why, but it's not.

In fact, in certain places like the St. Catharines clinic they got put out of business by this same ministry. Again, I don't really know why; I don't really understand that. I have read the evaluation surveys of that community clinic and understand them, but I certainly don't agree with their conclusion.

They have this serious problem of paying people. I recognize that maybe their problems are compounded when a doctor, whose sole purpose in life is to provide health care, is prepared to take a salary, and I suppose in that very real sense to risk the wrath of the medical profession. When he gets squeezed one more time, with absolutely no raise, he may be at that point where he decides to give up; I would hope not, but that's certainly the case.

The matter of how these budgets are struck is a perplexing one. I asked the minister

during the course of the estimates to provide me with copies of their budget, samples of them. Let me see, in actual dollar-for-dollar comparisons, how various clinics are being run. He agreed quite openly and very easily, in the course of the estimates, to do that.

That, of course, was in November of last year. I haven't got them yet, but then the mails are slow.

I asked again in a written question. You may have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that I put a number of matters which were of concern to me on the order paper in the form of written questions. I put those on early in this session. For some strange reason—well not strange really, because I understand it—the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), in charge of children's mental health, pulled out from those lists of questions that I submitted the ones that were now his responsibility. He was able to answer all of my questions within the 14-day period. The Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) was not able to answer one, not one.

Mr. Wildman: How does that compare with a downward mobility in the front bench?

Mr. Breagh: The only thing I could do short of that is maybe ask him his name; but I am sure, in this case, if I had asked the Minister of Health his name in a written question on the order paper, he would have sent me back notice that he required more time to research it. Not an answer was there; and they were all questions that were asked during the estimates last year to which we got no answer; questions that we had asked by telephone, by mail. We have done everything but use the pony express to try to get information out of that ministry, and none of it works because he doesn't want to answer.

The same attitude surrounds the set-up and the financing of these HSOs. They have roughly three kinds of budgets. The one that most people think is a sensible way to do it is to provide a global budget for the operation—much the same as we do in hospitals or in schools, or for building roads or a number of other things—plus the salaries. That's one method that's in place. There's kind of an interim per capita technique that's used for physicians who already had a roster of patients. There's another one that's causing a lot of problems; it's called capitation negation. Bless us, we certainly come up with titles.

Mr. Wildman: What's that, capital punishment?

Mr. Breagh: It's close to that. This is apparently the one which the ministry wants

to use, and apparently one of the reasons you can't get budgets is because they don't want outsiders sticking their nose in such things and comparing what's fair and what works. They do that on a monthly basis; so in terms of saying to an HSO, "Buy your supplies in bulk for a year," they can't do that because they are unsure of their finances. The amount of money they are paid changes depending on whether someone moves from an area and moves to an opted-out physician, or even to a physician outside their roster; so that there are complicating factors. It's hard to determine whether these things are legitimate or whether they work well, how they are financed and what's the best way of financing, because there is a noted absence of public information and because on the one hand the ministry has been steadfastly saying: "Okay, we will give it to you," but on the other hand never providing the information. It's kind of a live from month-to-month, from hand to mouth situation for most of those HSOs.

Try this on for size. There's one called Lawrence Heights. This is a community clinic providing medical care. It has had no budget increase since 1973. I can't name you a hot dog stand that's been able to stay in business since 1973 without some reflection of inflation, additional costs, expanding services. It's totally unrealistic. York Community Centre has had no budget increase since, 1975. Boyden Hill has had no budget increase since 1975. Regent's Park had its budgets cut in half in 1975.

If this is a good and workable model for the provision of health care, one that we would like to expand and provide across the north for example, where it would certainly be a workable notion, one that we could set in place in Peterborough now to solve the problem of whether people have access to a health-care system, you have to be prepared to pay for it. You certainly can't do it if you keep on cutting their budgets or holding them to a 1973 or 1975 budget amount. That's totally unrealistic.

There's no question there are cases at these HSOs, of staff people who have had to be dropped because they couldn't continue to carry them. There's no question there has to be kind of a practice developed of borrowing other services from around that community to see that the thing stays in existence. There's no question that you have to go to groups of people, like trade unions and community groups, and ask them to cough up money once again to provide health

care. I wouldn't mind that if I wasn't paying income tax, federally and provincially, for health care; and if you didn't come back at me and say that you want a premium out of me; and if you didn't come back at me again when the doctor says he wants more money; and you come back at me again when somebody else wants more money. We pay for health care, a lot, so why are we now going back to community groups and saying let's run the local community clinic like we run the amateur softball team? I think there has to be a little difference in the priorities in the way that those things are dealt with.

Municipalities are funding health care too. HSOs are paying municipal taxes. There are just a multitude of systems in place; which strikes me, if I weren't the naive and not suspicious person that I am, that this ministry has got a campaign under way to harass this model of health service organizations out of business. I don't know why they would want to do that. I'm not suggesting it as a panacea, but in many respects we can provide a better level of health care, a more integrated form of service, at much less money, in an HSO than we can in any other way.

Let me quote just a small quote from the Hastings report, which is another one of those magnificent studies that have been done in this province and tabled in this House and put out to pasture somewhere and not much is happening from it: "Central to the concept of a community health centre is the provision of care through an integrated team of various types of professionals, technologists and other personnel."

We have to have that and we have to have the financial stability to be able to provide that kind of a service to a community, and that is what is endangered here. If we move to these kind of fancy budgeting procedures that are now being accepted we threaten the life blood of these systems; they don't know where they are going from month to month.

Once again we have come up with some kind of a magic formula and stuck an impressive name on it. I still can't figure out what the name is supposed to mean, and I defy any member to give me a quick and easy definition of "capitation negation." Anyway, it is there and the name is probably impressive and it sounds like it is legitimate; and the end result will be that health service organizations suffer and there is no sane way to explain that.

What seems quite logical is that we provide to these people what municipalities are asking for, what school boards want to do these

days, what a number of agencies want: they want to give block funding, global funding. Let them then go to see if they can work on their administration costs, and in most of the HSOs that I am aware of the administration costs are pretty low because there aren't many people working in administration there.

We might well be able to get into viability in rural and northern areas because you are allowing for local difficulties. We would save money in bulk buying if we got a budget, for example, semi-annually instead of monthly. We would allow some people to be innovative in providing these services, which we almost work against in this province.

It basically comes down to insecurity. People working in these clinics want to provide a good service to a community, want to see that that service is provided at the least possible cost, and it strikes me that they are being harassed. It could be, and may well be, that they are, in fact, a threat to the medical establishment in Ontario.

I wouldn't like to think that the medical establishment is a threat to anybody. I would like to think that bodies like the OMA, or the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, or local medical groups, are concerned about patient care first and not concerned about professional jealousies over the provision of services to their community. Frankly, I think that is true. I am at a loss to explain why all of these things happen to the HSOs; why they have gone from 12 people down to two in the ministry—two and a half, excuse me.

I can never figure out how you can have half a person working, but apparently the ministry does. They have gone from 12 people monitoring, suggesting, looking after the HSOs, down to two and a half. Perhaps that is a clear indication of the priority of this program in the minister's eyes. I think that is sad, because I find in this one not a panacea but a partial solution to providing good medical care in rural Ontario, in northern Ontario, in Ontario where you have a lot of opted-out physicians and you need access to the system.

[5:00]

I think it is sad that we have come to this point—and I will be raising this matter again in subsequent question periods—that a model the minister himself says is a good one is being so poorly treated by his own ministry. In many areas where the hospital cuts are most dramatic, it would seem logical then, if the ministry has decided that this won't be a general hospital as one would have in downtown Toronto but will be a different

kind of thing, that one of the ways to accomplish that might well be to move it into the HSO classification and provide that kind of a service.

I really do not have much faith that is going to happen, and many of us are saying much the same thing. We are saying this ministry should put in place community programs because there is a clear consensus evolving within the medical profession itself and among those people who are interested in all forms of health care, whether that is mental health or working with handicapped kids or working with people who have a particular interest, on the model to provide health care. It should be smaller and it should be more responsive. It should be designed specifically to meet the needs of a community, whether that is a geographic community or a community of interests.

That is a better way to provide service. The ministry agrees with that, but we do not see any of those programs in operation, except on a pilot program basis or on a sampling basis. I don't understand how the minister gets away with having a chronic home-care program in seven places in Ontario and not in the rest of Ontario. I don't understand, in legal terms, how he does that. I don't understand how he survives in political terms and has that, but he does.

The best I can get out of him is that if he ever gets any more money out of the trees he will expand that program around Ontario. To me, that is like saying that one can only have a heart attack in certain places in this province because those are the only places where we have cardiac units. It is dumb; it does not make any sense; there is no rationale behind it. There isn't even a feeble political apology that makes any sense that he can use; he just does it that way.

I am concerned that there are not any differences when it comes to paying the tax. I am not aware of any great program at work which says that if one lives in downtown Toronto he pays taxes to this level, municipal taxes to this level and a premium to this level because he has much more sophisticated services around him, but if one lives in Kapuskasing or Smooth Rock Falls or Cochrane he pays less money because he has fewer services. No matter where one lives in this province one pays the same tax rate, one pays the same premium rate, one probably pays pretty close to the same municipal tax rate that might get diverted into health care. One pays the same no matter where one is, yet the level of service is far different. We all clearly recognize that. There isn't much

going on in that ministry to level that out and to make it more even.

In those places where we have found a model that works, as with health services organizations, we see those are the things that are subject to the most abuse. It is almost as if the current Minister of Health is taking the whole ministry to self-destruct, and at some point in time he will blow up; that nice little peach-fuzz face that we see sitting across from us will be no more and the entire ministry will disappear. That is tragic and certainly to the extreme. I admit I would pay \$9.80 a day to watch that act, but it is far too drastic for me.

Talking about the chronic care deterrent fee: why would the minister pick on chronic-care patients? The minister knows that of all the programs in operation around Ontario the one that is in poorest shape everywhere is chronic care. We have chronic-care patients in active-treatment beds at \$130 a day when we know that we could take them across the road to a clinic or a specialized community home, or even a different ward in that hospital, and reduce that cost substantially to downwards of \$25 to \$30 a day. Why pick on chronic-care patients? Did they decide to be chronic-care patients? No. If they had any place to go wouldn't they go there? Yes. Why nail them?

I recall that great and glorious day when he announced those two deterrent fee programs for psychiatric care and for chronic care. He did note that the one requiring psychiatric care co-payment would have to be legislated. I haven't seen that one yet. I imagine it may never come. I heard a couple of statements by his assistant saying, "That one isn't going to fly, so we are not going to do that one."

Certainly when he announced the chronic-care deterrent fee there weren't any guidelines attached to that. Things were pretty loose. It took a few days of media exposure to get him to change his mind on that and now there are a number of people exempted from those chronic-care deterrent fees. There are a number of unfairnesses in that. Who is going to sort out the unfairnesses? Not the minister; the local hospital administrator is going to get stuck with that job, thank you very much. Are they going to keep the money for doing the dirty work? No, that money goes to the ministry.

It seems that no matter where this Minister of Health turns he picks on the worst example that one could find to punish. I do not understand that. I do not understand why chronic-care patients, of all the people that he could pick, are the ones who are centred out for

deterrent fees. It is most unfair and is not sensible. It is not even rational. That he picks on small northern hospitals and hospitals in rural Ontario to bear the brunt of his big fight on hospital cutbacks, again makes no sense. He picks on the lowest paid physicians and says: "We will freeze your salary and let others get an increase."

I am at a loss, clearly, to understand where this ministry is going, except to say that in my view it is going to hell on a bandwagon and the faster it gets there the better off we all will be.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate on the speech from the throne this afternoon. In so doing, I would first and foremost like to compliment you, sir, on the fine and even-handed way in which you are discharging your duties as the Speaker of the House. I think your patience and tolerance and understanding is well exemplified in the way you deal with all members of the House, even our rambunctious colleague and friend from Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) on most occasions.

Mr. Nixon: More even-handed than the NDP.

Mr. Williams: Indeed, I would first and foremost compliment you on the way in which you are discharging those duties.

The most difficult consideration I have had in speaking to the speech from the throne was to single out one of so many topics that are raised in the very substantive speech from the throne, which is I guess the longest speech, and I would say of course the most substantive speech, ever presented to this Legislature. It has taken a great deal of time to select from the speech a number of topics which I feel I can, within the time permitted me, deal with in some depth. It was a difficult decision to try to select an area I felt I could concentrate on this afternoon. Hopefully, I will do some justice to the topic I think is of some major concern to the people living within the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Some aspects of the speech that caught my attention were ones that dealt essentially with environmental matters. The speech does touch on matters dealing with land and airborne contaminants that are tending to pollute our great lakes, and of course it made reference to the acidic precipitation phenomenon that has recently come to light and which has been discussed and debated at some length in this House. The speech, as well, touches on the whole well-publicized topic of the spills of toxic substances and how we should deal with them in a safe manner to

prevent the adverse effects of such unfortunate incidents.

We had a great deal of debate in this House in recent months on the matter of liquid industrial waste and the problem of containment of PCBs. Most recently, of course, we have been involved in the debate on the great concern all of us have with regard to the safety factors that relate to the operation of any nuclear power program. This, of course, arose out of the tragic accident that has occurred in one of our neighbouring states to the south.

All of these certainly have received a great deal of attention. I might say they have all been very difficult problems, with no easy answers or solutions, notwithstanding the fact that members of the opposition would tend to imply to this government that they have the answers and they can be provided forthwith.

I must compliment the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott), who has discharged his portfolio so well in dealing with all of these complex and difficult issues. I think he is dealing with them in a very forthright, honest and knowledgeable manner. The ministry obviously will continue to give leadership and direction in this very important field.

The one area within the field of environmental concerns that gives me great concern is one of a more parochial nature in that it pertains to the Metropolitan Toronto area. It is a type of situation that also has built into it a crisis. It is a more insidious type of situation that has gained little publicity in recent months, yet it has all the earmarks of the same type of environmental problems which have been under debate and which I have identified in my earlier comments.

This crisis I am alluding to is more conventional in nature and yet perhaps even more substantive, if not equally so, than all the others I have referred to. It is the solid waste disposal problem that confronts the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Metropolitan Toronto is indeed at a critical stage in endeavouring to deal with the problem. It is one that has been gaining a head of steam in recent years but has really not had the attention I feel it deserves, at least as far as publicizing the crisis is concerned. I do not believe the public at large within the Metropolitan Toronto area measure the garbage disposal problem in Metropolitan Toronto in the same light as they express concerns and fears with regard to these other types of environmental problems. Yet the solid waste disposal problem should be of equal concern to all the citizens of Metro-

politan Toronto, because it is as imminent as these other problems and probably will have a more direct personal effect on the people of Metropolitan Toronto if the crisis is not dealt with within the immediate future.

To put in proper perspective the nature of the problem and to make you aware of exactly how the problem has arisen, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch for a few moments on the historical evolution of the management, control and responsibility for solid waste disposal within the Metropolitan Toronto area.

In the earlier years it was a problem that had to be dealt with on an individualized basis by each of the municipalities, certainly before the creation of the Metropolitan Toronto corporation. The population of Metropolitan Toronto in those days was not nearly as great as it is today, with our 2,250,000 people.

[5:15]

As the need for a federated metropolitan system of government came to be perceived as being the necessary means of dealing with regional problems of local government in all areas, at that same time it was recognized that the handling of waste disposal within the metropolitan area had to be looked at on a regional basis.

Even though this was perceived early on, after the creation of Metropolitan Toronto the responsibility for waste disposal was still left with the individual constituent members of Metro. They endeavoured, within their limited financial and other capabilities, to deal with the problem reasonably well. But the sheer volume of solid waste was building up as the population grew and the ability of these municipalities to deal with the problem on an individual basis was quickly being lost. It was for that reason that, as early as 1956, not only after the creation of Metro, concerned officials and representatives of the local governments embarked upon rather in-depth studies and began to encourage the province to consider setting up regional responsibility with the Metropolitan Toronto government.

After a number of studies had been undertaken, representations and recommendations were made to the province. As a result of these the province did agree to give certain limited powers to Metropolitan Toronto to assist the municipalities in handling the garbage disposal problems within their respective boundaries.

But the province did not directly give full responsibility for the handling of garbage to Metropolitan Toronto. It occurred in two-

stages. First in 1956, when the Metropolitan Toronto Act was amended and Metro was given the authority to assist area municipalities in the matter of refuse disposal. This proved to be not totally satisfactory. Consequently, after further encouragement from the local municipalities, the province reconsidered the matter. It was through this action, along with further submissions from the Metro governments individually, as well as from the royal commission that was set up in 1963 to study the Metropolitan Toronto concept under Carl Goldenberg, that the real problem came into clear focus. The individual municipal governments within Metro, as well as Mr. Goldenberg in his report, recommended to the province that the Metropolitan Toronto government, being responsible for regional needs, had to be given that authority to deal with garbage disposal.

So it came to pass that the necessary enabling legislation was enacted and given effect from January 1, 1967. On that date the Metropolitan Toronto government took full authority and control over that complex area.

One might ask what the capability of Metro was to deal with this problem on assuming these responsibilities, and what had been accomplished by the individual municipalities before the authority was passed over to the senior level of government.

It is interesting to note that at the time Metro did take over this responsibility, there were within Metro Toronto five incinerators, two landfill sites and five transfer stations which had been set up.

I might indicate that there really are only two basic ways and means of disposing of solid waste, burn it or bury it. A variation of the latter has evolved in recent times through sophisticated technology where, primarily through the initiative of this government and the Ministry of the Environment, we have developed ways and means of trying to some extent to deal with the problem by waste recovery techniques. This is a variation on which I would like to, and will, elaborate upon at some depth in a few moments. But, essentially and basically, there are only two means by which we can realistically and effectively deal with solid waste disposal: incineration and the burying of the waste in landfill sites.

In other jurisdictions the opportunity does exist to bury solid wastes in a fashion other than burying it in the ground that is to bury it at sea. This is one of the very significant ways in which the city of New York sees a

way of dealing with the problem when hundreds of tons of solid waste, properly contained and sealed, are shipped out to sea every day of the week and dropped into the Atlantic Ocean in designated containment areas.

We don't have that opportunity to rely upon burying of waste at sea in this jurisdiction and I don't think it was ever considered, or should be, that the Great Lakes should be used for this purpose. We are restricted to the burying of garbage in landfill sites, that is, to use the crass term, in holes in the ground.

At the time that Metro came on to the scene on a full-scale basis, as I indicated a moment ago, there were five incinerators operating within Metropolitan Toronto; the Grand Street, Wellington Street and Commissioner Street incinerators, all of which were located in the city core area. The Grand Street incinerator actually was out in the Mimico Creek area.

Mr. Nixon: My God, this is uplifting.

Mr. Williams: That was somewhat west of the downtown area. In addition to that, there was the Ingram facility in North York, and more recently the Dufferin Street incinerator, which was also constructed in North York. I might point out that in those days each of the municipalities had to find the capital resources with which to build these facilities within its own community or municipality. In addition to the ones I have cited, there was the old Forest Hill incinerator the village of Forest Hill had and there was the Symes Road incinerator.

Today there are three incinerators in Metropolitan Toronto. There has been a marked decrease. Why, one might ask? Some of the incinerators I have named were totally inadequate for dealing with incineration today, based on the sheer volume of waste created every day in this metropolis.

Some of the facilities were totally inadequate, from a technical point of view, to meet the necessary environmental standards. Others were totally undersized and totally unequipped to deal with the problem we have today.

For this reason, it was necessary indeed, based on directions from this government, to close down some of those facilities. Decreasing the number of incinerators within Metropolitan Toronto meant that the growing volume of waste had to be transferred increasingly to the other option, that is the development and use of landfill sites.

In Metropolitan Toronto we are creating about 2,000,000 tons of solid waste annually.

If I may illustrate how much waste that means, you could put it in the exhibition ballpark, pile it higher than the CN tower, and still need room for garbage elsewhere. That's the magnitude of the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's a serious problem and one that has to be addressed here and now.

Within that period, as I have pointed out, reliance on incineration methods has decreased. Therefore, of necessity, reliance on landfill operations has had to increase.

In the early years there were a number of small sites operated within the Metropolitan Toronto area; sites operated for as short a term as six months and maybe as long as a year and a half to two years.

The only two major facilities developed and operated within the Metropolitan Toronto area—which in fact have kept Metro Toronto free of vast volumes of solid waste—are in the northwest, the Factory Road site, and, in the northeast the Beare Road site.

Now, as we all know, the Factory Road site is finished. It is no longer being operated. It was finished last year. The Beare Road site will reach its capacity within the next 12-month period.

Mr. J. Reed: Two more desert areas created.

Mr. Williams: The Beare Road site, of course, once it is finished will be converted into a recreational facility. It will accommodate a viable skiing operation, operated, I presume, on a municipal basis. It will accommodate the recreational needs of many people in the east end of this great metropolis. This only reflects the fact that once many landfill sites are completed they are converted to productive, usually recreational, use.

Mr. J. Reed: Have you heard about the gas problem?

Mr. Williams: Many landfill sites that were formerly holes in the ground, or abandoned quarries, have been converted through the landfill program into productive, useable land resources again.

Mr. J. Reed: Nonsense.

Mr. Williams: Many of these facilities have been converted, as I say, to recreational uses and the Beare Road site is a perfect example.

Mr. J. Reed: Ask about the trouble they are having.

Mr. Williams: But, Mr. Speaker, the real, major concern is the fact that by the end of this year there will be no more landfill sites within the 240 square miles of Metropolitan Toronto. Now the very fact that we are on borrowed time in this regard is self evident because through the initiative of the Metro-

politan Toronto government, of course, steps have been taken to try to deal with this short-term crisis by working with this government to find other landfill facilities within reasonable proximity of Metropolitan Toronto.

[5:30]

Mr. J. Reed: It generates 50 megawatts of power.

Mr. Williams: Indeed, a number of what they call transfer stations have been developed in Metropolitan Toronto in order to provide the technology and means by which garbage could be taken from the local municipalities by the equipment that's operated by the different municipalities to the various transfer stations within their areas and taken by the larger Metropolitan Toronto vehicles out to the existing landfill sites at Beare Road and beyond. At this point of time, Mr. Speaker, there are seven transfer stations operating within Metropolitan Toronto. There are three of them which in fact are former incinerators which have been closed down for one or more of the various reasons I cited earlier.

There is the Grand Street facility which has been converted to a transfer station. There's the Symes Road facility and also the Wellington Street facility. These three, having been closed down a number of years ago, are now being used for this purpose; but because they were not designed specifically to be transfer stations but rather incinerators they do not really have the suitable facilities to handle solid waste in large volume. The only transfer stations that are really designed to cope with the volume problem are those that have been specifically built for that purpose. I refer specifically to the Bermondsey transfer station in the northeast corner of North York and to the new Victoria Park station that has also been constructed and gone into operation in the northeast sector of the city of North York.

In addition, the existing Ingram incinerator, which is still operating in North York, is serving in a dual capacity as a transfer station. The new Downsview resource recovery plant is also serving in this capacity.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that since 1967 not one incinerator has been built in Metropolitan Toronto; that's over a decade ago. In fact the last one to be built was while the local municipality still had responsibility to provide for solid waste disposal.

I had an opportunity to be a member of the then township of North York council which was wrestling with the problem at that time because it was a quickly growing municipality with a dramatically increas-

ing population and resultant increasing volumes of solid waste. The only resources we had available to us within the township at that time was the heretofore referred to Ingram Avenue incinerator. That incinerator was located in the west end of North York and was not adequate to deal with the total problem within the township, so the municipality on its own initiative had to embark upon a stepped-up program of either landfill operation or to provide additional incinerator facilities.

Mr. Lawlor: Are you going to deal with the watts from waste program?

Mr. Williams: I certainly am; give me time.

Mr. Lawlor: I sit here with bated breath.

Mr. Williams: So you should, it is going to be a revelation.

The township at that time decided to embark upon the construction of what is now known as the Dufferin Street incinerator. It was the last significant and major incinerator to be built within this region in the past decade.

After Metro Toronto assumed the responsibility, it is not that they did not themselves consider embarking upon an expanded incinerator program in the way of providing the capital dollars and plant and facilities, in fact one of the major undertakings of the Metro Toronto government after it assumed that responsibility in 1967 was to consider the construction of a major facility in the southwest of Metro, in Etobicoke. At that time consideration was given to the construction of the Kipling-Horner Avenue incinerator which would have had the capacity to deal with 1,000 tons of garbage on a daily basis. That project did not get off the ground, although it had a great deal of potential. Not only would it have been the most modern and sophisticated facility in the Metro area, but it would have had complementary facilities that would have had reclamation components built into it.

Mr. Lawlor: Put it in your riding.

Mr. Williams: Of course that is the whole problem with the matter of waste disposal. "Put it in your area"; that is what you hear all the time. No one wants to deal with the problem. They think there is a magic answer to it, that it is going to go away.

Mr. Lawlor: I take it that you are welcoming the next one, are you?

Mr. Williams: These are the same people who in dealing with the energy problem will say—

Mr. Lawlor: I will tell Godfrey you want one.

Mr. Mackenzie: Get the industry engineers up there tomorrow.

Mr. Williams: —“Energy conservation will solve our problems; we don’t need new Hydro plants, whether they be conventional or nuclear. The problem is going to go away, just exercise greater conservation.”

Mr. Lawlor: Williams wants the garbage; Williams is offering—

Mr. Williams: This is the distorted perspective that I want to correct here today. I wouldn’t want the public perception to persist in that fashion, and I am amazed to hear it coming from an informed member—

Mr. Lawlor: Why don’t you lend yourself to the undistortion?

Mr. Williams: —of the Legislature who would be taking that type of attitude.

Mr. Mackenzie: Let’s show leadership, bring it to your riding.

Mr. Lawlor: Wait until it happens to you, Williams.

Mr. Williams: It is just incomprehensible that we would have these kinds of remarks coming from members of this Legislature. This is why I felt it so important for me, tonight—

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, that holier than thou.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Williams: —to bring the whole issue before this House and publicize the urgency of this problem of crisis proportions that is confronting Metropolitan Toronto.

The members of this House don’t seem to be paying attention to it and certainly are not talking about it; and they should be. They should be getting away from these distorted views of, “Don’t worry, the problem will go away; just put it in somebody else’s backyard.”

Mr. Lawlor: If your government would take the proper methods and use the Kingston experiment they might do something.

Mr. Williams: The off-the-cuff interjections by the members are really starting to highlight the nature of the problem; the distorted thinking and the illogical, irrational approach that is being taken to the problem.

Mr. Lawlor: It is beginning to get a bit dull around here.

Mr. Mackenzie: Highlighting the distortion across the chamber, like the distortion that is speaking.

Mr. Williams: We have heard debate in estimates in this House in the past from some

members of this House suggesting that we don’t want more landfill, we don’t want incineration; they are all going to contaminate the atmosphere. But they don’t have the alternative answers. They think that watts from waste is going to be the panacea, the total solution to the problem. That is an Alice in Wonderland attitude, but we have to face realities. Most certainly through the initiative of this government and the Minister of the Environment great strides have been taken to introduce the new technology in the resource recovery field—

Mr. Mackenzie: Now we are hearing Alice in Wonderland, and he is Alice.

Mr. Williams: —and I will be dealing with this matter in some depth. But I want to make it abundantly clear that—

Mr. Lawlor: Williams just went through the looking glass.

Mr. Mackenzie: This is cruel and unusual punishment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Warner: Another filibuster.

Mr. Williams: —that capability alone is not going to solve the problem of waste disposal. The basic fact of the matter is that of the 2,000,000 tons of garbage generated in Metropolitan Toronto every year, approximately 70 per cent must continue to be handled by conventional means. That means either incineration or the operation of landfill sites.

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, there is no alternative answer to that basic fact of life. We have to face up to that problem and we have to face up to that problem realistically.

This minister is making great strides in endeavouring to minimize and reduce the reliance on incineration and landfill operations through the resource recovery program. But it will not replace those two basic components in the waste disposal program of Metropolitan Toronto. No matter how many millions of dollars this government chooses to put into the resource recovery program, no matter how quickly those dollars are spent to build capital plant facilities, they could not, even if unlimited numbers of such facilities were to be built between now and the end of the century, be built in time to even begin to cope with the problem. For this reason alone we must continue to rely on the conventional facilities available to us, and make provision for additional such facilities as the need dictates. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the need is here now. It is an immediate and critical need.

Mr. Lawlor: Lord, man, it has been around for over 10 years and you have been reluctant to face it. What kind of a government—

Mr. Williams: If, in fact, the government had not, through the Minister of the Environment, approved the Pickering landfill facilities, the crisis today would be such that garbage would indeed be starting to pile up, as private compost heaps, on the lawns and in the backyards of the members from Metropolitan Toronto and the rest of the citizens of this fine metropolis. The member for Lakeshore would probably be one of the first to find the need to develop a compost heap in his backyard to deal with the vast quantities of garbage that I'm sure is generated from his home, as from every other home in Metropolitan Toronto. The crisis would have been beyond redemption if, in fact, the Pickering facility had not been opened.

The fact of the matter is that when the Beare Road site is completed this year the only operating facility with proximity to Metropolitan Toronto will be the Pickering landfill site.

Mr. Lawlor: You know the experimental project at Queen's University in Kingston which your government wiped out, they cut off all the funding.

Mr. Williams: At this point of time even the vast capacity of the Brock West facility, now expanded from approximately 7,000,000 to 8,500,000 million tons, even that facility will be completely filled with waste by 1983. Until new landfill locations can be located, engineered, developed and brought on stream, or new incinerators built, the only thing keeping us from the brink of disaster in this area is the fact that the Pickering, Brock West, Brock North and Brock South facilities can carry us through, but to no later than 1985.

[5:45]

We are indeed living in a world of make-believe if we persist in putting off this problem. It has to be dealt with immediately. This is not to say or imply that the Ministry of the Environment is not aware of this situation and is not doing something about it because indeed it is. I will be elaborating on this matter as to how our ministry is dealing with this problem.

Mr. Lawlor: He must be really aware, otherwise you wouldn't be speaking in such horrendous terms.

Mr. Williams: I want to point out at this time how the provincial government has come into an area that has been largely reserved up until recent times to the local municipalities,

and most recently to Metropolitan Toronto. I must say that the problem is one that needs joint consultation, joint involvement, and a joint undertaking through the whole process by local governments and the provincial authorities.

This team effort has been evolving and developing at a considerable pace, and none too soon. The province has started to realize that since it came into the field in 1970, when legislation brought into existence—the waste management legislation which subsequently became the environmental protection legislation—from that time forward this government has taken an ambitious and aggressive stance in dealing with this problem, working in liaison with the Metropolitan Toronto authorities.

Mr. Mackenzie: Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. Williams: In dealing with this problem, one of the first steps the ministry took was to assist in expediting necessary environmental approvals for the Pickering facility. Were it not for that facility now being available to us the crisis would have hit much sooner and would have reached much greater proportions.

One of the first steps the ministry took after entering into this field was to commission a major study to be undertaken, which came to be known as the metropolitan area waste management study. This study was undertaken by two firms of consultants on a consortium basis. James F. MacLaren Limited and M. M. Dillon Limited collaborated on the undertaking of this major study, which was published in 1976 and which I believe brought the whole matter and concern for solid waste disposal within the Metropolitan Toronto area to a new plateau.

This study clearly identified the needs, the existing shortcomings and the directions in which this government, working in league with the Metropolitan Toronto government, had to move if we were to continue at least to keep pace with the growing volume of solid wastes and the need for disposal thereof. This study made a number of recommendations, some of which were directed to local government and others which placed responsibility on this government for finding solutions.

The report clearly pointed out that there had to be a greater consultative and co-operative effort among local governments. I would point out that this particular waste management study was developed not only to deal with the Metropolitan Toronto waste disposal problem, but as well with the problems of the adjoining regional municipalities of Peel,

York and Durham. For that reason, it was called the metropolitan area waste management study, because a broader area geographically was taken into consideration in recognition of the fact that the whole problem of solid waste disposal could not be confined within the political boundaries of any one municipality or region. It was most appropriate that such a study was undertaken and given as broad a base as it was, because to have done otherwise would have meant a study that at least would have been unrealistic.

One of the major recommendations of the study was that the four regions involved in that study should prepare a detailed master plan for solid waste management to provide for integrated solid waste management systems.

The Ministry of the Environment responded to this situation by setting up its own committee, which has been identified as the Metropolitan Toronto and area waste management committee, and which is under the present chairmanship of Mr. Cockburn, who is the director, central region, of the ministry. This committee has the responsibility for endeavouring to co-ordinate the activities of the four regions that come under the umbrella of this particular study, and a great deal of progress has been made in attempting to have a better co-ordination of effort between these municipalities.

One of the problems that has existed in the past was that local governments tended to want to retain the responsibility for waste disposal until they found that the problem had become so big, and the cost associated with dealing with the problem so great, that they no longer had the financial capacity and other technical resources to deal with the problem.

For this reason the study recommended that the regional acts should be amended to give full authority to York, Durham and Peel to be able to deal with the problem on a regional basis, as Metropolitan Toronto currently has that authority.

One of the interesting anomalies that exist at the present time is that, while the regions of Durham and Peel have authority to deal effectively with the problem, the region of York has been denied this right, I guess just through circumstance when the legislation was being prepared. But, in any event, York region has been denied the responsibility and authority for dealing with solid waste within its jurisdiction.

This in itself has created some problems which have required the Metropolitan Toronto and area waste management committee to set up another resource committee to deal

specifically with Metropolitan Toronto and York region to see if they together could not resolve this problem and deal on a joint basis with the problem of finding the necessary landfill sites or incinerator locations to accommodate the waste disposal that will be generated by those two regions over the next two decades.

At the present time the waste management committee that I have been referring to has determined in its ongoing studies that approximately 3,500,000 tons of solid waste will be generated within the region by 1985 and almost 4,500,000 tons by 1995. The projections indicate that by the turn of the century the four regional municipalities within the area study will be generating in excess of 5,000,000 tons of garbage per year. This is a massive problem that requires extensive capital investment, the development of massive capital resources to deal with it.

Mr. Lawlor: How can you speak for this length of time without once mentioning the word "recycling"?

Mr. Williams: After the dinner break, I will be dealing with the resource recovery programs that exist and are on stream within the Metropolitan Toronto area and that are being developed through the initiative of the Minister of the Environment.

I think the member for Lakeshore will have his illusions shattered when he learns how actively and aggressively the ministry is making headway in the whole matter of resource recovery.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm sure I'll be pulverized—into garbage.

Mr. Williams: I hope the member will be first in his seat after the dinner hour to hear words of wisdom and become informed and brought completely up to date on what is happening in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Mr. Lawlor: You wrap me up like a bale. I'll be shredded.

Mr. Williams: In the few minutes left to me before the dinner recess, I would like to dwell further on the magnitude of the problem that exists, as identified by the waste management study that was undertaken.

It is quite clear that the local municipalities, even at the regional level, cannot on their own initiative cope with the problem any longer. The Ministry of the Environment, through its initiative and in co-ordination with these municipalities, has to come to grips with this existing crisis. The only means by which they can do so is on an ongoing basis, whereby a great deal of capital dollars

and technical input has to be brought forward and provided on an on-going basis.

After the dinner hour, I will elaborate on how the province specifically will be making its initiative and endeavouring to at least contain the crisis that currently exists. It is no more than a matter of containment. It is not a resolution of the problem unless we are prepared to recognize and, as a govern-

ment, assist the regional municipalities in providing the necessary conventional waste disposal facilities which are lacking at this present time.

Mr. Acting Speaker: This might be a reasonable time to ask the honourable member to break his speech.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Nuclear plant safety, statement by Mr. Auld	645
Legal Aid tariff, statement by Mr. McMurtry	648
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. J. Reed, Mr. Sargent	650
Ryerson financing, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Cooke, Mrs. Campbell	652
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. J. Reed	654
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Conway	656
Glanbrook landfill site, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Cunningham	657
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Ms. Gigantes	657
Chest disease cases, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Pope, Mr. Wildman	658
Disposal of hazardous wastes, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Foulds	659
Health questionnaire, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	660
Day-care policy, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy	660
Cabinet authority, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Warner	661
Petition re Ministry of Health annual report, Mr. Lawlor	662
Motion re Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Welch, agreed to	662
Insurance Amendment Act, Mr. Nixon, first reading	662
Employment Standards Declaratory Act, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	662
Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Stong, first reading	662
Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Williams	662
Recess	685

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Pope, A. (Cochrane South PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rotenberg D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Orillia PC)



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resumption of the debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock the member for Oriole was holding forth.

Mr. J. Reed: That's a fairly good description.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, just at the time of the dinner break I was commenting on the impact the metropolitan area waste management study, produced in 1976 for the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, was having. I had pointed out that that study had brought the whole problem of solid waste disposal to a new high level of interest and involvement at the provincial level. I pointed out that historically the responsibility for solid waste disposal, or garbage as it is commonly called, had been largely vested in and remained with the municipalities.

Mr. J. Reed: That's what it is.

Mr. Williams: We have moved from the day of the handling of this matter by the individual municipality, through the two-tier system of local government into the regional government area of operation and control. We have now reached the point where we have an active co-operative venture being undertaken with the provincial authorities through the Ministry of the Environment working with the local regional governments.

The metropolitan area waste management study has pointed the way. As a result of that study, one of its major recommendations was implemented when the Metropolitan Toronto and area waste management committee was established.

As I was saying in my closing remarks before dinner, that committee has been actively involved in co-ordinating the efforts between the four regional municipalities which are encompassed within that area study; the regions of Peel, York, Durham and of course Metropolitan Toronto. It is through the co-ordinating efforts of that committee

that real progress is being made in joint undertakings and efforts by these regional governments to deal with the problem on a truly regionalized basis.

One of the other extremely important areas of involvement by the committee is that dealing with resource recovery. The Metro Toronto and area waste management committee undertook a study in 1978 which concluded that the municipalities within the study area should pursue very actively resource recovery methods as they are proven viable, with the purpose in mind to ultimately lessen the dependence on landfill.

I stress the point that the purpose is to lessen the dependence on landfill as a means of disposal. I made it quite clear earlier that the resource recovery methods and techniques as they're known to us today will never be able to fully replace the conventional methods of disposal of solid wastes by either incineration or the landfill process.

The objectives established by the committee have been to embark upon a program that would provide resource recovery facilities to reduce the dependence on landfill and incineration by approximately 26 per cent. That is the resource recovery program, when fully implemented as envisioned by the committee, would process about 26 per cent of the total annual waste generated within the study area by the year 1985. This objective would indeed help to contain the ever-growing problem of the increasing volumes of solid waste created by an ever-growing Metropolitan complex.

What I would like to do, particularly now that the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) has joined us, is to embark, for a few moments, upon an in-depth consideration of the resource recovery programs the ministry has in mind and what successes they have had.

Mr. J. Reed: That's exactly what it is.

Mr. Lawlor: You are rising to the bait.

Mr. J. Reed: It's had them in mind since 1973.

Mr. Williams: I think we can identify specifically this evening at least six resource recovery programs in which the ministry is actively involved. One of these is no longer on the drawing boards, it is a reality and

is in place and operating. That particular undertaking, of course, is the Downsview resource recovery plant that was opened just about a year ago. I guess it was last August when the Premier (Mr. Davis) attended the official opening of the plant, which is considered by many to be the world's most advanced solid waste processing plant. The objective of that facility is to ultimately, when operating at full capacity, handle approximately 1,400 tons of garbage daily, acting as a transfer outlet within the transfer station program that we have within Metro, transferring 800 tons of that refuse to the existing landfill site out in Pickering, with the remaining 600 tons being subjected to resource recovery treatment. Essentially what happens in that situation is that when the glass and non-combustible materials are segregated from the paper and film, the combustible material can then be shredded, dried and processed, and the material treated in this fashion used in conjunction with the contract that's been entered into with Canada Cement Lafarge Limited, in Woodstock, Ontario, to assist them in fuelling their furnaces in that operation.

It is hoped that the use of the recycled fuel from the Downsview facility will ultimately contribute to approximately 50 per cent of the fuel consumed at the Woodstock undertaking.

If those expectations are met, it is anticipated that other cement manufacturing plants within Ontario will come on board and also participate in this project, which I think is a world leader.

The Downsview facility is at the startup point in its operation and is processing approximately a third of the anticipated daily 600 tons; in other words, it is now processing somewhat more than 200 tons. As of the coming week, the first transfers of processed garbage in the form of fuel—recycled fuel from the garbage, if you will—will be in transit to the Woodstock facility. Up until this point they have been burning it on stream, experimenting with the recycled material at the Dufferin incinerator close by and doing other experimental work with the recycled refuse.

Accordingly, we would hope that a year from now we will have our first significant report on the total success of that operation, utilizing the facilities of the cement company in Woodstock.

One of the other high-priority items currently under consideration is conversion of a part of the existing Commissioners Street incinerator, which is one of the three remaining operating incinerators within Metro-

politan Toronto, so that it could provide steam from the processing of the garbage that is transferred to that facility. This would be for the purpose of providing energy in the form of steam to the Continental Can Company operation which adjoins the Commissioners Street incinerator facility.

This is an exciting proposal that still is in its planning stages. It requires the co-operative efforts of the ministry, Metro and, of course, the private industrial concern involved. It is anticipated, however, that the details of this particular project will be resolved in the near future and, therefore, that this program itself will also become a reality in the near future.

Dealing with the highly touted watts-from-waste program, an undertaking that has caught the particular attention of the member for Lakeshore, in which he places a great deal of faith, as we all do, that program is at the point where consideration of the establishment of a facility in Etobicoke is very much along in the planning process.

I am speaking of the Disco Road proposal, for development of a facility that would process about 800 tons of waste a day, with the residual 500 tons of recycled fuel being processed on a daily basis. That fuel would be used specifically to feed the Lakeview generating station at the lakeshore so that the Disco Road watts-from-waste program is tied in specifically with that particular electrical generation station of Ontario Hydro.

[8:15]

I must say, however, that there have been two setbacks in this particular program of some significance. It is with regret that I have to inform the House this evening, if it is not already generally known, of two difficulties that have arisen. First, the anticipated cost of the project of about \$36,000,000, based on preliminary tenders that have been received, has now proved to be an underestimated cost in that the tenders reveal a more accurate projected cost of \$46,000,000, up by \$10,000,000.

I must point out that the total cost does involve the converting of one of the furnaces at the lakeshore facility at an estimated cost of \$12,000,000. That is part of the built-in cost, but the total project has increased dramatically by \$10,000,000.

While the province would absorb totally the cost of the furnace conversion at the Lakeview facility, estimated at \$12,000,000, the province would be contributing only \$3,000,000 more to the development and building of the actual Disco Road site. Consequently, the increased capital cost of that

project, based on these preliminary tenders, has put the Metropolitan Toronto corporation in a rather difficult position, to the point where it appears the moneys that have been set out in the Metro Toronto capital budget for this year for this project have now been set aside. This indeed is a setback in the undertaking and development of that project.

I must point out, however, that it is not only the increased cost factor that is causing difficulties with the Metro partner in this undertaking but, in addition thereto, there are some mechanical problems that have come to light in recent weeks.

There are similar facilities being operated on an experimental basis too in our neighbouring states to the south. In three plants in particular, one in Iowa, another in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and a third in Chicago, Illinois, they have been experimenting with this watts-from-waste concept.

That has been reported to the ministry whose observers have determined that they have run into some difficulties in the use of that recycled fuel in the plants in those jurisdictions. This is giving great cause for concern because the recycled fuel is not burning cleanly and is causing difficulty in those facilities where they don't have the appropriate equipment to handle continuing residue falling out from that recycled fuel.

Those facilities heretofore have used coal totally as the source of fuel. It goes in in a powdered form and is completely consumed so that there are no grates or other equipment in the furnaces in those American experimental plants that are equipped to handle any residue or fallout such as they are experiencing from the recycled fuel with molten glass and other contaminants that are fouling up the grating system in those furnaces.

This then is the second setback that the watts-from-waste program has experienced. At this time it is difficult to say from a timing point of view how much further back this will set the program. My understanding, however, is that it is the full intention of the ministry, notwithstanding, in continuing to co-operate with Metropolitan Toronto, to persist and to see that program develop.

The fourth resource recovery project the ministry is pursuing actively in partnership with one of the regional municipalities is the Peel-Reed waste recovery plant that is proposed in the Peel region. The ministry is working actively with the Peel authorities to develop that program.

What is involved is the providing of waste material to act not only as fuel but also as material to go into the manufactured products of the Reed board plant in Peel. Reed

has a property that is adjacent to the proposed site for the establishment of the separation plant that Peel and the ministry are proposing to build in that area.

I would point out that the Peel project would indeed be a unique undertaking as far as North America is concerned, in that they would be adapting a system new certainly to Ontario that has been developed in Italy. It is called the Sorrain-Cecchini separation process of waste material. This technique apparently has proved itself in Europe and is one that would be ideally suited to this particular undertaking.

In conjunction with the development of the separation plant using this technique it is also anticipated there would be incineration facilities developed on the site that would also assist in the waste disposal program in that region.

The fifth resource recovery project actively under consideration, which will have a profound impact if eventually brought on stream, as I anticipate it will be, is one that affects the inner core of the Metropolitan Toronto area. That, of course, is the development of the new Toronto district heat plant within the inner city that would replace the existing Toronto Hydro Pearl Street plant that contributes so substantially to the steam-heat program within the inner city.

At the present time, as you know, Mr. Speaker, we have operating within the inner city approximately five different systems providing steam heat to some of the institutions, such as the hospitals, government buildings and to some of the private corporations as well, I believe. It is anticipated that the new Toronto district heat facility would become the baseload carrier for the system within the city of Toronto, and as such would replace the present systems, making them simply the backup or secondary resource facilities in the event of a shutdown for whatever reason of this new, main facility.

That undertaking is one that would cost in the way of capital outlay approximately \$84,000,000, so it is a very substantial project. But the steam-producing incinerator is one that is very much needed to assist in dealing with the solid waste volumes within the inner city, and at the same time assist in meeting the needs of the Toronto central heating system.

I think I have clearly shown that, indeed, there are some very specific resource recovery programs under way within Metropolitan Toronto. Just before leaving the one I mentioned last—the district heating plant for the inner city—I must point out it is still very much in the planning stage. It is such a big

undertaking that, in fact, a rather substantial study has to precede the actual undertaking of the work. At this point in time, the city of Toronto has set aside \$500,000 for a \$2,000,000 study, with the province committing itself for \$500,000 and the federal government \$500,000.

At this time, the Metropolitan Toronto corporation is being asked also to contribute the same amount of money to provide the necessary funds to undertake this comprehensive study. But the initiative is coming from the city of Toronto, notwithstanding the fact it is a Metropolitan Toronto responsibility. There is certainly a great deal of co-operation going on right now, at the administrative level, between those two local government jurisdictions.

I think I have highlighted the resource recovery program and where we are with regard to it. The Ministry of the Environment, of course, is helping too in a very tangible way—in the form of dollars and resource people to give direction and assistance in the continuing development of this program.

Having touched on these specific types of resource recovery programs, I have to come back, however, to the main point I made earlier in the day. That is, we must not lose sight of the fact that if all these resource recovery projects come to full fruition and become totally operative, as envisaged by the ministry and the committee in charge of developing the programs, these projects, along with the existing three operating incinerators within Metropolitan Toronto, will handle only between 25 and 30 per cent of the solid waste disposal problem in Metropolitan Toronto; 30 per cent maximum is what the experts predict.

So I clearly come back to this point: Those people deceived into thinking this is the panacea, the answer to the solid waste disposal program, are just not considering this matter in the light of reality. Seventy per cent of the solid waste disposal program will need to be left to the conventional means of incineration or landfill. The best that the resource recovery program will do is to help contain the increased percentage by which incineration and landfill will have to cope with this problem.

I can't stress that point too strongly because it brings me back to one or two of my concluding comments.

[8:30]

Mr. Martel: Oh, don't quit now.

Mr. Williams: While we have the Pickering landfill facility operating as really the only major facility that will take us through

the next five-year period, decisions have to be made now, not five years from now. Decisions have to be made within the next few months as to what new landfill sites will be available to the study region, that is, the four regions that are the subject matter of the study.

There is no existing facility, either north or west of the Metropolitan Toronto boundaries, that can accommodate the growing volume of waste. As I pointed out earlier, the existing landfill sites will be able to accommodate the volumes of waste only until 1985. We've got about a five-year period. That doesn't mean we don't have to do anything for another four or five years. The fact is we have to be making decisions now so that the necessary lead time is available to us to develop new landfill sites or expedite the development of the new incinerating facilities, such as the proposed district heating plant for the inner city of Toronto.

Whichever direction we move in, there are huge capital dollars that have to be committed. There are significant studies and plans that have to be developed over the next two or three years. Before those can even get under way, decisions have to be made that will give the green light to the agencies or governments involved to start this work. And it has to be done now.

A great deal of consideration and concern has been expressed about whether or not the provincial government should involve itself even more deeply in the field than it is at present by assuming directly the responsibility for the locating and developing of landfill sites within the region. Members will be aware of the fact that with regard to Metropolitan Toronto, John Roberts in his review of the Metropolitan Toronto government recommended specifically that the province assume this responsibility and that it be taken out of the hands of the metropolitan regional governments and given to the province. I think he felt in his study, in giving his reasons for this, that the province would not be acting in as parochial a way as perhaps some of the regional governments would be in applying the 19th century attitude expressed by the member for Lakeshore earlier today in saying that it's a great undertaking but "let's not have it in my backyard."

Mr. Lawlor: I've been leaving you alone. You had better watch yourself.

Mr. Williams: I think so long as that attitude persists and prevails—

Mr. Lawlor: I've been very patient with you up to now.

Mr. Williams: —we're just going to go nowhere with solving the huge problem that confronts Metro.

Mr. Lawlor: I thought you were winding down. I didn't want to get you going.

Mr. Williams: This indeed is a matter that is of great concern. I would say—and the minister has made it quite clear as recently as two or three weeks ago in addressing himself to this problem, based on representations and petitions submitted to him by the Whitchurch-Stouffville council—that the ministry is not about to take on that responsibility because it is felt that the regional governments have the full capacity and ability to deal with this regional problem.

The minister does not hesitate to make a place at the disposal of these regional governments through the committee and directly through the ministry. It's placed its resources at the command of these regional governments, but he does want the regional governments to remain primarily responsible for developing these sites to meet this regional problem.

The minister has committed himself and the ministry to allaying some of the concerns that have been expressed, if additional landfill sites are developed, about what safeguards or guarantees are going to be there, once these sites are completed and are converted to other functional uses. I think it has been made clear that the ministry is prepared to ensure that any of the public health and safety concerns are met.

One of the considerations of the ministry will be to ensure that perpetual care will be taken of existing—

Mr. J. Reed: You are going to need that. It will be just like a cemetery, won't it?

Mr. Williams: —and yet-to-be-developed landfill sites. If it did come to pass that any off-site contamination occurred after sites had been completed—which could happen, as we cannot guarantee that none of these things will happen; it's impossible to guarantee that nothing will happen since nothing is totally perfect, as we all realistically recognized—the ministry is prepared to commit itself to ensuring that perpetual care will be available there through the auspices of this government—

Mr. Haggerty: Like the Love Canal.

Mr. J. Reed: Is perpetual care your final solution?

Mr. Williams: —to provide these additional safeguards and to meet any unexpected contingencies that may arise. The financial resources and the resources of the ministry will be there to provide this protection. In addition

to that, it is anticipated that a mechanism could be developed whereby a fund could be established to set up a contingency reserve to meet any of these possibilities.

In the event that the municipalities are not able to continue the initiative and co-operation they've shown—

Mr. Martel: There ought to be a law against this.

Mr. Haggerty: Put the city dump in your neighbour's backyard. That's what you're saying.

Mr. J. Reed: He doesn't want it in Oriole.

Mr. Williams: —in working with each other to develop the much-needed additional landfill site or incinerator and/or facilities within their regions—

Mr. Haggerty: Let the cities control their own.

Mr. Williams: —then the ministry will at that time have to decide whether it will have no other recourse but to assume that primary responsibility of locating, designating, developing and operating such sites. But, as the minister and the ministry have stated, they do not want to take that initiative away from the regional municipalities.

I know the Metro chairman of Metropolitan Toronto has suggested that, if necessary, if the continuing co-operation which is looking very positive at the moment didn't persist and continue, he would see the need for the provincial government perhaps to set up a separate crown agency that would have to assume this responsibility. It is hoped that the province will not have to assume the responsibility for securing sites for solid waste disposal and it would only be as a last resort that we would do so. I would hope that the suggestion by Metro Chairman Godfrey does not have to be pursued through default by the participating regional governments.

I hope in my brief comments this afternoon and this evening I have been able to bring a meaningful and true perspective to the magnitude and scope of the solid waste disposal crisis—

Mr. Kerrio: It's liquid waste, too.

Mr. Nixon: Are you still in the sewage?

Mr. Williams: —that confronts the people of Metropolitan Toronto and neighbouring regions. We must, on a co-operative basis, come to grips with this unpublicized crisis as a top-priority consideration and I would hope in the ensuing weeks and months ahead the members of the Legislature, working in co-operation with the ministry, will ensure the priority this problem deserves and will en-

courage the ministry to accelerate its undertakings to bring about a solution.

On behalf of the 2,500,000 people within Metropolitan Toronto and environs I would hope that this crisis, which has not received the recognition it deserves, will now be considered anew, and with renewed interest and involvement by the regional and provincial governments, to bring a solution to this problem.

Mr. J. Reed: I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that when I was beginning to put together some of the remarks I thought I would like to make tonight, I didn't have the benefit of stimulation from the member for Oriole. But now, especially during the last 43 minutes or so, in speaking of a subject that is rather close to my heart, he has succeeded in stimulating my adrenalin flow to the extent that I am now once again duly revived—

Mr. Grande: Stimulating your adrenalin flow!

Mr. Ruston: Ninety-five minutes.

Mr. J. Reed: —and I hope I will be able to make some contribution in this reply to Her Honour's speech.

Mr. Gregory: Don't take too long.

Mr. Ruston: I guess we will have to play the game too.

Mr. J. Reed: The great riding of Halton-Burlington is one of those ridings where population intensity has been increasing at a rate somewhat larger than in many other areas of the province.

Mr. Ruston: You have until 10:30.

Mr. J. Reed: As a result, the garbage crisis, to which my friend the member for Oriole referred, is a very real one. It has developed to the extent that the landfill sites—and what a misnomer that is; landfill, sanitary landfill site. There is nothing sanitary about a dump. We have to accept that fact right at the beginning—the dumps in Halton-Burlington are essentially full and, lo and behold, would you believe that now the region is selecting a new dump. It is to be located on 250 acres of prime agricultural land, some of the finest land, incidentally, in southern Ontario.

Mr. Haggerty: Choice agricultural land.

Mr. Nixon: It always is.

Mr. J. Reed: This problem was one of the issues that led me into the political forum in the first place.

Mr. Haggerty: You are going to be there a long time.

Mr. Lawlor: It lead you up the garden path, did it?

Mr. J. Reed: I have spent a good part of my time trying to look at the alternatives to landfill sites, if I use the very polite term, and I might say that over the last three years I have made some interesting discoveries, as have the environment critics in the Liberal Party, which obviously have not filtered through to the government as yet.

[8:45]

The first observation I have to make is that Ontario is the last jurisdiction in the civilized world to get serious about resource recovery. I wonder whether the member for Oriole understands that in England resource recovery was common practice 40 years ago. I wonder whether he understands that in Montreal there is a company called Dominion Bridge, which exports its garbage disposal technology to all corners of Europe, and that the first installation was made a couple of years ago in the city of Montreal, which is producing 20 megawatts of electricity by burning garbage on a continuous basis.

I wonder whether the member for Oriole knows that. Does he realize that the technology exists in Canada, and yet the government of Ontario only now is discovering this wondrous thing called resource recovery. To accommodate this grand idea, they have spent \$15,000,000 at Downsview for a separation-at-source or front-end system. It may be, as the member for Oriole says, the most advanced of its kind in the world. The only question is, of course, who wants it? Another question is, who needs it? The main question is, what percentage of the product going into the resource recovery system is coming out as usable product? I think it is around half—if that—that is coming out as some kind of usable product.

As a result of that, the member goes on to say that because of that advanced technology and what we have found, if I understood him correctly, we must have a continuing progression of garbage dumps across the province to take the necessary landfill.

Do the member and the government understand that with the correct kind of utilization of garbage the kind of end product is entirely different; that the kind of place it needs to go is entirely different? Does he realize there are processes where the end product is not only greatly reduced in size, but it is also relatively inert; that there is no problem with deterioration of the water table? There is no need to worry about it, because it simply is a relatively inert product.

I wonder whether the member even realizes there are two technologies that I know of in North America that now are on stream and produce two end products and just two end products—one a feedstock either to the petrochemical industry or for energy production, and the other a granular building product—and the systems require no landfill whatsoever.

The choice of technologies is broad—it was quite broad by 1975-77—and is increasing all the time. As a matter of fact, in 1977 the environment critic and I had the opportunity to go to Washington, District of Columbia, and attend a seminar on waste recovery. It was a seminar held 18 months after the federal government in the United States had declared garbage to be a national resource—not a problem, but a national resource.

The US government put up some seed money and challenged the municipalities and the states across the United States of America to put together various technological choices and various financial arrangements that would allow resource recovery to become a reality in the United States by 1980. In 18 months, I remind the member for Oriole, there were 68 different resource recovery systems in operation.

I always wonder with amazement why it is that in Ontario we are the last. We never seem to be in the forefront. I can tell the House right now that when we finally get on the ball—and it may not be until after another election, when the Liberals finally take over the government—we may once again, because of pressure of time, have to choose a technology created and manufactured outside this country. It disturbs me very much.

The government has made a big thing about resource recovery through the Environment ministry. There was a grand announcement, first of all, in 1973, that resource recovery would become a reality in Ontario. I think at the time the indication was that eight resource recovery plants would be created.

Mr. Haggerty: In the gravel pits around Woodstock?

Mr. J. Reed: There were to be eight, Mr. Speaker. I haven't seen one. There is one demonstration front-end plant at Downsview and that's all it is—a front-end plant; not one resource recovery unit in Ontario and it is now 1979.

The Ministry of the Environment also made a grand pronouncement last year that the government would underwrite 100 per cent of the cost of resource recovery for municipalities, with a 50 per cent payback. But when you read the fine print, what you find

is that the technological framework makes acceptance of that kind of thing virtually impossible.

I have been pleading with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott) ever since to broaden the base of that kind of financing to allow municipalities to choose the kind of resource recovery system most appropriate to their own population density, most appropriate to their own infrastructure and most appropriate to their financing capabilities. Yet the ministry reneges because it is always easier to make the grand pronouncement and then let everything slide.

Mr. Haggerty: It's cheaper to buy existing plants, isn't it, John?

Mr. J. Reed. My friend from Erie talks about the relative costs and so on. I have had this story presented to me so many times—landfill \$5 a ton, resource recovery \$8 a ton. But nowhere have I seen an award given to the value of the end products of resource recovery systems. The only official comments I have heard from the government about that very subject came from the former Minister of the Environment who said: "We just couldn't find markets for some of those products." That is the biggest piece of hogwash one could ever imagine. Garbage has to be looked at as a provincial resource; it must be dealt with as a provincial resource.

We heard everything in the last hour. I even heard—it is wonderful—the word "crisis" and with that I agree. Then I heard the expression "perpetual care." It is related somehow to other areas. The only expression we didn't hear in connection with this was "final solution."

The member, the new minister of garbage, has talked about the great uses to which these landfill sites can be put. The member for Oriole should inquire of organizations like Landscape Canada and so on, and just find out whether or not there are any problems with some of these landfill sites turned into recreation areas. To carry it a step further, some of them have even been turned into housing developments. Let him find out about the ones that have been vented in the Kitchener area. Let him find out about the people who have been called back to ski hills built on garbage dumps because of the danger of methane explosion.

Mr. Grande: Finished?

Mr. J. Reed: I have just started.

All of the dreams and machinations of the government will not bring resource recovery to pass. And all of the protestations that landfill is a continuing necessity on the basis on which it had been engineered in the past is

just plain nonsense. To suggest that one can constantly monitor a landfill site in perpetual care does not hold any water whatsoever.

I do not know of one leachate system, for instance, in the province of Ontario that works 100 per cent. I don't know of one that works 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker, but I can take you to lots that don't work well at all. Anyone who knows anything about landfill and garbage knows that the toxicity and the intensity of the runoff in the leachate builds for the first 10 years and then stays with us at a gradually diminishing level for the next 20 or 30 years. And that landfill site, if it is on prime agricultural land, will never again grow a crop that is suitable for human or animal feed.

The time has come for the government to do something constructive about garbage. The riding of Halton-Burlington has a very large population in the south end and a relatively small one in the north end, which has precipitated a problem since the inception of regional government. The problem is simply not only that the voting power is concentrated in the populated area, but also that the provincial government's calculations and provincial government spending in the area are directed to calculations based on the whole region.

Because of this anomaly the north end of the region of Halton is devoid of nursing home facilities. For the last two years I have tried to convince the ministry of the reality of the situation in Halton, and the fact that the figures the ministry uses to calculate the need for bed space is based on the whole region and does not address the obvious problem of what one does with a person in the north end of the riding who needs extended care. The situation at the present time is such that a person living in the great town of Georgetown or the great town of Acton must leave his community for the rest of his natural life in order to get the kind of medical care that he needs.

Mr. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. J. Reed: Yes, it is a shame, because there is no need for that kind of thing if the ministry were to just calculate the need on the basis of the physical areas, the community areas, rather than on the basis of the region. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the need for nursing home beds in the north end of Halton is one of the projects that I have pursued with intensity since my first election to this House, and I will continue to pursue it until we succeed.

Mr. Nixon: We will back you up when you are Minister of Energy, too. The week after next.

Mr. J. Reed: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has brought me nicely to my next subject because I would like to talk for a couple of minutes on that state within a state that we call Ontario Hydro.

Mr. Nixon: This will be good. He knows more about it than anybody.

Mr. J. Reed: You have to know something first of all about the history of how Hydro got that way, Mr. Speaker. It wasn't always that way. It was the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

Mr. Makarchuk: It was only when they got the friends of Bill Davis on the board of directors. That is when it started.

[9:00]

Mr. J. Reed: Just be a little careful because your party voted in the Power Corporation Act.

I believe it was in 1973, if I understand my history properly, that the Power Corporation Act changed Ontario Hydro from being a commission to a power corporation.

Mr. Nixon: A black day for Ontario.

Mr. J. Reed: It was a black day for Ontario. Thank you. I get my best lines from my colleague. But first of all I have to say that, to the credit of the Liberal Party, under the great leadership of the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, we were the only party that voted against that headlong rush into the Power Corporation Act.

What did it do? The Power Corporation Act, with all of its benefits on one hand, removed any ability of government to impose policy framework or active controls on the operation of Ontario Hydro. As a matter of fact, if we study the corporate makeup of Ontario Hydro as it exists now, we will find that it is logical for the directors of Ontario Hydro to consider that they, in trust, own Ontario Hydro. If we look at it further and try to get an opinion on where the responsibility is of those directors, that responsibility—and I have to give this name, because I just learned it two weeks ago—is called fiduciary responsibility. In a private corporation, that would be the responsibility of directors to their stockholders. If we look at how it is set up in Ontario Hydro, we find that the fiduciary responsibility is to the board of directors itself. It is a state within a state.

Probably for the first time, there has been a great deal of concern in the last few years about Ontario Hydro because of rising energy

costs and with the change from hydraulic generation of electric power—which is the best, most reliable and cheapest in the world—to basically thermal generation, both nuclear and fossil fuel. There is a coming realization that the buck has got to stop somewhere in terms of responsibility. The people of Ontario expect—and believe, by and large, at the present time—that the buck stops with the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Nixon: That's a joke.

Mr. J. Reed: It is the biggest joke that has ever been perpetrated on the people. The buck does not stop with the Minister of Energy. The only ultimate control is in the hands of the Treasurer of Ontario and, in a reactive sense, with the Premier through the approval or non-approval of Lieutenant Governor's order in council. That is the only control. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, that is some control; it is the kind of control that could have been exercised over the last five or six years.

I would like to ask the Premier—and I think the opportunity will come this spring—how many orders in council the cabinet really turned down when Hydro went to them asking for approval. There was a great temptation to rubber-stamp absolutely everything that came before them: Hydro could do no wrong.

We hope to change that when we reintroduce our bill, called the Hydro Public Accountability Act, later this week. It will compel the Ministry of Energy to take government policy to Ontario Hydro, and it will amend the Power Corporation Act to compel Ontario Hydro to accept it.

If the members think this is something far-fetched that the government could not accept, I would just like to refer briefly to a press release dated February 14, 1974. In this press release the Premier (Mr. Davis) announced the appointment of the new board of directors of Ontario Hydro and I have to reveal something very interesting in his statement. He says that the focus of the board's efforts is to facilitate consistent policy direction in compliance with government policy. Can you believe it? I wonder where he's been all these years: "in compliance with government policy."

Even Task Force Hydro recommended that government policy should apply to Ontario Hydro and that has never ever been effected, and I believe it can only be effected through proper amendments to the Power Corporation Act and the Energy Act. Only then will the Minister of Energy become

accountable to the people of Ontario for the actions of Ontario Hydro.

As a result of the lack of imposition of control on Hydro, control the government could have imposed through the refusal to simply rubber-stamp orders in council, there began a process of overbuilding which is incomparable in the history of this province. The capital overbuild, if one takes the whole investment of Ontario Hydro, is \$2,000,000,000. If one considers the replacement, the current building cost of that capital, it is \$4,000,000,000, which has to be the biggest blunder in the history of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: And there have been some big ones.

Mr. J. Reed: I think this one is bigger. The government has started to come to the rescue and they said it is better to have too much than too little.

The Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman), speaking to the Association of Major Power Consumers on March 29, talked about the surplus and to accept the surplus but accused the opposition of "talking of dealing with the surplus by stopping the world"—I am quoting from Mr. Grossman's speech—"by stopping the world." The minister said, "We at the Ministry of Industry and Tourism see this surplus as a key weapon in our competition for new industry."

If he only knew; if he only understood enough about the generation of electric power he would realize that that 4,000 megawatt surplus—the surplus which exists over and above reserve margins of all sorts, over and above all techniques of load management, over and above any thrust to gain in capacity through conservation, that surplus which is unused and unusable—simply adds to the cost of the electric power that is being consumed in the province of Ontario.

We talk about the problems with and the costs of medical care. I have often wondered about our employment, our medical care and our government thrusts in various directions in resource and recovery and so on, and what it would be like if we had redirected that \$2,000,000,000 in other directions.

Mr. Nixon: The minister says it is good to be stupid, I guess.

Mr. J. Reed: It is better not to think if you want to become a minister of this government.

Mr. Gregory: You are perfectly qualified then, aren't you?

Mr. J. Reed: The so-called positive economic impact of the overbuild is of the shortest duration; maybe that's political, but

if anybody would take the trouble to look at Hydro's forecast of the wholesale cost of producing power in 1984 or 1985, it's easy to see that the cost of power between now and then will once again more than double. Why? Because we've got a system that will go largely unused.

The Premier says this surplus is going to save us from the ayatollah. This is one of the great myths of our time. If one observes the growth of electric power consumption in the United States where there is really an energy crisis, where there is really an oil crisis, where it's all happening and where gasoline is being rationed this week in Florida, one finds that the growth of electric power is actually declining. The reason is simple enough. It is that one doesn't transfer technologies overnight from one to another.

I did a little thumbnail observation about what it would be like if tomorrow morning a million automobiles drove out of the garage energized by electricity and what impact that would make on the electric power system.

Mr. Gregory: There would be a hell of a traffic jam.

Mr. J. Reed: Anybody who does a little calculation on that is going to find that all that would succeed in doing is using up the hollows in the daily load curve. It wouldn't even move into our reserves, let alone into our surplus.

Mr. Nixon: Or half the amount we use at Christmas time.

Mr. J. Reed: I'm all in favour of a technology of motor power through electricity. It's a very high end use to make electricity turn wheels. But let's look at the reality of trying to transfer technologies from one to another. I would say to those who see electric power as a large-scale producer of low-grade heat in this province in the future that they should look at the competitive costs of the alternatives as the cost of electric power increases. If those who live in gold medallion homes at the present time think the cost of power has gone up now, they ain't seen nothing yet. It's only started.

The only hope we have to get us off the hook and to get these errors smoothed over is going to be to be able to export large amounts of interruptible power to the United States. Because of the unfortunate incidents of recent days and the closure of nuclear plants for safety reasons in the northeastern United States, we may yet have the opportunity to get ourselves off the financial hook. But that is no excuse for incredibly bad management. That is no excuse for a government

to ignore the utility or to continue to ignore the utility. That is no excuse for the government to continue to fail to understand the energy situation in the province of Ontario.

I realize that it may be politically advantageous sometimes for the Premier to subscribe to the philosophy that where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise. But the chickens will come home to roost, sure as can be. We're headed in the direction of higher costs. The government can play politics with this surplus and can say how secure we suddenly are because we've got 4,000 megawatts of electricity. But when one comes to try to use it or to compare it with the alternatives that are available, even the alternatives that could be available if we put a little bit of research and development and a little bit of thrust to develop, one finds that electricity does not hold up very well in terms of cost to the consumer.

[9:15]

Cost brings me to one other area that has to be addressed in terms of Ontario Hydro; that is, the rate structure. My colleague the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) introduced a bill last year which would allow a small initial sale of electric power to every power consumer in Ontario, giving a price break to those people on fixed incomes, the elderly and people who are generally small users of electric power in the first place, but who at the present time are paying the highest rates and are at the highest end of the scale. Why? Because our rate structure is still geared to the hydraulic power system, where it was cheaper to buy more electric power because it was cheaper to produce and, otherwise, the water would be going over the spillway and not through the turbines.

That situation has changed dramatically in the last 10 or 15 years. In those days, in fact, we actually had what was called marginal cost pricing because the more you used, the cheaper it was, and the cheaper it was to produce. We're completely away from that at the present time. I would suggest two approaches for the government to consider.

One is that the domestic user of electric power be allowed to purchase his power possibly on a two-price system, on a base load and a peak load, in a manner similar to many commercial and industrial enterprises. That kind of system could provide the incentive to the consumer of fairly substantial quantities of electric power to buy quantities of base-load electric power. It has been estimated that a switch to baseload utilization of electric power could actually cut the cost by one third.

The other approach is for the government to immediately accept the lifeline approach to electric power sale. It will not affect the total cost of electric power. It won't raise anybody's total payment, if one looks at the reality of it, but what it will do is give a break to the people who need it the most. Surely, if electrical generation in Ontario is a public utility it should be available to everybody.

I would like to spend a couple of minutes talking about one other area of energy that I believe is vital to the province, but is addressed in about the same manner as garbage utilization and resource recovery. That is, we do mounds of talking. We put up little dribs and drabs of high profile money here and there, but we don't take it on as a serious thrust. We don't really get serious.

If we look at the potential or at the inventory of energy in Ontario, we find we have some uranium, we find we have some hydraulic power, both where we can generate electricity, but we also find there are areas where we have potential we're not pursuing.

One is the area of conservation. I get a kick out of the government. When it suits them, they'll say: "Conservation really can't have the impact that you would like it to have, Julian. It's a nice idea, but it really can't work."

Just let me go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying the evidence is in that Ontario could gain about 5,000 megawatts of generating capacity by simple energy conservation such as insulation and increasing the efficiency of energy utilization in homes. That is 5,000 megawatts. The cost of that gained generation capacity would be half of the cost of building nuclear reactors. That's a lot of energy that is currently being wasted. When you stop and think of the fact that in Ontario we're the highest consumers of energy per capita in the world, it seems to take on, hopefully, a little bit of significance.

The other area, of course, is the development of renewables and alternatives. The government has indeed, and to its credit, raised the expenditures in these areas over recent years, but what continues to plague us in Ontario is that it is not coupled with any alteration or any breakdown of the institutional barriers which prevent us from getting on with the job.

It is also continually frustrating that the government does not undertake what has to be undertaken at the present time: the establishment of demonstration projects in new technologies which will allow us once and for all to establish the financial validity of

some of these alternatives that are available to us.

I have said often to the Canadian nuclear industry that one of the things they might do is promote the research and development in renewables, in alternative energies. If they are so convinced that nuclear power is the cheapest, the most viable, then that kind of demonstration would establish it, wouldn't it? It would establish it once and for all.

I have also, of course, said to the government many times that the further development of hydraulic power in the province of Ontario would provide the perfect complement to our nuclear system, understanding that nuclear power has a limitation in that it can only generate baseload electric power and can't go beyond that, but hydraulic power can provide a good part of the peak.

I wonder as well what the government of Ontario does regarding its relationship with the federal government. You know, Mr. Speaker, the feds came out with a statement that they were approving the export of 2,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas over the next 10 years.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Talk to Margaret.

Mr. J. Reed: In the light of the perceived need, that 2,000,000,000,000 cubic feet appears to be in surplus, but I don't think there is one member of this provincial government, neither the Premier or the Minister of Energy, who has gone to the federal government and said that 2,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas could provide the difference between Canada being a net importer and a net exporter of petroleum. No one has gone to the federal government and said we have to establish a system for the conversion of natural gas to liquid fuel in order to supplement our petroleum supply, but the potential is there.

Methanol is made in Ontario at the present time. The last wholesale price I got I think was 62 cents a gallon. The fact is the technology is there; the technology is simple, it is easy, it is before us. If we are concerned about oil insecurity and importation from the Middle East, then we should be concerned about those facilities we have inside our own country.

Ontario imports 80 per cent of the energy it uses. It seems logical that the Minister of Energy of Ontario should be talking like a Philadelphia lawyer to the Minister of Energy in Ottawa, persuading him that those 2,000,000,000,000 cubic feet could make liquid fuel for automobile transportation. I don't think there is anything radical about it; there is nothing that is not tried and true at the

present time, but the potential is there. We have a long way to go.

I realize that it is a little risky to talk about new ideas to the government of the day. The first response of the government is always negative. We are always told that new ideas and new concepts will not work, and so on. It has been an observation of mine that about two years later those ideas end up as Tory policy, usually in a much watered down form. That is a technique I think used to try to placate the opposition on one hand, and also utilize some of the originality which this government is totally devoid of at this present time.

Mr. Nixon: Right.

Mr. J. Reed: The Ministry of Energy, of all ministries, needs imagination and needs creativity. There is no status quo in energy any more in the world. We are in a constant state of change and those sources we have relied on and which we thought were tried and true 20 or 30 years ago are no longer in the same category, sometimes because of cost and sometimes because of uncertainty of supply.

The world is changing, and energy will be the most important issue to face this province between now and the end of this century. We are already a decade behind in our grasp of what is actually going on. We are a decade behind in our grasp of what the potential is in the future. I am not the least bit discouraged about the potential of energy in Ontario. With the proper application and the proper development, we could even strive for self-sufficiency, given the time, given the inclination and the determination, but we are not getting anywhere. We are spinning our wheels at the present time. We are spinning our wheels simply because a government which has been in power for 36 years has run out of ideas. It's got no place to go except, I understand, it picks through Hansard on a daily basis to suck the ideas presented by the opposition. That's not the kind of government I want.

Mr. Nixon: Time for a change.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I think an enema will do.

Mr. J. Reed: That is the signal that a change is due and that a change is impending.

Mr. Nixon: Starting Thursday.

Mr. J. Reed: As I close, I would just like to make a statement to this House about the nuclear incident that has precipitated such concern among the people of Ontario in recent days. Our leader has called for an immediate reconvening of the select committee in order to look at all the safety aspects

of the Canadian nuclear technology. This is something which was addressed to the select committee to be done later on this year in the summer; but we have urged the government to allow the select committee to sit concurrently with the House so as to examine this system in detail.

The people of Ontario deserve no less. We have also asked that the chairman of the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning be seconded in order to provide an impartial, learned consultant on this matter.

Ms. Gigantes: That's letting the politicians off the hook.

Mr. J. Reed: The member for Carleton East will get her chance. If she'll just keep it together, she'll get her chance.

One of the main reasons we want the chairman of the royal commission to be with us is that certain testimony has to be in camera. We know that. We know for instance that Dr. Gordon Edwards,—

Ms. Gigantes: What in camera? What are you talking about, in camera?

Mr. J. Reed: —her friend, has requested certain information about the nuclear systems that has not been given to him because it's been considered classified information.

Ms. Gigantes: Do you accept that non-sense?

Mr. J. Reed: No.

Ms. Gigantes: Do you accept that non-sense?

Mr. J. Reed: I accept that they have said it's classified and I have said that they accept that it can't be revealed.

Ms. Gigantes: Shame on you.

[9:30]

Mr. J. Reed: I would suggest the people of Ontario have trust in Dr. Porter, more trust than they have in the select committee, because historically with select committees in this province the minute something is done in camera or done confidentially it somehow is leaked by some party to the press.

Ms. Gigantes: What are you talking about, in camera?

Mr. J. Reed: Remember the history of those things?

Mr. M. Davidson: You guys are pretty good at that.

Mr. J. Reed: I don't think we have borne the responsibility for that.

Ms. Gigantes: You sound like the federal Liberals.

Mr. J. Reed: I would, therefore, suggest that the people of Ontario deserve no less

than full disclosure of all the facts pertaining to the nuclear system; understanding that the parallels between—

Ms. Gigantes: In-camera hearings. Good Lord!

Mr. J. Reed: —the American system where the most recent problem occurred and the Canadian system are very hard to draw. They are not similar. They are not similar technologies. I am not going to go through the differences here. But I do believe, when the truth is revealed about the two technologies, that the Candu system, while it may very well have problems, will not reveal the same problems or similar problems to those that occurred in Harrisburg.

Ms. Gigantes: Nonsense.

Mr. J. Reed: The Candu system has proven its reliability to this extent. Indeed, the Liberal Party has accepted the validity of those engines. Our concerns about nuclear power have been connected with storage of wastes and ejection of massive quantities of warm water into the environment. Those areas are where the Liberal concerns still lie, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Gigantes: You sound like Clark dealing with the oil companies.

Mr. J. Reed: Well, the member for Carleton East would close down the energy system in Ontario tomorrow morning, I know she would.

Ms. Gigantes: Is that right? Just wait for it.

Mr. J. Reed: I know she would like to do that.

Ms. Gigantes: Wait for it. Just wait for it, Julian.

Mr. J. Reed: I know she would like to be in a position to make some draconian imposition on all the people; to bring about her great socialist plan for Ontario. But, believe me, what we are going to do with the select committee—

Mr. Makarchuk: Don't be provocative now.

Mr. J. Reed: —is get at the truth. We are going to get at the truth of the technology. We are going to establish the facts so the people of Ontario can then judge where they want their energy future, in terms of electric power production, to lie.

Ms. Gigantes: Who elected Arthur Porter? Did you elect him? You are a gutless wonder.

Mr. Ruston: Evelyn, what did you say?

Mr. J. Reed: I would point out to the honourable member that I—

Mr. Nixon: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. J. Reed: —I don't share her view of my physique and—

Mr. Samis: Where is the evidence?

Mr. J. Reed: —I wonder if she might change that phrase somehow.

Ms. Gigantes: Hot air.

Mr. J. Reed: You may call me gutless, but I can never accept that accusation.

But I do believe the time has come for a full revelation of the facts. We, the people of Ontario, are not ready to accept the notion that Big Brother is good for us and that Big Brother will tell us what is right. That is what has been happening up to this point.

Ms. Gigantes: Arthur Porter will tell us; that's what you say. Little Brother will tell us.

Mr. J. Reed: The big brothers, the technocrats of the nuclear industry, have said, "Everything is fine; you don't have to worry about anything; we have no problem."

It may turn out that we don't have significant problems. But we do know there is no technology on the face of the earth that can be made 100 per cent safe. So, therefore, the facts will have to be weighed in the balance and those decisions made and I would—

Ms. Gigantes: That was a meaningful statement.

Mr. J. Reed: Well, all right. Yes, I think it is a meaningful statement. When you consider that there are now 5,000 megawatts of nuclear power being generated in Ontario, that has to be a meaningful statement. I would ask the member just to think of the alternatives when she shuts those reactors down. Pray God it never happens, if a socialist government was ever to take over in Ontario. I also wonder what the unions would think of her too.

Interjections.

Mr. J. Reed: But that is a story for another day.

I would like to thank the members of the House for putting up with this rambling escapade tonight. I do believe there has been a little bit of ground covered. Some of it has been in very important areas that pertain to my own riding, and some in areas I am deeply concerned with, in the energy portfolio that I am honoured to hold as critic for the Liberal Party.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the best of voice. I hope my honourable colleagues will bear with me.

Mr. Conway: We hope you are in the best of moods.

Ms. Gigantes: I am in a very good mood, however.

We have put forward a no-confidence motion in response to the speech from the throne. In part, that no-confidence motion reads: "That we have no confidence in this government for its failure to put into place a balanced energy strategy reflecting Ontario's need for conservation and energy sources additional to electricity and imported fuel."

That section of our no-confidence motion relates to a particular section of the throne speech. In the throne speech we have the promise that the Ministry of Energy "will continue efforts to ensure that the option for Ontario's future supplies are as flexible as possible." One has to ask at this stage, what efforts?

The speech alludes vaguely to the aim of concluding the \$58,000,000 agreement with the feds to demonstrate new conservation and renewable energy technology. It is the same old game we see played so often in this Legislature of saying to the federal government, "After you, Alphonse. We will do something, but you do it first. Let's have your money; let's have you make the first move, then we will do something." This government turns to the people of Ontario and says, "We are waiting for the feds." All this from the government which tells us we cannot afford a provincial home insulation program. Some flexibility; some options.

The speech from the throne also alludes to the Ontario Energy Corporation's support for what it calls "energy-related business development of byproduct power and energy from waste." That is quite a mouthful. One has to wonder, is this what is known usually as industrial co-generation? What kind of program is the government proposing with that kind of mouthful? Is there any promise of money? Is there any promise of reorganization, really to undertake the kinds of programs that are involved if we are going to move to industrial co-generation?

Again, the speech from the throne says the government wishes to "enable the Ontario Energy Corporation to take a more active role in the achievement of energy and economic policy objectives in Ontario." There is nowhere to go but up when they talk about a more active role. Any action at all would be more action as far as the Ontario Energy Corporation is concerned. The only significant undertaking by that corporation in four years of existence has been to buy \$100,000,000 of Syncrude shares in 1975 and sell them at a profit of \$60,000,000 in 1978. As soon as the government realized it was making a profit for the public of Ontario by taking an equity

position in this undertaking it quickly ran to the market and sold off its shares. That is all the Ontario Energy Corporation has really undertaken in four years of action. Everything we do and everything we see from that corporation now has got to be more action.

Given that this government has not brought forward any respectable policy objectives for this province's energy and economic future, it is more than a little difficult to be impressed by the promise that the Ontario Energy Corporation will be developed as a tool for achieving policy objectives in either the economic or the energy field.

The throne speech speaks of only one policy commitment of any significance in the energy field. That is a commitment to "safeguard and enhance Ontario Hydro's production facilities as a future guarantee of electricity." It goes on to say: "It would be highly irresponsible to weaken the province's commitment to the generation of electricity from nuclear power." The speech refers to Ontario's nuclear power program as a "safe, secure and efficient means of protecting present and future generations of Ontarians."

I would like to spend the next several minutes explaining why I feel, as energy critic for the NDP caucus in this Legislature, that it would be highly irresponsible for members of this Legislature to approve a throne speech which contains such a miserable excuse for an energy policy. This government has never had an energy policy worthy of the name, and it is not proposing to have one in this throne speech. In the past, it has had instead a series of disjointed responses that have been developed on a totally ad hoc basis.

Some of those responses have involved major commitments to energy supply programs, commitments such as the multimillion-dollar temporary commitment to the development of tar sands oil and the multibillion-dollar commitment to expanding nuclear power. Enormous as these substantial undertakings have been, they are, nevertheless, ad hoc responses to particular pressures in the energy field.

Though this throne speech suggests expanding Ontario Hydro's generation facilities and, therefore, its transmission system and though the speech suggests vaguely that nuclear power can protect us from the international oil "meanies," it nowhere announces a government policy objective of having electricity substituted for oil in Ontario. The vague platitudes and mushy thought contained in the energy announcements of this throne speech do not add up to even that much of a policy.

With all the energy hocus-pocus that it has given us, the federal government has at least had the gumption to state that its clear goal is to see Ontario substitute nuclear-produced electricity for oil. It may be a stupid and perverse policy, an inefficient and insupportable goal but at least the federal government has had the courage to come right out and say it is its goal. Would that this government would at least show similar courage. If it did, if this aged Conservative government were willing to display the intestinal fortitude which the Premier (Mr. Davis) always cites when it comes to such things as cutting back hospital beds and starving services to people, then at least we could challenge the government to explain why it has adopted the goal of substituting nuclear power for oil.

As it is, with no clear statement of government policy we are forced to talk into a policy vacuum and to try to encourage the analysis of a policy goal which has not even been publicly identified. Suppose we try to speak to the nonexistent policy goal. In Ontario, in the main, we use oil to achieve two desirable ends. One is to warm our buildings and the other is to transport goods and people. If we did not need to transport goods and people and if we did not need to warm our buildings, we could eliminate the use of oil in Ontario without much disruption.

So the real question has to be: Is it reasonable to aim for the use of nuclear power—electricity produced by nuclear power—as a substitute for oil and oil derivatives in transportation or in space heating in this province?

[9:45]

Let us look at transportation first. The sad fact is that even the most enthusiastic nuclear promoters are unwilling to propose a substitution of electricity for oil in the transport sector. The full electrification of interurban rail and the full electrification of urban public transit systems, neither of which will or could be cheap or easy to accomplish, would contribute relatively little in oil savings. It would not be unfair to say that the electrification of Ontario's transportation system, as far as it can contribute to oil savings, would be but a drop in the barrel and that the nuclear addicts are willing to concede that this conclusion is a fact.

So then we turn to space heating to search for the presumed benefits of substituting nuclear-produced electrical power for oil in Ontario. The question is raised—and we see it raised often, and it's put simply: why doesn't Ontario plug in to keep warm, espe-

cially as we have excess capacity on line in the electrical system?

The answer is as simple as the question. And the answer is cost. Nuclear power is too expensive to provide warmth for Ontario consumers. It's too expensive now—witness the dropping Hydro forecast—and it's likely to become even more expensive in real terms in the future. It's precisely because nuclear power is too expensive for heating that we have witnessed the dramatic dropoff in the growth of electrical use in this province.

Everyone, including Hydro, the Ministry of Energy and all the technical experts who have testified before the select committee on Hydro, everyone now admits that Hydro's forecasts were exorbitant—not only because Hydro assumed a healthier economy than we have, but also because Hydro assumed the rate increases of the last three years would not have a significant effect on how much electricity Ontario consumers would buy when the price per kilowatt shot up.

Ontario consumers have proved ready, willing and able to use less electricity as the electricity has increased in real terms. They have successfully used less electricity, even though there has been no substantial government program to help them use less. There has been a Hydro ad campaign which told residential consumers they were slobs if they wasted energy, but there has been no home insulation program to help make energy savings, and there has been an understaffed, underfunded advisory campaign to encourage industrial consumers not to waste energy, but there has been no co-generation program to help industry make energy savings.

In spite of the insubstantial support of this government we have seen Ontario consumers trim their use of electricity in substantial ways. In fact, the reaction of Ontario consumers to real increases in the cost of a kilowatt has been so immediate and so impressive that it has already created the vicious cycle where Hydro's revenues from its existing electrical system are not adequate to cover the costs of that system on a year-to-year basis.

The cycle goes as follows: Hydro adds a higher rate increase with the goal of covering current costs, only to discover that extra rate increases create even lower levels of consumer purchases of electricity. This pattern of rate increases, lower purchases, revenue shortages; rate increases and further lowering of purchases, is a real and present threat to Hydro's financial capability. It's a pattern which will become even more dangerous as Ontario consumers become aware

of the private benefits of insulation and investment in alternate methods of energy supply.

Though this government has refused to acknowledge the fact, Ontario Hydro is in real and present danger of financial catastrophe because of consumer reaction to rate increases. People in this province are not willing to pay the price for increased electrical heating, and this government will either have to face that fact or try and force Ontarians to do what they will not willingly do. I doubt that even this government would dare such perversity.

As we know all too well, the current Conservative government stance as the legislative apologists for Ontario Hydro mistakes has already cost Ontario taxpayers billions of dollars. Every day of delay in the decision to stop construction of excess heavy water capacity at Bruce heavy water plant D costs Ontario \$330,000. The 74 days that elapsed between the time the select committee recommended construction be stopped at the plant on October 26, 1978 and the time that Hydro, not the Minister of Energy, announced the halt in construction, created a cost, that Ontario consumers should not have had to pay, of \$24,420,000.

From the time the Premier (Mr. Davis) insisted on signing contracts for an oversupply of uranium from Rio Algom and Denison, Mr. Stephen Roman has picked up a personal profit on his shares of Denison which I calculate at well over \$50,000,000.

Mr. Nixon: Is that with the drop yesterday taken into consideration?

Ms. Gigantes: Yes, I think you could add that in.

Mr. Nixon: You subtract that.

Ms. Gigantes: I'd fold it in. The majority of the Hydro select committee recommended that the Premier not approve the contracts, but the Premier laughed at the majority because it was not of one mind about the alternatives. He gleefully signed those awful contracts, on which we are obliged to put a \$300,000,000 down payment and pay \$5 per ton more than the cost of production, whatever those costs may be according to Rio Algom and Denison Corporation.

It's hard to put an estimate on the unwarranted cost the Premier loaded on us with that one. The extra costs range from \$50,000,000 straight up to a potential of \$2,000,000,000. Unless we can somehow modify them, these uranium contracts will be providing us with excess fuel until the year 2020, and all of it at an outrageous cost.

More than these little specific slips, each of which we will be forced to subsidize as consumers of Ontario Hydro, the unforgivable sin of this government is that it has not only permitted Ontario Hydro to continue a program of overbuilding nuclear power stations; it has encouraged, and continues to encourage, that program.

While the government downplays the scale of existing overbuilding, it manipulates the figures and stretches credulity to the point where it claims the overbuilding is only "17 per cent." Seventeen per cent as an estimate of the overbuilding in the current Ontario Hydro system is a laughable estimate.

The facts are as follows: Hydro now has enough stations in operation to produce 23,000 megawatts of electricity. Last year and the year before, Ontarians purchased 16,000 megawatts on the coldest days of each year. The excess of capacity on the Hydro system is therefore 7,000 megawatts gross. Hydro claims it needs a reserve margin of 25 per cent for those times when stations are undergoing planned repairs and for times when stations are, for one unexpected reason or another, out of commission.

What Hydro never says is that the part of our system capacity which depends on water power as opposed to the burning of various fuels, in other words the real hydro system, produces 6,000 megawatts of extremely cheap, extremely reliable electric power. Even the drought of 1977 cut only about 1,200 megawatts off that 6,000 megawatt energy goldmine. It's therefore ridiculous to believe that our 6,000 megawatts of water power requires a reserve margin of 25 per cent.

If we were to assign a reserve margin of 1,000 megawatts to that 6,000 megawatts of hydraulic electric capacity, that would be, averaging over the years, a very generous margin of reserve.

If we then turn to the fuel-burning thermal generators which Hydro has built, we know that only 10,000 megawatts of the already constructed 17,000 megawatt capacity was being used on the coldest days of the last two years. Let's imagine, then, that 1,000 of the extra 7,000 megawatts is required to provide a reserve for the hydro part of the system. We're left with an extra 6,000 megawatts. If we accept Hydro's estimate that the 10,000 fuel-produced megawatts on the system will require a 25 per cent reserve margin—which in itself is a questionable assumption, but let's give it to them—then we will merely subtract another 2,500 megawatts from the extra capacity.

So from the original 7,000 extra megawatts, we first subtract 1,000 megawatts to ensure reliability or backup of the hydraulic power and then we have 6,000 megawatts extra. From the 6,000 we subtract another 2,500 megawatts to provide a 25 per cent margin on the fuel-fired electrical system and we're still left with 3,500 megawatts we don't need, even though we've had to pay, and must continue to pay, for the cost of constructing the plants.

Those 3,500 megawatts are excess fuel-fired capacity. They are thermal plants which are excess to the thermal part of the electrical system. They are 35 per cent in excess of the thermal system which we require, even if one accepts Hydro's contention that a 25 per cent reserve margin is vital to reliability, which the select committee questioned in 1976.

If we proceed to build Darlington, and Darlington is constructed for operation in 1986 or 1989, it will cost us roughly \$5,000,000,000 and it will be capable of producing 3,500 megawatts. If we proceed to build Darlington for operation in 1986 or 1989, we will be spending \$5,000,000,000 to construct another 3,500 megawatts which we will not need in 1986 or 1989.

The 3,500 megawatt excess capacity which we have in 1979 did not cost us \$5,000,000,000 to produce. It probably cost us closer to \$1,500,000,000. But that \$1,500,000,000 investment will earn Ontario Hydro no revenue in 1979, in 1980, 1981, and for God knows how long after that.

That excess 3,500 megawatts will earn no revenue, but it's costing us plenty, nevertheless, because Hydro rates will be reflecting the construction and interest costs of that excess 3,500 megawatts for years to come. That's the biggest sin of this government. It has encouraged that overconstruction and it continues to encourage overconstruction. One has to ask why? Instead of rational answers, we're given mind-mush.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) delivered an important speech on March 5 and said he does not understand what is happening, which is true, and that we could be selling our excess power to another jurisdiction for profit, which is not true. There is absolutely no evidence that other jurisdictions want to enter long-term contracts for the purchase of Ontario power. Apparently other utilities are also into excess capacity situations.

The Treasurer and the Minister of Energy claim that no reasonable person could have foreseen that Hydro's expansion plans were over-ambitious; which is not true, the select

committee issued warnings in June 1976. The Treasurer and the Minister of Energy claim that the cost to consumers has not been excessive, which as I have already indicated is not true.

They claim that Hydro expansion is a good investment as a public works job-creation program; which is not true, because the creation of new energy supplies in insulation programs and renewable energy programs is a much better employment creator. They conclude by suggesting that anyone who dares to question their analysis is undermining employment, the economy and atomic tomatoes. All this is falderal, to put it mildly, and it won't sell in Ontario.

For these reasons alone, though there are others, the speech from the throne is totally inadequate and it will not receive my support. When the speech from the throne was delivered, just about a month ago, the comments I have just made would have been the only remarks I would have bothered to try to make. A month ago I felt the general public in Ontario was alive to the issue of this government's failure to curb Hydro expansionism, and that the general public in Ontario was alive to the alarming price we are paying for the government's irresponsibility as far as the energy future of this province is concerned.

A month ago I would have done my best to give legislative expression to that financial dismay and anger. I would have voiced that public frustration with a government that has no vision of how we will provide for this province's energy future, and I would have felt that I had done my best to represent the largest part of the concern ordinary people in this province feel on the subject of energy.

But it is not possible to feel satisfied with that kind of effort today, because today there is a new reality in public concern about the energy future in Ontario. I think it is the duty of elected representatives to give expression to that new public anxiety.

We live now in the pretty firm hope that from this day forward the people who live in the area surrounding the site of the Three Mile Island nuclear reactor will be able to live their lives quietly and without threat. The anguish they have gone through and the dignified way in which they have borne that anguish has been an ordeal which all of us have felt.

The people of middle America have been tested and they have been found strong and responsible. In a sense they are models to the rest of us and I think we can feel proud that the human animal can pass such a trial with such decency. The anguish they have endured

has marked our minds permanently, from the turmoil of the braggarts to the fear of the first who took flight. We can empathize with it all. We can understand every bit of the reaction.

In its tortured way I think it has actually added to our understanding of ourselves as human beings. It has been a major event in human history and it will now enter into song and poetry and myth as something that shapes the way we view ourselves and the world we live in.

As with any event that has such power, it has direct and urgent political implications. It has caused millions of people who were not familiar with the ferocious potential danger of peaceful nuclear power to become familiar with the risks of peaceful nuclear power and the exact manner in which those risks can become immediate catastrophe.

The accident at Three Mile Island, and perhaps it would be better to describe it as a series of cumulative failures at Three Mile Island, probably tells us more about how mistakes get made than it does about nuclear power. But even if that is how we should best assess the event, it tells us, as clear as a bell, that we should pay much more attention to the possibility of overlapping mistakes than we do to the assurances that each and every individual failure has been scientifically and administratively overcome.

I guess the thing that most upset me over the last week has been to see and hear the official line in Ontario: "It couldn't happen here." That official line is coming out of the mouths of people who know better; who know that it could happen here.

Because what are we talking about after all? It's a relatively simple accident. In the jargon of the trade, it's known as a loss-of-coolant accident that leads to fuel failure. They refer to these incidents in the trade by the letters LOCA, loss-of-coolant accident; and they aim for NSFF, no significant fuel failure.

What it means, and it's very simple, is that the cooling liquid which controls the temperature of the reactor core is not reaching the reactor core in adequate volumes. When the cooling liquid is not present in adequate amounts the core of the reactor will overheat, the cladding on the fuel may rupture and the fuel itself may melt. This process is called fuel failure, and if a large portion of the fuel within the reactor fails the reactor core may melt, with all the drastic consequences that follow.

When a reactor experiences a loss of coolant, for whatever reason, there's an emergency cooling system which is designed to

pump emergency coolant into the core in a high pressure jet of liquid. The emergency cooling system is the final backup for an initial loss of coolant. It's a vital system. It must be perfectly designed; perfectly constructed; it must operate perfectly in mechanical terms; and it must not be turned off by the technical staff when the reactor is in a state of loss of coolant.

At the Three Mile Island reactor there was a loss of coolant and the events that followed produced a near catastrophe. But we're told it couldn't happen here. Why? Because we have a vacuum building attached to Candu reactors and all the radioactive steam and gas from a loss-of-coolant accident would be sucked out by the vacuum building. But what if the vacuum building has a door open or a leak which nobody has noticed? Both these events have occurred at the Pickering reactor. What if the emergency core cooling system does not operate in the way that the designers believed it would?

Let me read two short excerpts from leaked documents that have been tabled with both the Porter commission and the select committee on Ontario Hydro. The particular document from which I will read is minutes of a meeting of the reactor safety advisory committee. This advisory committee is made up of representatives of Ontario Hydro, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and the Atomic Energy Control Board, the federal regulatory agency. The minutes of the reactor safety advisory committee which I will read from are from a meeting covering August 10 and 11, 1976. The item under discussion is called: "No Significant Fuel Failure, NSFF." It involves the discussion of the licensing standards which had been the basis for the licensing of Bruce A by the Atomic Energy Control Board. I will identify the participants as they join the discussion.

"Mr. G. L. Brooks—" of AECL—"reminded members that the designers had acknowledged that the no significant fuel failure criterion would not be met by the Bruce design. He felt that this criterion could not be achieved by modifications to the present design. He conceded that it would seem intuitively that increasing the driving pressure on the emergency core cooling system should improve the situation. He explained, however, that the leakage from a figure-of-eight loop does not prevent circulation within the loop until the leak rate is such that stagnation occurs; beyond this rate flow reversal occurs in some part of the loop and once-through flow then prevails. Thus he argued that there is some stagnation point even within high pressure coolant injection. Only the size and possibly

the location of the critical break would change. Designers were concerned as well about the potential damage arising from the greater thermal and hydraulic shock which would be associated with the introduction of coolant at high pressure. Although they are studying ways of designing a high pressure system they were not convinced that an improvement in overall system security would be achieved.

"Mr. W. G. Morison—" Ontario Hydro "—declared that it was not practical to design the fuel and heat transport system of a power reactor so that it can meet the objectives of viable economic operation and at the same time be capable of withstanding the effects of the rather violent failures which must be assumed. He did not feel it was reasonable to place the entire dependence on keeping the fuel sheath intact. To him it seemed more appropriate to try and ensure the oxide fuel matrix retains its fission products and that the effectiveness of containment is maintained at all times. Committee members pointed out that maintenance of the sheath is very important to certain safety arguments made in public. Mr. L. Pease—" of AECL "—protested that AECL had never claimed that sheaths would be kept intact as a defence for the public against any conceivable system failure.

"Mr. Brooks acknowledged that it was certainly the intent of designers that no significant fuel failure would be an important criterion and they certainly did not compromise on design of the containment or emergency core cooling system because of this assumption. However, new information on system performance and the characteristics of the fuel made them realize the target had not been achieved in the Bruce A design and they now appreciate it is not simply achievable, if at all. Discussion of the definition of significance revealed a spectrum of opinion among committee members and designers. The chairman—" Mr. Morison "—felt that the significance of the number of fuel failures should be judged without reference to the magnitude of release from containment. This suggestion did not receive unanimous support. Staff of the Atomic Energy Control Board recalled that approval of the construction licence for the station had been based in part on AECL document BRS 71/2. In this document no significant fuel failure was identified as a design requirement. The document did not specify that no fuel should ever fail, but stated that it should not fail as a result of the inadequate cooling accompanying a loss-of-coolant accident.

"After some further discussion the chairman—" Mr. Morison "—concluded that de-

signers were claiming only a small portion of the accident spectrum could lead to significant fuel failures, requiring reliance to be placed on containment as the final line of defence. Reactor and accelerator licensing division staff asserted that the portion—" I should point out this licensing division is associated with the Atomic Energy Control Board "—of the accident spectrum leading to large releases into containment is larger than might be inferred from designers' statements. Mr. Pease expressed the view the board's stated requirements for containment system effectiveness have not been consistent since the siting guide was presented in 1965.

[10:15]

"Referring again to the question of emergency core cooling system effectiveness a member pointed out that a high pressure system would have the benefit of distributing flow more equally among the fuel channels. Mr. Brooks did not feel that improving flow distribution would greatly reduce the potential for fuel failures.

"Another member asked what the experience had been with maintenance of containment system integrity. Mr. K. E. Elston—" of Ontario Hydro "—felt that experience had been very favourable. Two minor breaches of containment have occurred, but these were detected very quickly. Repeat tests have shown the leakage rate to be about 0.25 per cent per hour, much better than the acceptable specification."

I turn over a few pages and through an overnight recess in this meeting to the day of August 11, 1976, where we find this committee once again in discussion of the no significant fuel failure criterion.

"The chairman asked designers to discuss further their reasons for believing that no significant fuel failure is not readily achievable in the Bruce design. For the purposes of this discussion he defined no significant fuel failure as failure of more than a dozen or so fuel bundles."

I should point out that the chairman I have just referred to is Mr. Morison from Ontario Hydro.

"Mr. Brooks reported that designers have begun to analyse the sensitivity of the fuel-failure mechanism in the loss-of-coolant cases, in order to determine an operating power level at which the no significant fuel failure criterion could be achieved with the present emergency core cooling system design. It appears that this power level will be at about 65 per cent of fuel reactor power."

Mr. Speaker, I have to call your attention to the fact that the plant we are discussing here is the Bruce plant.

"Mr. Pease, added that a serious problem in assessing the extent of fuel damage and hence the magnitude of a release is determining the fraction of fission products held in the fuel matrix; this fraction depends strongly on the temperature history of the fuel bundles. Following some further discussion Mr. Brooks stated that the greatest concern of designers is the extent of fuel failures during the emergency cooling phase of the accident, rather than during the blow-down phase.

"In reply to a question, Mr. Morison stated that the concern of designers in trying to meet no significant fuel failure is that a relatively small amount of sheath damage can result in release of all the free iodine in the damaged element. The free iodine available for release is about 2,500 curies per bundle. Replying to a further question, Mr. Elston stated that the limit on iodine allowed in heat transport system coolant would be less than 2,500 curies in normal operation. Of course, single-element defects in a few bundles must be expected at any given time. Following some further discussion on the possible course of loss-of-coolant accidents Mr. Morison stated designers' belief that it is impractical to design to the tight limits implied by the no significant fuel failure criterion."

We then move directly to the closing remarks in the minutes of the meeting:

"Mr. Morison thanked members for their attention, declaring that Ontario Hydro recognizes their responsibility for exercising judgments on behalf of the public. He stated that Ontario Hydro wished to operate the station at up to full electrical power output as soon as permission is received. He believed that operation in such a manner would supply valuable data to help enhance the confidence of operators, designers, board staff and the committee in the Bruce station design. Although he acknowledged that the committee's prime concern was safety and not economics he reminded them of the cost to Ontario of the unavailability of Bruce generating station. This had been reckoned at about \$250,000 per day per unit. Furthermore, a reduction

in the rating at Bruce costs some \$10,000,000 for a one per cent derating per unit."

And so closed the meeting of the reactor safety advisory committee, August 11, 1976.

Mr. Nixon: Is that exhibit 81?

Ms. Gigantes: This is exhibit D-12A of the Hydro select committee.

Does this kind of discussion bother you, Mr. Speaker? It bothers me.

The last documented evidence we have from August 1976 indicates the Bruce plant should be operating, for safety's sake, at 65 per cent of full power. We know it is operating at close to 100 per cent of its designed power. Why is that happening? What has changed so that it is now safe when it operates at over 65 per cent power? We don't know because the utilities and the federal agencies involved won't tell us.

As a matter of fact, we wouldn't even know these serious questions had been raised if the documents of the 1976 meeting had not been leaked to the Canadian Coalition on Nuclear Responsibility. And we are supposed to take it on faith that Ontario Hydro so loves us all that it will deny financial advantage to its own corporate body for the sake of our safety? We are supposed to take it on faith that the federal monitoring agency, the Atomic Energy Control Board, will delicense the Candu reactor if it is found to be failing in safety design? It is stretching faith a little far, methinks. I, for one, would like to have some straight answers to straight questions; some straight answers and the release of documents which have been unavailable for the study of serious critics.

This throne speech rhapsodizes about nuclear power as "a safe, secure and efficient means of protecting present and future generations of Ontarians." But is this an energy policy, or is it more likely a desperate flim-flam by a decrepit government, which is no longer progressive, no longer conservative, and no longer deserves the confidence of the people of Ontario?

On motion by Mr. Belanger, the debate was adjourned.

On motion by Mr. Gregory, the House adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. Williams, Mr. J. Reed, Ms. Gigantes	691
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Belanger, agreed to	710
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Gregory, agreed to	710

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Belanger, J. A. (Prescott and Russell PC)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, April 5, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: Pauline M. McGibbon, the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1980, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 5, 1979.

CHARGES AGAINST LLBO EMPLOYEES

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: It has come to my attention that the Ontario Provincial Police news bureau has had on its desk for some considerable time now a list of persons charged, persons in the employ of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario. They have told the news media that they cannot give out those names, even though the charges have already occurred, until the minister has made a statement in the House at 2 p.m. today.

Since it would appear to me that this takes the form of news management, it seems to me there is incumbent upon either the minister who gave those orders or the Solicitor General (Mr. McMurtry) or whoever it is in the OPP who believes they are acting under such orders, to make clear to the public of Ontario, and to the members here, that the mere fact that we meet at 2 p.m. is no reason for any form of news stage-managing to go on, and that it is a misuse of the fact that we meet here at 2 p.m.

The public surely has a right to know who is being charged in these instances and should not have to wait for the right psychological moment as determined by any minister of the crown.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before I read the statement in reply to that, the Leader of the Opposition is cockeyed. I gave no such instructions to the OPP; I gave none.

Furthermore, the Leader of the Opposition as usual is manifestly misinformed.

I was apprised of sworn informations that were taken, apparently yesterday, by various crown attorneys across this province. The informations were sworn and warrants were issued, apparently sometime last night. I was apprised of those documents in my office at approximately 9:30 this morning by the Deputy Solicitor General. At that point, I said since they were provincial employees I would be issuing a statement in the Legislature at 2 p.m. That is all I said.

For the sake of the record—and once again the Leader of the Opposition is manifestly misinformed—four of the accused, it is my understanding, appeared in Ottawa court this morning for arraignment. That information is obviously public. The only request that was made to me by the provincial police was that in view of the fact that at that time, early this morning, two of the accused had not been taken into custody, they did not wish me to say anything prior to 2 o'clock so that the accused could be taken into custody, prior to any formal announcement being made in the Legislature. I hope that sets the record straight.

Mr. S. Smith: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister undertake to inform himself that the Ontario Provincial Police news bureau at Downsview had on its desk all the names, had these names requested of them by the press and were told that they could not release them until a minister, namely the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, had made a statement at 2 p.m.? That may not have been the instructions of the minister—

Mr. Hennessy: Apologize.

Mr. S. Smith: Go back and check, and the member will find out I said, "Did he make the—"

Hon. Mr. Drea: Then apologize to me for your earlier remarks.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Apologize.

Mr. S. Smith: I didn't say that. The minister wasn't listening. Why doesn't he read what I said? I said: "Did the minister or did the Solicitor General—"

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Leader of the Opposition made what he thought was a legitimate point of privilege.

Mr. Riddell: Why doesn't the minister grow up? It gets a little sickening.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has given his word as to the series of events as he knows them. I think that the Leader of the Opposition should accept his word.

Mr. Wildman: Let the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk take over.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

CHARGES AGAINST LLBO EMPLOYEES

Hon. Mr. Drea: In January 1978 the chairman of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario requested the Ontario Provincial Police to launch an investigation into allegations of irregularities involving liquor licence board personnel.

As a result of that investigation, the following people have been charged: Robert George Lamb of Toronto, director of the inspections branch, has been charged with three counts of breach of trust under section 111 of the Criminal Code of Canada. John Edward Lawrence of Toronto, manager of regional inspectors, has been charged jointly with Mr. Lamb with one count of breach of trust under the Criminal Code.

Thomas Roy Dempsey of Ottawa, district liquor licence inspector, has been charged with 51 counts of uttering a forged document, 16 counts of accepting benefits and one count of breach of trust under the code. Harvey Blake Slade of Ottawa, district liquor licence inspector, has been charged with six counts of uttering a forged document under section 326 of the Criminal Code and 32 counts of accepting benefits. Ronald David Knudson of Ottawa, district liquor licence inspector, has been charged with 23 counts of uttering a forged document under section 326 of the Criminal Code and with four counts of accepting benefits under section 110 of the code.

Robert Edward Zimmerman of Ottawa, district liquor licence inspector, has been charged with eight counts of uttering a forged document and with 16 counts of accepting benefits under the Criminal Code.

As a result of these charges, the employees will be suspended without pay pending disposition by the court.

Mr. Sargent: All outstanding Tories.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Board policy is that even the slightest hint of impropriety or innuendo of wrong-doing be investigated.

Mr. Sargent: All Conservatives.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Since the matter is before the courts, there will be no further comment by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario or by the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry. The Treasurer.

Mr. S. Smith: Why couldn't they give out that news?

Hon. Mr. Drea: I have no idea. Why doesn't the Leader of the Opposition talk to them?

Mr. Nixon: Somebody told them not to.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Treasurer has the floor.

Hon. Mr. McCague: The Leader of the Opposition should check his facts.

Mr. S. Smith: They were dead on.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Treasurer have a statement or doesn't he?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was commiserating with the Leader of the Opposition.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the renewal of the Ontario Youth Employment Program for 1979. This program, aimed at encouraging Ontario businesses and farms to provide summer job opportunities for young people from 15 to 24 years of age, has operated successfully now for two seasons. In 1979, OYEP will run from April 30 to October 21, and the amount of the grant is again to be \$1.25 per hour.

The Ontario Youth Employment Program is designed to benefit both employers and the province's youth by providing youth with valuable work experience, skills, contacts and references which will better equip them for full-time participation in the labour force; by encouraging additional productive activity by reducing the cost of summer labour to Ontario's farm and business enterprises; and by assisting the farm and business sectors in recruiting youth for future employment.

In 1979, employers may apply for a grant for up to 150 weeks of employment at each business location, regardless of the number of positions created. This will provide greater flexibility for the employer and allow him to maximize the benefits of the program, since in previous years he has been restricted to six positions at each business location, even if the positions lasted only six or seven weeks.

For example, the practical effect of the new rule is that if employers can create new work for as little as six weeks, which is the minimum, they may apply for up to 25 employees for this period.

In 1979, I expect OYEP to provide about 40,000 jobs at a cost of \$26 million. This compares with 34,000 jobs in 1978 at a cost of \$20,000,000.

Mr. Eakins: Oh, yes?

Hon. F. S. Miller: "Oh, yep" is what my friend will be saying Tuesday night.

Mr. Eakins: I said, "Oh, yes?"

Hon. F. S. Miller: My colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) will administer OYEP again in 1979.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have questions for the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman). Is he going to be back? Does the Premier know?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think so. I just left him at a luncheon.

Mr. S. Smith: If it is agreeable to the third party, I can withhold my questions until he comes back. Is that agreeable?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes.

Mr. S. Smith: I will wait, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the continuing absence in China of the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson).

Can the provincial secretary confirm statements by Ministry of Education officials that Ontario intends to provide an additional \$40,000,000 to school boards to meet its new commitment to special education for all children who need it over the next three years? Can she explain how the government could have arrived at such a small amount when there are an estimated 30,000 children on waiting lists for special education in the province and many more whose needs have never yet been identified; and will she assure the House that none of the proposed \$40,000,000 for special-education funding will be found by cutbacks in other Ontario grants to school boards?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that this government is committed to meeting the educational needs of those children with special learning difficulties. We have made a commitment, and the amount that has been established is, in effect, the amount of money that could be put into that program immediately. We do not have the teachers who are trained; we do not have all the facilities that are required.

[2:15]

Mrs. Campbell: Why don't you import them?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As quickly as they can be brought into place, the problems will be addressed and children requiring that kind of special education will be looked after.

Mr. Cassidy: You have been asleep at the switch.

Mr. Warner: Hollow words.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister say whether the amount of \$40,000,000 is all the province is providing? Will the minister assure the House there will be no other cutbacks in other education grants to municipalities? Can the minister explain how the needs for special education which still exist in the province will be met, when this proposed grant is going to total \$443 per year for each child on the waiting list, while the city of Toronto estimates it costs \$4,824 for special education for each child?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The honourable member knows I don't have all those figures at my fingertips. I have indicated to him that the government has made a commitment that every child in this province who needs special education will indeed receive it.

We have two new schools which will be opening up to provide such special education for these children. We have made money available to all boards of education for special education programs. That is the commitment the government has made.

Mr. Martel: Eighteen students.

Ms. Gigantes: Subtracting it from other grants.

Mr. Martel: That's no commitment at all.

Mr. Sweeney: Is the minister prepared to make a commitment in principle that for the newly mandated special education requirement a board will be able to get from the government the additional costs resulting or flowing from the new legislation mandate?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I am not prepared to make the commitment. The Minister of Education will be back in the House within a week and that question can be put to her at that time.

Mr. Cassidy: I thought you were the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As I have indicated, the government has made a commitment. It is government policy that education for children with special needs will be provided by boards of education as quickly as it can be put into place.

Mr. Martel: What year? What millenium are you talking about? How many years down the road?

Mr. Grande: Since the minister mentioned one of the two schools that were to be started, I suppose the minister is referring to Trillium in Milton? Regarding this school, can the minister tell us what criteria are used to determine which children qualify, because no psychologist I know of is aware exactly how to refer children to that school yet?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: A special board will determine the eligibility of children to be admitted to that school.

Mr. Warner: Those were supposed to be ready for January.

LAKESHORE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question to the Premier arising out of the moving, or the transfer, of 32 psycho-geriatric patients from Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital to the Queen Street mental institution yesterday.

Here is the Minister of Health; I will ask the Minister of Health.

Mr. Warner: Saved again.

Mr. Cassidy: My question arises from the decision to transfer 32 psycho-geriatric patients from Lakeshore to Queen Street yesterday. In view of the enormous anxiety that move caused among patients and staff, and the mounting concern expressed by the neighbouring community, by health-care workers and by all the people who are patients or potential users of the Lakeshore facility—and in view of the fact that the whole rationale for closing Lakeshore will be examined fully by the standing committee on social development over the course of the next few weeks—will the minister stop trying to make the closure of Lakeshore a fait accompli before the review by the standing committee has been concluded? Will he assure the House that there will be no further transfers of patients to other institutions from Lakeshore until that committee has reported?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I may say I think it was 29 patients and not 30. The patients were moved yesterday in what turned out to be an orderly fashion, in spite of the circumstances that were created at the Lakeshore hospital.

Mr. Warner: It's nice to have orderly destruction.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I'm advised there was a get-together last night in their new facilities—

Mr. Warner: You should have been in charge of the Titanic.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —in the 1956 building on Queen Street and this morning the patients are all well in spite of the additional pressures created around their move.

The honourable member will recall that when I made the announcement in January about the decision to close the Lakeshore hospital, I indicated the patients would be moved in groups, a few at a time, so that it would be an orderly move and would not be disruptive to the patients. It is our intention to carry on in that regard.

I welcome the opportunity, whenever the standing committee gets to the matter, and I don't know when that's going to be, to set the record straight. I have a few other initiatives under way to set the record straight. There's a great deal of misinformation abroad about the numbers and various other things. I intend to set that record straight and to continue with the orderly movement of the patients.

In the final analysis, sir, my recommendation to the cabinet was based on, and will continue to be based on, the interests of the patients in that particular facility and the alternatives available for their care.

Mr. Warner: Even though the Premier's meeting? He's challenging it.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister explain what kind of planning is going on for these transfers, when the patients who were transferred from Lakeshore were not put into the same ward at the Queen Street mental institution and when they will no longer be looked after by the same staff who were looking after them at Lakeshore? They now have different staff in certain cases. Can the minister say what the effect is going to be on the health of the patients at the Lakeshore hospital if they are going to be arbitrarily transferred at short notice to different hospitals so the minister can empty Lakeshore before the people who've been questioning his decision have had their chance to put their views and their problems before the committee of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I suggest some of the activities the member is describing are, in fact, more disruptive to the patients than the actual move.

I am told they are, in fact, in the same ward; I think it's in the 1956 building. In most cases we are transferring staff with the various units. I will check to see if there are any variations in that, for whatever reason. Some staff, who had been with that unit at Lakeshore may very well have accepted posi-

tions elsewhere in the psychiatric hospital system. Some have already done that. They may also have accepted positions in other areas of the provincial government, or with the public hospitals or elsewhere. There are a number of people who have already taken positions elsewhere, but I'll check on that particular thing. I am advised, though, that they are in fact in the same ward.

Mr. Lawlor: It must be awfully close.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary to the minister's answer: In view of the fact that one of the reasons given for this closing was the concern about a patient who had burned to death and the so-called fire hazards of Lakeshore, would the minister table in this House the report of the fire marshal and of the fire department with reference to Lakeshore so we may have that material before us?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, that question is already on the Order Paper and was among the very large number tabled at the beginning of the session, answers to which are being prepared right now. As you will understand, Mr. Speaker, that is taking a—

Mrs. Campbell: We'd like to have them before everybody is out of Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —great deal of time and costing a great deal of money, but answers will be given.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. Lawlor: I would like to ask where is the Minister of Health's famous consultation and supply of information? Might we expect some information with respect to his next nefarious move? When is he going to reply to questions asked in this House on previous occasions with respect to the special observation unit he didn't know very much about on that occasion; or with respect to the alcoholic services and his disposition thereof; and with respect to the dialysis disposition that seems to be as vacuous as the policy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I thought we had answered all outstanding questions on that.

Mr. Lawlor: No.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If not I'll check the record. As you know, there is and has been since the announcement, a committee established to effect an orderly transition, an orderly move of the patients and staff.

Mr. Grande: But no answers.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That group is made up of staff of Lakeshore and Queen Street, who by the way had done the assessments of the patients, I am told, before they were moved. This is contrary to another bit of misinforma-

tion that was bandied about. They will continue their work until the moves are all made.

CONVENTION FACILITIES

Mr. S. Smith: I think the Minister of Industry and Tourism is here. I will start my question while he is taking his seat, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why it is that in the presence of the Metro chairman—

Mr. Warner: And his buddy.

Mr. S. Smith: —he told the federal Minister of National Defence that he would have no intention of proceeding with the matter of the convention centre for Metropolitan Toronto because he did not wish to give the federal government the benefit of this election plum at this time? Does the minister not recognize that his duty is to allow the people to decide for themselves what are election plums or goodies and his job is to, first of all get the centre and get the promise, and then to make darn sure the promise is carried out? Why did he decide to play politics instead?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I presume the Leader of the Opposition has spoken with Mr. Danson, who has confirmed the allegations he has repeated just now. I will give the member my clear recollection of the circumstances.

First, so far as the Metro chairman's recollection of the conversations is concerned, what he hasn't made clear is the fact that he was present for only one of the two conversations I had with Mr. Danson over a two-day period.

Mr. S. Smith: He almost fell off his seat.

Mr. Nixon: Joe Clark doesn't need Bill Davis anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Second, I originally placed the call to Mr. Danson to canvass—

Mr. Van Horne: He said, "Who needs him?"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the question with him in an attempt to keep this very major and important project from becoming a political issue.

Mr. Mackenzie: Self righteous.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you becoming Canadian Liberals all of a sudden?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I invited Mr. Danson—
Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would I want to politicize him? I in fact made one mistake, and that is I said to Barney—I said to Mr. Danson—

Mr. Peterson: Barnyard to you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Probably to you too, David.

I said to Mr. Danson: "If you wish to proceed with this now I want to tell you how we feel about it. I am going to make that quite clear." I said: "Mr. Danson, we feel that land is not a sufficient contribution to the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto. The federal government, if it is finally becoming serious about doing something for the people of Metropolitan Toronto, has to do more than put in land. In addition to land it ought to make a financial contribution so the land component plus the financial contribution equals the amount of money Metro and the taxpayers of Ontario put in." I said Barney—sorry, Mr. Danson, it shows members how well we get along ordinarily.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What did he call you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said: "Mr. Danson, quite honestly, the land isn't going to be good enough by itself." I said: "Now, if you want to give the land—

Mr. S. Smith: No reference to the campaign?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell the member what the reference to the campaign was, I am going to tell him exactly what the reference to the campaign was.

An hon. member: Give him Toronto Island, Larry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He said you guys goofed on Harbourfront, why would you want to do it again?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will tell the member exactly what the reference to the campaign was, it was this: I said to him quite clearly: "If you give us only the land then our response will be that the land isn't good enough." That is the old federal Liberal game of saying: "We will give you one dollar, now you guys go spend five."

I said: "Therefore, if you want to give us the land now without the money, then you have to make that decision in the context of your campaign. However, in order to keep this from being involved in the campaign, if you want to withhold any further discussion until after the election, I am happy to do that."

[2:30]

That was what he called back the next day and said to me. He said, "I have spoken to my colleagues"—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They don't want to hear the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Danson said he had spoken to his colleagues and could not even get them to go along with the land at that time; so it would have to wait until after

the election. And, considering how the election is going, I am confident it will work out a lot better then.

Mr. S. Smith: What a pity, Mr. Speaker, that there was a witness. What a pity.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: One would assume that the members on one side of the House don't want to hear the question and those on the other side don't want to hear the answer.

Mr. S. Smith: You are right on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to hear both.

Mr. S. Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker. What a pity there was a witness.

By way of supplementary: Would the minister not accept that it is not his job to keep the issue out of the federal campaign? The people can judge the worth or lack of worth of federal election promises. The minister's job is to get the federal government commitment and then to hold them to it. In that regard, will the minister tell us why he is withholding for his own personal study the report of Gladstone Consultants in Washington; and why is he refusing to share that report with the other levels of government at this time? Granted, he may wish to study it, but what is the reason that the other levels with whom he is supposed to co-operate are not being permitted to see that report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to the first part of the question—why do we not get the federal commitment and work from there?—the answer is, that is precisely what I asked Mr. Danson for; and I asked him again today. If they are sincere in their desire, let them just call up and say the land is available. That is the one thing that Mr. Danson has not done, to say, "Yes, the land is available." I trust the Leader of the Opposition will get on the phone over the weekend and arrange for that to occur on Monday.

The answer to the second part of the question is quite simply that we have got the study and, quite honestly, rather than have a study distributed and start public jockeying for position, as has now developed because of Mr. Danson's intervention—

Mr. Peterson: This is ridiculous, just ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just wait a minute—

Mr. Nixon: The CBC has got it, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Rather than have one level say in public, "We are going to throw in so much; now go and squeeze the other side," I thought the best way to do it would be to

meet quietly and talk with the other two levels of government.

Mr. Danson asked that that conversation be suspended until after the election. In response to his request that we not pursue the discussion until a later time. I agreed at his request to take more time to look at it from our standpoint. In response to that, I have not had an opportunity to complete our analysis of it and to take it to my colleagues to see what extent we are going to be able to contribute. We are long on record as being in favour of trying to find a way to build a convention centre for this city.

Mr. Peterson: It is despicable, the way you have handled it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Barney's way was terrific.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: While the Minister of Industry and Tourism is talking to the federal government and, despite what he said to him and what he was told, since 60 per cent of the workers in the construction industry in Toronto are unemployed and Toronto had to refuse 90 conventions which would have brought \$100,000,000 worth of business to the city of Toronto, can the minister tell us what is his commitment towards building the convention centre and what is the time table, since it looks as if he had been ready to go ahead since February if the federal election had not been called?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I say it is refreshing to hear the member support the use of government funds to attract new jobs here and to create some investment. I am sure his colleagues who are aldermen in the south end of my riding will fully support this project when it is brought up.

May I say that one of the reasons we have been studying the report is to determine the extent to which the taxpayers of Ontario should participate in that centre. I am a little more careful with the allocation of those funds. I have colleagues who have requested the Treasurer for funds and so on. We are trying to resolve our capability to fund that centre.

That is why I would have hoped the three levels of government could have met quietly and determined the extent to which we are all able to contribute. I can assure the member that this government, having paid entirely for that study, having long been on record as supporting convention centres in several municipalities—not NHL rinks for Hamilton—is very committed to that type of project. Members will see our contribution very shortly.

Mr. Wildman: Maybe you can get Ford to do it.

Mr. S. Smith: What is wrong with Hamilton being in the NHL?

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary: Since we have a tourism deficit of \$660,000,000 in Ontario, and since tourism is receiving a very low profile and not the priority it deserves, does the minister not see it as his responsibility to bring together the various bodies to discuss this centre? Also, is it not true that the people in the industry have themselves offered to make a substantial contribution to this centre?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have spent a great deal of time with the Metro convention people. I have spent a great deal of time with Paul Godfrey, who happened to be in my office when a certain call came in.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Did he get a copy of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A transcript of the call or the study?

I must repeat this: Mr. Danson says he is not sure who placed the original call; I am sure, I called him. It was the day before the federal Liberal cabinet came to Toronto to have its meeting. I must repeat: we paid for the study and co-ordinated the whole endeavour. But for Mr. Danson's request to stand this thing down until after the election, then it would have been going forward.

Mr. S. Smith: The people paid for it, my friend. You didn't pay for it, the people paid for it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot co-ordinate it when a major player in the game has said he doesn't want to talk until the election is over. I repeat my offer: We are happy to contribute and happy to co-ordinate if Mr. Danson will contribute the land as a minimum and some money on top of it. We are ready to talk tomorrow. If the member can get him off the campaign trail we will talk to him tomorrow.

PROPERTY TAXATION

Mr. S. Smith: A second question to the same minister on a different topic: Given his throne speech commitment to help small business, can he tell us whether he intends to speak to his colleagues in cabinet to try to prevent some of the small businesses of Ontario from property tax increases which are threatening to bankrupt them? In particular, does he not agree that he has a duty to urge upon his cabinet colleagues some further consideration to mitigate the impact of property tax reassessment as it affects small busi-

nesses? Shouldn't there be a mitigating factor taking into account the size of the business?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, I recall looking at some of the earlier studies. One of the concerns that was expressed the last time this issue got a lot of profile in this assembly and other places was the fact that there were many small businesses, particularly in the tourist areas, which would be dramatically and adversely affected by that reassessment. It was, in part, a very real concern with regard to the fact that many tourist operations and others would be put right out of business by some aspects of reassessment that has caused us all to have another look at the question.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, is the minister not aware that because his government has encouraged certain cities to go ahead on their own and introduce the new evaluations, that small businesses are being hurt? Is he aware, for instance, that in Hamilton there are businesses now facing increases ranging to 500 per cent and that a number of them will be facing bankruptcy? In particular, does he know that Centennial Volkswagen—one particular dealership in Hamilton—is facing an 89 per cent increase, which will make its taxes \$10,000 a year higher than the largest Volkswagen dealer in Canada, located in the Don Mills area in Toronto? Does he not see it is his duty to step in and prevent this kind of terrible hardship on the small business people in those places where new evaluation is being brought in on a local basis?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course we are terribly concerned about it. That's why we are all having a look at those problems and inequities. The fact is that at the same time I am expressing concern over those types of situations, and I am, we have other situations where the net result of that same reassessment package is that some small home owner who has had a home for very many years and who has been underassessed—

Mr. S. Smith: This is commercial.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One can't separate the commercial from the residential; it is all part of the tax base of the same area. At the same time the municipality would lose some assessment from the situation indicated by the member—

Mr. Nixon: Taxes are \$180 a car.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the burden is, in many cases, being shifted to some small residential owner. It is because of the very great burden that we may be shifting from one individual to another individual, even if they

are in different sectors, that we have this tremendous problem.

Of course, if one had it all to do over again and could start it all over again, it would be dramatically different. But now we have built-in inequities and equities in the system, and when one tries to sort them out people are going to get hurt on both sides. We have tremendous awareness of that. Indeed, I can tell the member of a lot of people in my own riding who, as residential owners, would go up 100 per cent in assessment. I can show him small businesses that are being dramatically hurt in my riding at the same time by their current assessment rate. It is because we are struggling with this that the debate has continued for quite some time.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary question to the minister for global product mandating: Would he, when he is responding to the problems faced by the small business community dealing with property tax, also look into the problems expressed by the Federation of Independent Businessmen about the effect that these corporate takeovers and mergers are having on competition in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not sure that was a supplementary question—

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, it was.

Mr. Warner: It's relevant and important.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and I am not sure I believe that member was carrying John Bulloch's briefcase today. In any case, I will be happy to look into all those concerns at the same time. I will report in a more reasoned way than Warren Allmand, however, I should caution the House.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you in favour of competition or against it?

Mr. S. Smith: A final supplementary: Does the minister not understand that it is possible to bring in a new market-value assessment category by category, that it isn't necessarily required that the commercial be reassessed as is the residential? The commercial could be left alone for a while. Could he intervene with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maack) and bring to his attention increases such as 500 per cent in a company, Bindery Services, 490 per cent in Colortron, 314 per cent in DeWildt Fiat, 92 per cent in a company called Hacienda, and so on? Does he not recognize a responsibility to protect the small businesses from this kind of huge property-tax increase? Will he intervene with the Minister of Revenue?

Mr. Peterson: Just as with licence plates, you can do it differently.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. I hope as I continue to discuss this matter, as I have been doing, with all of my colleagues who are concerned with it, that the member will also reflect on whether Hamilton city council, who also asked for the very reassessment he is complaining about, might join me. I know the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham)—I know where he is today—was one of those front and centre supporting the push to have the very reassessment this member is now expressing concern about.

Mr. S. Smith: There is a mitigating factor. You know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps Hamilton, the member for Wentworth North, and this member will join me in worrying about the effects of the reassessment they asked for. We are talking about this on a regular basis. And Gordon Dean will help us after tonight.

Mr. Martel: He is going to become your executive assistant.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. Sargent: I have a question to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of secret reports within Ontario Hydro under the title of Internal Significant Event Reports dealing with malfunctions and accidents at Hydro's nuclear stations? If so, does he know whether the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) sees these reports? If he does see these reports, would the Premier not agree that they offer little support for Hydro and government assurances that all is well with respect to safety in nuclear plants? If the Premier does not see these reports, or the minister does not see these reports, does he not agree it is high time that he did?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can't speak for the Minister of Energy, but I think the honourable member will find, in the very lengthy discussions before Dr. Porter's commission—I can't say whether this particular thing was referred to—a great deal of time, I guess there was close to 400 hours of discussion and presentations, related to the whole question of the safety of the Candu system. I think I'm right in this too, that the members of the select committee met with Ontario Hydro in terms of an explanation of the system that has been developed in this country.

I think, as the minister pointed out, that there are always some problems, no one is minimizing that, but in terms of safety the Candu system is regarded as being safe. I noticed a story in the paper this morning, I think it was in the *Globe and Mail*, with re-

spect to Pickering. I think the question really had been asked here before. My guess is that was also discussed before Dr. Porter's commission, perhaps even before the select committee.

I would say to the honourable member we are as interested and concerned, we are most desirous of having safety as complete as possible. I think if one looks at the record of our system—and I emphasize our system, I am not knowledgeable to speak about the situation near Harrisburg; but with respect to our own, it is regarded by most people who are knowledgeable in the business as being a safe system for the development of nuclear electricity.

I guess I could say I could ask Hydro, when these incidents occur from time to time, that they might send the minister and me a report. I must confess that if they sent me a technical report of that nature, I think the honourable member would be the first to say, "Then what are you going to do, Mr. Premier? You don't understand it anyway?" His colleague is nodding his head up and down. However, I can assure the honourable member that the Atomic Energy Control Board and the people at Ontario Hydro, from my assessment at least—not in technical terms because I can't express it in technical terms, but in terms of concern for and consciousness of the need for safety—have exceeded the requirements, in many situations, as laid down by AECB.

If the honourable member wishes to pursue a particular situation, I know that the chairman of the select committee mentioned, I believe on Tuesday, that this was an area that the committee would be getting into, at the same time not duplicating the studies and the hearings that Dr. Porter has already undertaken.

I would point out to the honourable member that I think when the select committee organizes the approach to this, when there is some opportunity to meet with those people who were there to see some aspects of what went on near Harrisburg, this whole question could be properly pursued. I am as anxious as anyone else to make sure that the people understand that this system is safe.

I can't quote them because I wasn't there, but I understand after discussions with and presentations by Ontario Hydro, one or two members of the committee who sit on the other side of the House gave the impression, and I say it was only an impression, as to their assessment, and that was that it was a safe system. That is by hearsay only but I think probably it reflects part of the conversation that took place.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the Premier, but that's not good enough, sir.

In the meantime would the Premier advise the House whether he thinks a series of near misses, serious human error, equipment failure, and other potential horror stories in the past year, should be covered up? Would he not agree it is of paramount importance that total freedom of information on internal nuclear reports should be available to the government and opposition members, both federal and provincial?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't doubt the honourable member's genuine interest in the subject, I am not being facetious about that, but I think it's also important to point out that perhaps some of the language that is being used is excessive on his part. I don't know of any secret reports about horror stories, I've not seen any of this. I do know there have been reports on the day-to-day operation of Pickering and Bruce, you name it—

Mr. Sargent: I said "potential horror stories."

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know, but the member is a very flamboyant, colourful, effervescent individual. I think in this situation one should—

Mr. Sweeney: It was a serious question.

Mr. Sargent: You can't laugh this one off.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right. If the honourable member is saying that he knows of potential horror problems at one of our plants I think he should tell us about them.

Mr. S. Smith: Be fair. He talked about a specific report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think he should be using the language "a potential horror story." I think it's wrong in this situation, I really do. I'm not here to play politics on this issue. It's serious. We should be concerned about it. In terms of the information Hydro or AECB may have, my assumption is—and I wasn't at any of the hearings—that a lot of this was discussed before Dr. Arthur Porter's commission. Has the honourable member read those aspects of that report? Maybe it would, shall we say, help him in his assessment and in his understanding of the system.

Mr. Sargent: Don't talk down to me. Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not talking down to the member. I'm suggesting that perhaps he might read those reports and make some judgements after that.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary: Would the Premier be prepared to give an undertaking to this House that he would look at docu-

ments tabled with the Porter commission and with the select committee on Ontario Hydro that include minutes from a meeting of the reactor safety advisory committee, August 10 and 11, 1976, in which Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—Mr. Brooks specifically—says Bruce generating station A, in order to meet the requirements it was licensed under, should be operating at 65 per cent of power for safety's sake? Will he give an undertaking that he will read those minutes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to read almost anything. I can't undertake that I could read the complete minutes and that would in turn solve the honourable member's problems. I assume the select committee has been dealing with this and will be dealing with it. I'll take a look at those minutes. I'm not sure what it's going to establish.

WESTINGHOUSE CANADA

Mr. Mackenzie: A question of the Premier, arising out of his meeting on Tuesday with the workers from the Westinghouse plant's switch gear division in Hamilton: In view of the company's threat to 700 jobs—a very real threat in that plant—what guarantees is the government prepared to provide to ensure these workers are not out of a job, and what steps will the government commit itself to in order to deal with the layoffs that are threatened?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll try to recall as much of the conversation as I can.

Mr. Peterson: Just summarize it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am going to summarize it. It was a lengthy presentation. It took an hour, so I think an adequate summary would be what?

Mr. S. Smith: Forty minutes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: About 40 minutes?

Mr. Peterson: Just two sentences.

Mr. Laughren: Quit stalling. Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for London Centre wants something clear and concise. I'll endeavour to do that.

Mr. Laughren: Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Sweeney: We'll settle for concise.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why? They made a presentation, a very understandable presentation, because they were concerned about the 700 jobs. I made it quite clear to them that I would be meeting with management of Westinghouse Canada—I think the date has been set, as a matter of fact. The ministry

was monitoring the situation and had a particular study related to the electronics industry under way, and also the company's study, which may or may not lead to certain changes, apparently is scheduled for completion around October.

I said to the representatives of the union who were there that I would be meeting with the company. We would keep them informed. I made this clear as well to Mr. Pilkey, the head of the Ontario Federation of Labour, who was with them.

It is also fair to state that as part of their presentation they indicated the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party would agree to legislation to deal with multinationals—why just multinationals in terms of economic problems, I'm not sure. I said I knew the New Democratic Party was prepared to legislate about anything, but I really didn't think the Liberal Party of Ontario had gone that far.

Mr. Mackenzie: A supplementary: Can the Premier tell me then what good is his intent to meet with the company some time in the next two weeks, and what good is the company's argument that they're going to conduct studies, when over the last week they have been systematically, throughout the plant, telling the switch-gear employees at what date their employment will terminate? In addition to that, what about the personnel management and site selection plans of the company, which obviously are intended to locate another plant away from any union involvement, if at all possible?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not familiar with the statement, other than some documentation that suggests there is some consideration of potential sites. I have not discussed this with the management of the company but I shall be doing so, that's why we're having a meeting. We will discuss that along with three or four other things we wish to raise with them.

I assured the ladies and gentlemen who were in to see me that we were interested in the viability of Westinghouse Canada. I assured them we were interested in it remaining within the city of Hamilton and that we would be, from our standpoint, making every effort to assist. They asked for a guarantee but I couldn't give it to them and I can't give it to the honourable member.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary, the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier make it clear to Westinghouse, since their so-called decentralization scheme has very clearly as its main purpose the escape from unionism, that in the province of Ontario in 1979 we just

don't accept that one sacrifices 700 jobs in a community because a company doesn't like dealing with a labour union? Will he make it clear to the company that that day is over, unionism happens to be part of life and they'll have to learn to live with it?

Mr. Breaugh: Does the Leader of the Opposition know what he just said?

Mr. Martel: I can't get over that.

An hon. member: It's by-election day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was waiting for the member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) to applaud that observation.

Mr. Martel: So were we.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is he speaking for the member on this issue?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, abso-positively—there are a number of things we will make clear when the company comes to visit us.

Mr. S. Smith: What was the government's position on the Fleck strike? Was the Premier against them on the Fleck strike?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let me tell the member this. As much as we like Prescott we're not going to suggest to them either they should all move out to Prescott et cetera. We're not going to suggest they move out of the golden horseshoe to go down there to locate.

DREE PROGRAM

Mr. Rollins: I have a question of the honourable Treasurer concerning an article that appeared in the Bancroft Times this week with reference to Hastings county being part of the new program now being negotiated between the province and the federal government in DREE. I would like assurance from the minister that Hastings county has been taken in consideration for favourable consideration as it has been, in the past, as part of the westerly boundary of the eastern Ontario agreements between the two levels of governments, whether it be DREE, ARDA, or other items?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The DREE agreement for eastern Ontario has been under negotiation for some time. I assume from the article the honourable member sent me that the candidate for the Liberal Party down there has not really talked to his colleagues in Ottawa—

Mr. Nixon: Hastings? He is going to win.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —because he said that Hastings isn't included. Our information at this point is that Hastings is included, as it should be.

I might also add that we thought we had Peterborough in it. We thought we had Victoria in it. We had Haliburton in and we had Muskoka in, and those were unilaterally withdrawn.

[3:00]

Mr. Rollins: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Inasmuch as I do represent a portion of Peterborough county, along with Hastings county, I regret that the federal government has not seen fit to co-operate with this minister—

Mr. Grande: Are you making a speech?

Mr. Rollins: —and include Peterborough county as part of this agreement.

Mr. Bradley: What a waste of the question period.

Mr. Martel: That's a great question.

Mr. Speaker: That really wasn't a question.

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it not true that Haliburton is still under negotiation, and has not been completely eliminated? It's my understanding it is still under consideration.

Hon. Mr. McCague: Until May 22, maybe?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The pipelines to Ottawa are open these days.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I hope the member is right.

Mr. Kerrio: He usually is.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It was in; it wasn't even under negotiation. I, for one, believe that with the handicap the electors already have in their member, they at least deserve to be included in the DREE agreement.

Mr. Conway: Wait until Bill Scott hears that.

Mr. Eakins: Our Liberal member won't like that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He's not a member. He's only a candidate.

Mr. Kerrio: We can't let the Premier in.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains, my riding was in too.

Mr. S. Smith: Speaking of handicapped ridings.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I want to say that the member's riding and my riding were included at the federal government's suggestion. To my shock, a week ago, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion informed me that because he could not include Peterborough, and because he could not include Victoria, he couldn't include Haliburton and Muskoka.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They don't think they can win those seats; that's why.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: He didn't mind including Montreal and Quebec.

EMPLOYEES' HEALTH AND SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) recently inquired about the degree to which workers and their unions had an opportunity to comment on the preparation of the regulations for promulgation under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Both workers and unions have been afforded an opportunity to provide comments on the regulations being proposed. To outline the extent to which input has been encouraged and indeed invited, I would like to comment specifically on each of the regulations in preparation.

First, let me deal with the regulations proposed for the industrial sector, which are essentially similar to those currently under the Industrial Safety Act. Some revisions have been proposed to correct deficiencies in the old regulations that have been identified over the past several years. A copy of the proposed draft was made available to a limited number of organizations for comment on February 12 of this year. Included among these groups was the Ontario Federation of Labour.

Second, in the case of the regulations proposed for the construction sector, an initial draft proposal was made available to the Construction Safety Association of Ontario early in January, and that association undertook to circulate the draft to a number of affected groups. A revised draft was later prepared and made available on March 6, again to a number of organizations. The Provincial Labour-Management Safety Committee was on that list and represented on that committee are the bricklayers and masons, the operating engineers, the carpenters, the labourers and the Provincial Building and Construction Trades Council of Ontario.

Third, the regulations for the mining sector have been under review by the Barrett committee for the past three years. Eight members of the committee represent the United Steelworkers of America.

Finally, concerning the regulations for the control of exposure to occupational health hazards, comment on the proposed draft regulations covering six chemical substances and noise was invited by notices in the Ontario Gazette in July and August of last year. In addition, copies of the proposed regulations were mailed to a number of organizations likely to be affected, including 45 union and worker associations. In the case of some of these regulations, we have specifically invited comment from representatives of the Ontario Federation of Labour and the United Steelworkers of America.

[Later (3:06):]

Mr. Cassidy: The question of the member for Hamilton East was not only about consultation about the regulations under Bill 70, but also about when we could expect the bill to be proclaimed.

Since it has now been 15 weeks since that bill was adopted by this Legislature, can the minister say when the workers of Ontario will get the protection of Bill 70 by having the bill proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I did answer that question of the member, but let the member and I be very clear. There is no delay, no interest in procrastinating, only a sincere interest in getting that bill promulgated as soon as it can be done. Let us not play that game.

[Reverting (3:04):]

FAMILY BENEFITS

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a second question, on Tuesday the member for London Centre—who is wearing a lovely tie today, by the way; that's a terrific tie—

Mr. Peterson: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Your wife didn't pick it though, did she?

Mr. Speaker: Time's a-wasting.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The member brought to my attention the fact I had not answered a question he posed several weeks ago regarding family benefits and the Ontario Human Rights Code. I regret this omission, but was under the impression he had obtained the answer he wished from the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) in a subsequent question.

Although it could be said the current policy regarding family benefits appears to suggest discrimination on the basis of sex, the commission has indicated its view is the point in question does not fall within the provisions of the code. When the matter was brought to the attention of the commission, it replied it cannot take such cases, largely because there is considerable doubt about the enforcement of the code as it applies at present to agencies of the crown, as a legal action would entail the crown acting against the crown.

Thus, I can only repeat my original statement to the member that this particular situation does not at present fall within the scope of the human rights code.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister, in his capacity as minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Code, prepared to investigate this entire situation to bring the various agencies of the crown underneath that human rights code? Is he prepared to deal with that issue and is

he prepared to give them instructions to come up with draft legislation in that particular area?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: There are two issues, one is personal. The member asked me whether I feel there is discrimination. I do, as does the Minister of Community and Social Services, as he said.

Mr. Peterson: You are not prepared to do anything about it. We want to give you a chance.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Second, the matter I have referred to is clearly one of those under consideration in our review of the Ontario Human Rights Code that is under way. As I mentioned before in the House at the time of his question, that act and proposed amendments will be discussed in the ordinary legislative way.

Mr. S. Smith: When?

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr. Van Horne: I have a question to the Minister of Health. I suppose I could very well have asked this of the Treasurer, in the light of his opening statement today.

Is the minister prepared to deny the allegations of the London ambulance attendants' association that many ambulances in Ontario are staffed in the summertime by students who have minimum medical, nursing or health training and who, therefore, could place the life of the injured or sick person using the service in extreme jeopardy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member has a sixth sense.

Mr. Conway: The question is, do you have five?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am just reading, at this very moment, some information on that prepared by my staff.

Mr. Laughren: Set up. Set up.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, we would not do that.

The students are required to hold a valid standard first-aid certificate issued by the Red Cross or the St. John Ambulance Association, plus a valid class F driver's licence which enables them to drive the ambulances. These qualifications, I am told in the information I have before me, are similar to the current legislative requirements for part-time and volunteer ambulance officers. The students who will be employed in the summer of 1979 will also be certified by the Canadian Heart Foundation in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation at the basic rescuer level.

Does the honourable member require any additional information? The information be-

fore me is extremely lengthy, and I haven't had a chance to go through it, so perhaps I could take whatever supplementary question he has as notice and I will get the full information back to him.

Mr. Van Horne: By way of supplementary: No doubt the minister has information in front of him because we have been chasing this particular item for a couple of days. I would say, by way of background, that the situation has been presented to the ministry for the last couple of years and, specifically, the allegations I have received lead me to ask this question.

In the regulations, section 14 suggests that in addition to nursing training et cetera, a person with a health discipline approved by the ministry might be qualified. We have instances of geography and psychology students acting as summertime ambulance attendants.

Does the minister consider those equivalent qualifications—geology, geography or psychology?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have already indicated the qualifications they must all have, regardless of the discipline in which they are training.

Mr. Van Horne: But that hasn't happened.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will be glad to respond to every single point addressed to the ministry in the most recent inquiry of which I have been made familiar. I have not been made aware of any earlier inquiry.

Mr. Conway: We have a used-car salesman as Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will be glad to share with the member information on all aspects of it, I hope to reassure him the standards are in fact quite appropriate for the summer students who are employed to assist as staff holidays rotate through the summer months.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health who last week made an announcement in this House that was purportedly to solve the problem of opted-out physicians. To avoid accusations of hyperbole I'd like to quote just one line from his initial statement: "that this announcement is based on a partnership between health care professionals, the medical community, the public and the government." He also said that "this partnership, despite some difficulties, has worked well in Ontario." Could I ask the minister how he rationalizes, or dared to make, that statement in light of this quote from the general secretary of the Ontario Medical Association to the AMA

convention in the United States? The quote is: "Partnership with government does not exist."

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would remind the honourable member—perhaps he couldn't see from where he sits in the chamber—at the time I made that statement last week the gentleman to whom he refers was sitting in the gallery. He was there with the president of the medical association and most of the executive of the medical association—

Mr. McClellan: Sitting there laughing at you.

Mr. Warner: You could hear the chuckles from here.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —as well as the president and executive director of the hospital association. I'm not familiar with that particular quote, but I suggest that the deeds—

Mr. Warner: You should be.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and their very presence here to back up that statement confirm the partnership to which I made reference.

Mr. Martel: Blame the opposition; we initiated the legislation.

Mr. Warner: You failed miserably.

Mr. McClellan: Why shouldn't he be here? He knows a sucker when he sees one.

Mr. Cooke: It is nonsense.

Mr. Warner: Don't talk on medicare.

Mr. Breaugh: I would take the man at his word, as that is exactly what he means. Would the minister then care to comment on Dr. Moran's description of the way the government arrives at physicians' fees? Again I will quote: "They are a sham, a charade; we are in a no-win situation."

Mr. Martel: He didn't say that, did he?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If I remember correctly, the appearance at the AMA—and I haven't seen that particular report—was many months ago. In fact the opinion was expressed on several occasions by representatives of the medical association—

Mr. Warner: No, no, wrong again. Try something else.

Ms. Gigantes: He's been saying it for months.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that while we were under the anti-inflation board controls as laid down by the federal government, the negotiations were hamstrung by the ceiling imposed.

Mr. S. Smith: Were you against it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We all knew going into negotiations in that three-year period what the upper limit was of the average income increase for a physician; what there was

left to negotiate was the distribution. With respect, any time that statement has been made in my presence—and it has been made—it has been with reference to that restriction that was placed on negotiations for over three years.

Mr. Warner: Wrong; wrong again.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Kennedy moved first reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, this is a re-introduction of a similar bill that was on the Order Paper and died last session. The purpose is to extend the eligibility for compensation under the Compensation for Victims of Crime Act, 1971, to any person who has been convicted of an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment and whose conviction is subsequently quashed. I might add there is a significant amendment to it in that with this change it would provide for cases such as the Peter Treu case which could now receive consideration.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of Bill 39, An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to.

[3:15]

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the bill has been the result of an academic research project sponsored by students of Wilfrid Laurier University—Cheryl Oleniuk, Lori Rheume and Tom Robson. The purpose of the bill is to require the Workmen's Compensation Board to establish at least one sheltered workshop for handicapped persons in Ontario. The board is also authorized to provide assistance to persons or associations who wish to establish sheltered workshops. The amendment is designed to place jobless injured workers in full-time employment.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, pursuant to standing order 13 I wish to indicate to the House the business for tonight, tomorrow and next week. This afternoon and evening, we will continue with the debate on the speech from the

throne, and similarly tomorrow morning, Friday. On Monday, April 9, we will have the windup of the reply to the speech from the throne with a vote planned for about 5:45.

Tuesday afternoon, April 10, we will do legislation and take into consideration Bills 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18 and in the evening we hear from the Treasurer. On Wednesday, April 11, the resources development, administration of justice and general government committees may meet in the morning. On Thursday, April 12, we take up private members' public business, being ballot items three and four with adjournment planned on Thursday, April 12, at 6 p.m. for us to reconvene at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17.

While I am on my feet, I wonder if we might have the unanimous consent of the House for the Treasurer to present the necessary supply bill to pick up the supplementary estimates that the committee of supply dealt with on Thursday evening and Friday morning of last week?

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent for such action?

Agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SUPPLY ACT

The following bill was given first, second and third readings on motion by Hon. F. S. Miller:

Bill 40, An Act granting to Her Majesty certain additional sums of money for the Public Service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, before I get into the debate, I would like to express my appreciation for the excellent manner in which you conduct the business of this House. You have been fair in all your decisions and I am sure this has been appreciated by all three parties.

Mr. Speaker, I will be using up a considerable amount of time this afternoon. As a matter of fact, I will be using up some of the time I haven't used during this past year.

Mr. Martel: It is going to be a filibuster.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, I am not a member who likes to get up and boast about what this government has done.

Mr. Nixon: It is going to be a short speech.

Mr. Belanger: I am not a member who will speak up in the House for the sake of publicity.

Mr. Lawlor: You are on the wrong side of the fence.

Mr. Belanger: And I am not a member who speaks in this House—or who shouts from my seat—about what this government should be doing, or what I want for my counties of Prescott and Russell.

Mr. Nixon: Why are you here?

Mr. Stong: You must be going to retire.

Mr. Belanger: When I have a request in my riding I go directly to the source: the minister, or even the Premier (Mr. Davis), if need be.

An hon. member: Or the Premier's advisers. That is where the power is.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, that is the way I operate.

Mr. Nixon: You don't know Lorne Henderson, do you?

Mr. Riddell: Is this your swan song, Albert?

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to have the opportunity of participating in the debate on the speech from the throne.

Monsieur l'Orateur: C'est un plaisir pour moi aujourd'hui de participer aux débats sur le discours du trône.

Je regrette cependant que le Chef de l'Opposition officielle ne soit pas ici pour entendre mes commentaires puisqu'il a manifesté un si vif intérêt dans l'est de l'Ontario et de mon comté. En août dernier, par exemple, selon le journal de Prescott, il aurait dit qu'il encouragerait l'industrie à quitter le centre prospère de la province pour aller s'établir dans l'est de l'Ontario. Je crains que le leader de l'opposition ne soit jamais dans une position pour avoir cette influence.

Mr. Martel: Oh, no, the north, Albert.

Mr. Belanger: Malheureusement, il semble qu'il dise la même chose aux gens des autres régions de la province et j'ai nettement l'impression qu'il n'a pas encore informé les gens de la région de Hamilton, de Burlington et de Toronto qu'il songe à déménager l'industrie de ces localités vers d'autres régions de la province. Evidemment, si c'est vraiment son intention, ce dont je doute sincèrement, il est fort probable qu'il adressait sa déclara-

tion pour plaire à la population locale comme c'est le cas dans un grand nombre de ses déclarations.

Je regrette aussi que le député de Nipissing, Monsieur Bolan, soit absent. Lui aussi s'est rendu dans les beaux comtés de Prescott et de Russell en disant lors d'une réunion libérale et je cite: "Nous avons un problème dans Prescott et Russell; c'est Albert Bélanger."

Mr. Martel: That's nasty, Albert.

Mr. Belanger: En réalisant qu'il s'adressait à ses amis libéraux, je suppose qu'il voulait dire que les Libéraux ont un problème avec Albert Bélanger parce qu'il fait du si bon travail pour ses électeurs que les Libéraux n'éliront jamais un député dans Prescott et Russell.

Toutefois, je ne suis pas ici aujourd'hui pour m'attaquer aux déclarations que les Libéraux ont faites dans diverses régions de l'Ontario—

Mr. Martel: Now you are boasting.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: No, in French it is not boasting.

Mr. Belanger: —surtout parce qu'ils chantent des refrains si différents dans chaque région de la province, qu'il est presque impossible de déterminer leur politique sur une question ou l'autre. En plus, je crois que les gens de l'Ontario commencent à réaliser que le Parti Libéral est contradictoire, opportuniste et pragmatique dans son évaluation des problèmes véritables des gens de cette province.

C'est pourquoi je suis heureux d'appuyer le discours du trône. Les préceptes qui en découlent reflètent la prévoyance, le souci et la compréhension dont ce gouvernement a toujours fait preuve pour relever les défis qui existent en Ontario. Bien que le discours du trône traite de nouveaux domaines et de principes généraux—

Mr. McKessock: Do you believe that, Jack?

Mr. Belanger: —il prouve que ce gouvernement sait reconnaître les défis qui nous sont imposés dans les sphères économiques et sociales, et qu'il est prêt à les relever.

Je suis particulièrement heureux de voir, par exemple, que l'on se propose d'établir un fonds d'encouragement à l'emploi, qui va servir de base à une collaboration entre le gouvernement et le secteur des affaires afin d'assurer que l'Ontario continue de répondre à la demande croissante d'emplois.

Bien que 140,000 nouveaux emplois aient été créés en Ontario l'an dernier, tous les membres de cette Chambre reconnaissent le besoin d'initiatives audacieuses de la part du

gouvernement pour s'assurer que notre économie demeure concurrentielle, en d'autres mots, s'assurer d'attirer de nouvelles industries et leur permettre de maintenir un niveau de développement qui puisse garder le pas avec le nombre grandissant de travailleurs que arrivent sur le marché du travail.

Pour ma part, je crois qu'à long terme, le fonds d'encouragement à l'emploi sera avantageux pour la province. D'une part, il va nous permettre d'encourager la croissance industrielle dans les secteurs de l'économie où il existe un potentiel de développement d'emplois. D'autre part, il va permettre d'attirer de nouvelles industries et de développer des produits qui ouvriront de nouveaux marchés et maintiendront notre position concurrentielle au sein des marchés traditionnels au Canada et à l'étranger.

D'aucuns prétendent que cette initiative représente une faveur de la part du gouvernement à la grosse entreprise. Nos amis libéraux évidemment appuient l'idée de fournir des encouragements à Ford une journée, puis changent d'idée et prétendent plus tard le contraire.

Mr. Wildman: Giveaway.

Mr. Martel: That's having it both ways.

Mr. Belanger: Je crois qu'il incombe au gouvernement d'encourager le progrès et d'aider à rendre l'industrie et le commerce viables. Je crois également que nous devons envisager objectivement la réalité de l'industrie et du commerce sur le plan international. Nous devons réaliser que nous vivons dans un monde dominé par des sociétés internationales. Evidemment nous pourrions faire des illusions et ignorer ce fait. Nous pourrions dire que dorénavant nous n'encouragerons pas les industries internationales à s'établir en Ontario. Nous pourrions dire que nous n'offrirons pas d'encouragement aux sociétés internationales étrangères.

Mais il semble que si nous ignorons cette réalité, les victimes seraient surtout les travailleurs de cette province. A mon avis, une approche rationnelle serait d'établir un équilibre entre l'encouragement aux industries domestiques tout en reconnaissant en même temps objectivement que nous devons attirer notre part équitable de capitaux d'investissements des grandes corporations internationales.

A titre de député d'un comté qui possède un grand potentiel de croissance industrielle, mes électeurs et moi serons heureux d'accueillir de nouvelles industries, de nouvelles usines et les nouveaux emplois qui seront créés par suite de cette initiative, surtout parce que cette politique signifie un emploi et un investissement à long terme dans cette province.

Ce dernier point a été l'un des critères soulignés par le Ministère de l'Industrie et du Tourisme dans un récent discours adressé au Board of Trade de Toronto. Dans cette allocution le Ministre a énoncé clairement les défis qu'affronte la province en terme de développements économiques. Les idées et les mesures proposées par le Ministre et subséquemment reprises dans le discours du trône constituent une attitude responsable envers un problème très difficile qui constitue un véritable défi. Le fonds d'encouragement à l'emploi va aider l'Ontario à maintenir sa position forte dans un monde où la concurrence est de plus en plus complexe et brutale sur le plan commercial international. [3:30]

Bien que le fonds d'encouragement à l'emploi représente une initiative importante du gouvernement pour assurer la croissance économique continué et la création de nouveaux emplois dans cette province, le discours du trône souligne également son engagement constant pour contrôler l'augmentation des dépenses gouvernementales et le processus de réglementation, deux points qui contribuent à la création d'un climat économique positif qui encourage l'investissement et le progrès dans cette province.

A ce sujet, j'ai été heureux de noter que le gouvernement va continuer de modifier et d'améliorer le système de réglementation concernant les petites entreprises. Les mesures visant à donner des responsabilités et une plus grande autonomie où c'est approprié, aux industries, associations et municipalités, vont aider à diminuer la participation du gouvernement dans nos affaires quotidiennes.

Toutefois, monsieur l'Orateur, la section du discours du trône qui aura peut-être le plus grand intérêt pour les gens de Prescott et Russell se rapporte aux initiatives à continuer, à étendre ou à apporter dans le domaine de l'agriculture.

En qualité de membre de ce gouvernement, je suis fier de notre collaboration avec nos communautés agricoles. Je souligne le mot collaboration car il caractérise exactement l'attitude de notre gouvernement au cours des trois dernières décennies.

Nous reconnaissons que l'agriculteur est un homme d'affaires indépendant. Nous comprenons également les difficultés et les problèmes de nos agriculteurs quand il s'agit de maintenir des opérations agricoles rentables. Ayant vécu toute ma vie dans une petite localité agricole, monsieur l'Orateur, je peux parler en toute connaissance de cause de l'importante contribution qu'apportent les agriculteurs à notre société.

Leur contribution s'étend au-delà du rôle très important qu'ils jouent au sein de l'économie provinciale, le rôle assurant que l'Ontario possède des réserves suffisantes de centaines de produits agricoles. Leur contribution en est également une de valeur et de bon sens qu'ils apportent dans notre vie. Au fur et à mesure que notre société devient plus complexe, il est bon de retourner dans une localité où les gens n'ont pas encore perdu leur perspective de la vie, où le combat le plus fondamental de l'homme, son combat avec la nature, continue d'être le point de mire de notre activité quotidienne.

N'allez toutefois pas en conclure ou en déduire que la communauté agricole n'a pas à affronter les mêmes problèmes que nous. L'agriculteur, comme nous tous, est la victime de l'inflation et fait face aux mêmes besoins que ses amis des centres urbains. Comme tout autre homme d'affaire, il doit faire face aux défis constants d'équilibrer ses comptes, d'offrir un niveau de vie satisfaisant à sa famille et de construire une communauté qui réponde vraiment à ses besoins et à ceux de son prochain. C'est en reconnaissant cette réalité, que le discours du trône a renouvelé l'engagement de ce gouvernement de continuer à travailler avec notre communauté agricole pour assurer que l'agriculture demeure un élément important dans la vie de cette province.

Il est certain que l'agriculture prédomine dans les comtés unis de Prescott et Russell où plus de 260,000 acres sont consacrés à des fins agricoles. On compte en plus 60,000 acres de terre non mis en valeur au sein des régions agricoles. Quelque 7,500 personnes vivent sur des fermes avec des ventes agricoles de \$50 ou plus tandis que 20,000 autres vivent dans des localités rurales.

Prescott et Russell comportent un bon équilibre de petites, moyennes et grandes opérations agricoles. Nous produisons une gamme étendue de récoltes bien que l'industrie laitière joue le rôle le plus significatif dans l'activité agricole des comtés unis.

Monsieur l'Orateur, le gouvernement de l'Ontario a mis en oeuvre de nombreux programmes pour aider les agriculteurs à maintenir des opérations agricoles rentables. L'assurance des récoltes, les programmes de stabilisation de revenue agricole et de revenue de l'élevage du bétail sont de bons exemples de programmes ayant pour but de permettre aux agriculteurs de continuer à maintenir des opérations rentables sur un marché souvent imprévisible et soumis à des facteurs climatiques qui peuvent affecter le niveau agricole d'une année à l'autre.

Dans les domaines où la province a travaillé directement en collaboration avec nos agriculteurs, nous avons connu un nombre remarquable de succès. Le meilleur exemple est peut-être le domaine du drainage qui, au cours des dernières années a pris beaucoup d'importance dans l'est de l'Ontario. Dans les domaines où la province a participé à des programmes de partage des dépenses avec le gouvernement fédéral, il y a certainement des améliorations possibles, surtout en ce qui concerne la récente décision du gouvernement fédéral de se retirer de plusieurs accords de partage de dépenses. Un domaine où ceci a créé beaucoup d'incertitude concerne les débouchés de drainage municipaux qui, conformément à l'accord relatif à l'aménagement rural et au développement agricole ont été partagés à parts égales aux niveaux fédéral, provincial et municipal.

Il vaut peut-être la peine, monsieur l'Orateur, de prendre quelques minutes pour énoncer le problème auquel nous ferons face dans l'est de l'Ontario si le programme de drainage municipal est éliminé par le gouvernement fédéral et c'est pourquoi j'ai été particulièrement heureux que le discours du trône contienne un engagement de la part du gouvernement de travailler en vue de la continuation du programme ARDA ou d'un programme de même calibre.

Je n'ai guère à expliquer aux députés des régions rurales l'importance d'un bon système de drainage pour étendre et améliorer les récoltes et les acres en production.

Mr. McKessock: Rene, you're the only one who can heckle him.

Mr. Belanger: A la suite du programme de drainage dans cette province, près de 1,200,000 d'acres disposent maintenant d'un drainage intensif. Pour ceux d'entre vous qui ne sont au courant du programme, un agriculteur peut obtenir un prêt de sa municipalité pour couvrir le coût à concurrence de 75 per cent de l'installation d'un système de drainage. L'agriculteur paie un taux d'intérêt de six pour cent et le prêt peut être remboursé sur une période de dix ans. La province absorbe la différence entre l'intérêt payé par les agriculteurs et le taux d'intérêt courant. Dans l'exercice financier 1977-78, par exemple, des prêts de plus de \$18,000,000 ont été accordés à quelque 2,600 projets de drainage. Cette année, \$3,800,000 auront été versés pour couvrir l'intérêt dont la province a assumé la responsabilité.

En plus des prêts, la province accorde des subventions aux agriculteurs pour les aider à installer des débouchés de drainage adéquats en fonction du système de drainage sur leur

propriété. Ces subventions sont versées aux agriculteurs par les municipalités en fonction du montant des coûts de drainage évalués selon les terres servant à des fins agricoles. Cette année, \$4,500,000 ont été mis de côté pour ce programme.

Bref, le Gouvernement provincial encourage activement les agriculteurs à installer des systèmes de drainage efficaces sur leur ferme pour accroître la production et le nombre d'acres utilisés pour la culture. Nous pouvons voir le résultat de ce programme dans le passage de la production de foin, d'avoine et de graines mixtes au maïs. Les terres consacrées au maïs dans l'est de l'Ontario se sont multipliées par 10 entre 1966 et 1976 et ce changement prend de plus en plus d'envergure. L'une des principales raisons de ce changement a été l'installation d'un bon système de drainage.

Toutefois, le programme de la province ne peut être vraiment efficace que si des débouchés de drainage adéquats sont installés par les municipalités pour que l'eau soit évacuée des fermes plus rapidement.

Afin d'aider les municipalités à développer des canaux de drainage adéquats, la province et le Gouvernement fédéral ont convenu en vertu du programme ARDA de fournir les deux tiers du coût de l'installation des canaux de drainage municipaux. La municipalité aurait à payer le dernier tiers du coût d'installation. Ces dernières années, ce programme a été très avantageux pour l'agriculture, l'agriculteur et la communauté.

Toutefois, le 5 décembre 1978, le Gouvernement fédéral annonçait son intention de cesser d'appuyer financièrement le programme ARDA et rétroactivement au 8 septembre. En réalité, cela signifiait que tout projet de drainage qui n'était pas déjà en construction à cette date ne serait pas admissible pour l'aide financière fédérale d'un tiers.

Entre le 8 septembre et le 5 décembre, des travaux de drainage au coût de \$1,700,000 avaient été entrepris. Il y avait dans le voisinage de \$5,200,000 de rapports d'ingénierie complétés et sur le point d'aller en appel d'offre. En plus, il y avait quelque 69 drains, ayant coûté au cours de l'année dernière entre \$40,000 et \$50,000 chacun qui totaliseront un autre montant de \$3,000,000 portant ainsi le montant total de travail sur les canaux de drainage municipaux à environ \$10,000,000 pour l'est de l'Ontario. Ces projets avaient été entrepris par les municipalités impliquées dans ce programme avec l'assurance qu'un tiers serait payé par le Gouvernement Fédéral en vertu du programme ARDA.

Malheureusement, par suite de la décision du Gouvernement Fédéral, un bon nombre de ces projets ont été interrompus et les municipalités qui se sont engagées dans des programmes coûteux de drainage pourront être obligées de payer les deux tiers du coût. Le Gouvernement provincial s'est engagé à fournir un tiers du coût. Mais à mon avis, le Gouvernement Fédéral a traité cette situation d'une façon déplorable et a manifesté une indifférence totale à l'égard des municipalités et des agriculteurs concernés.

Mr. Wildman: Did you Liberals hear that?

Mr. Belanger: Mais il existe encore un autre aspect malheureux à cette situation. Bien que la province encourage les agriculteurs à mettre en valeur des systèmes adéquats de drainage pour leur ferme, dans la plupart des cas, ces efforts seront tout à fait inutiles à moins que les canaux municipaux soient disponibles pour l'écoulement des eaux provenant des systèmes de drainage sur les fermes.

Dans mon propre comté de Prescott-Russell, nous avons eu beaucoup de succès en versant \$2,200,000 pour les canaux de drainage municipaux en vertu de l'accord ARDA. Dans mon comté comme dans la plupart des comtés de l'est de l'Ontario, il reste toutefois un besoin d'accomplir encore beaucoup plus dans ce domaine. Mais à moins que les municipalités ne reçoivent une aide financière par l'entremise d'un programme d'assistance partagée, le programme de drainage des fermes et celui des municipalités pourrait être sérieusement affecté.

[3:45]

A mon avis, il est essentiel que l'assistance pour les canaux de drainage soit offerte pour aider les municipalités. Que la source des fonds demeure avec l'ARDA, ou qu'une autre entente soit établie, le coût ne devrait pas et ne peut pas être laissé à la province et aux municipalités seulement. Il faut que ce programme continue d'être un effort conjoint aux trois niveaux.

Je dois avouer, monsieur l'Orateur, que je ne comprends pas les motifs du Gouvernement Fédéral de se retirer de ce programme qui a fourni une assistance formidable dans les communautés rurales de l'est de l'Ontario. En plus du programme de drainage, cet accord pour aider les agriculteurs a joué un rôle important en aidant les agriculteurs à améliorer leur terre de culture. Depuis 1962, par exemple, environ \$4,000,000 ont été dépensés pour aider à l'agrandissement de 355 fermes dans la région de Prescott et Russell. J'ajouterais également que l'ARDA a aidé à financer le Parc Provincial Carillon et a

fourni des fonds pour la recherche et les études de praticabilité pour le projet de la rivière South Nation.

Ce dernier projet, monsieur l'Orateur, est d'une importance considérable pour les agriculteurs dans ma région. Comme vous le savez peut-être, avec toutes les améliorations qui ont résulté de l'installation d'un système adéquat de drainage, la rapidité avec laquelle la quantité d'eau coulant dans la rivière South Nation s'est accrue. Bien que les inondations printanières et les inondations subites en été peuvent causer des dommages considérables aux récoltes, ce problème peut être contrôlé par des écluses à Plantagenet et une étude à ce sujet est en voie d'être entreprise pour examiner la possibilité de creuser le lit rocheux à Plantagenet. Une fois achevé, ce projet devrait aider à réduire le danger d'inondation pour les agriculteurs dans mon comté, et maintenir un niveau d'eau stable durant les sécheresses de l'été.

Monsieur l'Orateur, je suis également heureux que le discours du trône propose l'établissement d'un programme d'aide modifiée pour nos agriculteurs. Ce programme que je crois comprendre, sera appelé "Ontario Farm Productivity Incentive Program" et remplacera le programme de subventions qui a été établi en 1967. Au cours des douze dernières années, ce programme a permis aux agriculteurs de moderniser et d'agrandir leurs opérations. J'apprends que quelques \$165,000,000 ont été versés à environ 90,000 agriculteurs dans le cadre de ce programme, et que des demandes d'aide ont été acceptées jusqu'à la fin de mars de cette année.

Le nouveau programme d'encouragement sera établi pour cinq ans et son budget sera fixé sur une base annuelle. Il aura pour but d'aider les agriculteurs dans des projets d'aménagement du sol et du contrôle de l'érosion y compris l'entreposage du fumier et l'aménagement d'eau pour le bétail. Il servira également à la construction d'aménagements de production spécifiques pour les agriculteurs qui n'ont jamais participé au programme de subventions. Il y aura des projets comme les granges pour le bétail, des laiteries, des silos, des serres et même des projets pour le sirop d'érable.

Un autre développement proposé dans le discours du trône concerne la machinerie agricole.

Mr. Wildman: You can never get parts.

Mr. Belanger: Par suite d'un effort de co-opération entre les fabricants, les distributeurs, et les concessionnaires qui ont rencontré les responsables du gouvernement,

on travaillera à l'élaboration d'un code d'éthique qui assurera aux agriculteurs des contrats d'achat standard des garanties minimum et un service adéquat de réparation et de pièces de rechange.

Mr. Wildman: Are they going to bring in legislation?

Mr. Belanger: A mon avis, il était grand temps que l'on y voit. Il n'y a rien de plus frustrant pour un agriculteur que d'avoir de la machinerie en panne en pleine saison de semence ou de moisson parce qu'il n'est pas en mesure d'obtenir une pièce de rechange.

Mr. Wildman: It had better be in legislation.

Mr. Belanger: J'ai été également heureux de voir que l'on continuera le programme Agricrew. L'an dernier, ce programme qui emploie des étudiants pour travailler dans les fermes en équipe de cinq pour des périodes d'une semaine, a été entrepris à titre expérimental dans la région de Cornwall pendant 4 semaines. La majorité des participants ont de 16 à 18 ans et la plupart, avaient une certaine expérience agricole.

À la suite du succès de l'été dernier, quatre équipes seront basées à Plantagenet et serviront les comtés de Prescott, Russell, Glengarry et Stormont.

De mon point de vue, ce programme pourrait être bénéfique, à la fois aux étudiants qui y participent et aux agriculteurs. Chaque équipe travaille cinq jours et l'agriculteur n'a droit qu'à une seule équipe par été. Il en coûte à l'agriculteur \$90 par jour sur lesquels il reçoit un remboursement de \$15 de la part du gouvernement. Le programme permet à l'étudiant d'obtenir une excellente expérience en même temps qu'un revenu modeste et ce programme peut être d'une grande utilité pour l'agriculteur qui a un projet spécial à entreprendre. Le but cependant n'est pas d'interférer avec les occasions d'emploi pour la main-d'oeuvre saisonnière au cours des périodes de moisson. J'espère que les agriculteurs, dans ma région, profiteront de ce programme et que l'on utilisera des étudiants locaux.

While these programs are encouraging, there is one important issue that is causing some concern to dairy farmers in Prescott and Russell. I am, of course, referring to the problem of industrial milk quotas. This issue, however, attains added significance because it bears directly on Ontario's position as a cheddar cheese and specialty cheese producer.

As most members know, the cheddar cheese industry in eastern Ontario has gone through a period of transformation during the past

decade. In particular, many of the smaller cheese factories have been amalgamated into larger operations. Despite this, however, our cheddar cheese industry has not kept pace with the increased demand for cheddar cheese in recent years, particularly in foreign markets. In fact, we are producing about the same volume of cheddar cheese as we did five years ago. Last month Grant Smith, vice-president of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board, told a group in my riding that Canadian producers only met half their quota to the United States market last year. At the same time, there is a growing demand for Ontario cheddar cheese in Britain and there is no doubt that we could increase our sales in that market. There is also some concern that we will be unable to meet future demands for aged cheddar cheese, despite the assurances of Eugene Whelan that there is no shortage of cheddar cheese.

Mr. Riddell: A good minister.

Mr. Belanger: Yet, despite this rising demand for Ontario cheddar cheese, many factories are operating at a 50 per cent capacity.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Where was your minister when they were giving quotas to Quebec?

Mr. Belanger: According to cheese producers and dairy farmers I have talked to, the problem stems from the fact that industrial milk quotas for Ontario have not kept pace with the increased demand for cheddar cheese. I am told that a number of cheese manufacturers have imported surplus industrial milk from Quebec to produce Ontario cheddar cheese.

Mr. McKessock: Did we take Quebec's quotas?

Mr. Belanger: If this is the case, our dairy farmers who depend on industrial milk sales are getting the short end of the stick.

Mr. McKessock: What should we do?

Mr. Belanger: The controversy over industrial milk quotas is not new. Ontario's Minister of Agriculture and Food has brought this matter to the attention of the federal minister and has asked that the industrial milk quota be increased.

Mr. Wildman: Why bother? You already said he was indifferent.

Mr. Belanger: Though the price for industrial milk has been increased, the request for an increased quota for Ontario appears to have fallen on deaf ears, so far as the federal government is concerned.

I believe that a national milk supply management program is in the best interest of the dairy industry in Canada. At the same time,

however, it seems to me that the system has become too rigid. It has failed to adapt to changing circumstances within the dairy industry. The current problem just doesn't make sense. We have the production capability and we have the demand for Ontario cheddar cheese. There is also a growing market for many specialty cheeses produced here in Ontario. Part of the solution, of course, is to place a higher import limit on foreign cheese brought into Canada. The limit currently stands at 45,000,000 pounds per year.

It also seems to me that we must take a serious look at the quota system, as it applies currently to Ontario. I understand that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food recently has made some significant changes in relation to its role with the dairy industry. I also understand that the Ontario Milk Marketing Board and the Ontario Dairy Council have established a committee to review methods of allocating supplies of industrial milk. These are steps in the right direction.

Mr. Riddell: That report is completed, Albert.

Mr. Belanger: Good.

Mr. McKessock: Will Quebec give us some of its quota?

Mr. Belanger: You will have to ask Eugene Whelan.

There is an urgent need to reconcile the current market sharing quotas, which are based strictly on production, with the changing marketing criteria in Ontario.

Mr. Wildman: Considering what Trudeau said about Quebec farmers, he will probably give us some.

Mr. Belanger: In the past, the Canadian Dairy Commission has proven reluctant to bring about the necessary changes, though a subcommittee of the Canadian Milk Supply Management Committee is reviewing the national program.

It is interesting to note that in an article in *Le Droit* last Wednesday, several Ontario members were criticized because we asked for increased Ontario milk quotas. According to the article, which appears to have relied heavily on Mr. Whelan's interpretation of the problem facing the dairy and the cheddar industries, these members have misrepresented the situation.

Mr. Laughren: Shame.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Whelan can say what he wants, but the Canadian Dairy Commission is ultimately responsible for allocating the milk quotas on a national basis.

Mr. McKessock: And historically too. Right.

Mr. Belanger: Each province must work within the limits it establishes. The milk supply management committee—which is chaired by the chairman of the Canadian Dairy Commission, and which is composed of representatives from each province within the national plan—can make recommendations to the Canadian Dairy Commission with respect to the quota system. But it is still the ultimate responsibility of the Canadian Dairy Commission to issue these quotas.

[4:00]

It is not a simple matter of asking for more quota, nor does the final decision rest with the supply management committee. Moreover, to suggest that Ontario's Minister of Agriculture and Food is wrong in asking Mr. Whelan to assist us in increasing Ontario's quota is to say that Mr. Whelan has nothing to do with the Canadian Dairy Commission, which is hardly the case.

We all recognize that the national milk plan was designed to meet the problems that existed a decade ago. But times have changed. People's tastes have changed. We have had a consolidation in the processing and producing sectors. Population patterns have changed. New markets have been opened up. It's time that the national plan adjusted to all these changes.

If this problem is not resolved, I can foresee continued problems. If producers cannot get more quota to produce more cheese to meet the demand of a growing international market, these markets may very well be lost to other suppliers. Many factories are now operating on a marginal capacity. We have been encouraging them to expand their over-the-counter sales, which are affected by the quota system. We have been urging Ottawa to place lower limits on the amount of imported cheese. Many farmers are changing over to beef operations and, frankly, I can't blame them.

In the long term, however, we must improve the national milk plan and make it responsive to this province's needs. Some may say that I am being selfish.

Mr. Laughren: No, not selfish.

Mr. Belanger: The fact of the matter is that I am. The dairy industry is important to my riding in eastern Ontario. Heaven knows that our farmers are among the best producers in the world and they deserve our support, as does our Canadian cheese industry. It's very insulting when you read an article as appeared in the *Star*, April 4, where Mr. Trudeau says that farmers are professional complainers.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Right, they're voters.

Mr. Laughren: Do you agree with that, Leo?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He'll regret the day he said that.

Mr. Belanger: I resent that kind of remark, even if it does come from the Prime Minister of Canada. I have lived and worked with farmers all of my life and when they complain about something it's a legitimate complaint.

In that respect, I believe that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food is meeting its mandate. In recent years, the ministry has co-operated with marketing boards and producers to promote Ontario farm products at home and abroad. I hardly need to remind the members here of the success of the Foodland Ontario program which, through its promotional and marketing campaigns—

Mr. Laughren: It's like your buy Canadian campaign.

Mr. Belanger: —has assisted in raising consumer consciousness of the products produced here in Ontario. The speech from the throne promised a further commitment in this program, both within the ministry and from the industry. We have seen increases in sales of such products as turkeys, grapes, salad vegetables, soya beans and everything.

In the international market, the ministry has played a key role in increasing our sales abroad. The trade missions carried out by the ministry—

Mr. Laughren: Oh, you haven't done much to save your cheese factories, Albert.

Mr. Belanger: —have resulted in increased sales to Britain, Europe, Asia, and the United States, and I believe that this Minister of Agriculture and Food deserves a great deal of credit in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Right on, good suggestion.

Mr. Belanger: I could run through the list of places where he or his officials have been and the millions of dollars in sales that have resulted from their efforts, but I won't. Suffice it to say that our farmers are the beneficiaries of their efforts.

I might also say that the ministry is working with our farmers in two other important areas; that is, in the area of research in agriculture and the education of a new generation of farmers and agribusiness people.

In regard to the latter point, it is my sincere hope that in the near future the ministry will establish an agricultural college for francophone farmers. In the past, Ontario has had an agreement with Quebec in which we accepted their English students and where

they accepted our French students. While this arrangement sounds feasible, I have been told this is not working out at all well. I would hope the ministry would give serious consideration to establishing an agricultural college for francophone students. I think it would be ideal if a satisfactory site can be found. It can be found, and we have the building to locate this college, in the Prescott and Russell area, which has one of the largest francophone populations of Ontario.

In my view, such a program would meet a very real need for those of francophone background wishing to pursue a career in agriculture. The initiatives outlined in the speech from the throne reflect the concern and commitment that we of this government have to the farmers of Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: Now you have gone too far.

Mr. Belanger: It is a commitment that is based upon a partnership and upon a philosophical belief that government must work with the agricultural community to ensure that farming continues to provide a viable income—

Mr. Cassidy: Isn't your motto who governs least, governs best?

Mr. Belanger: —for farmers and that agriculture remains an important sector in the provincial economy. Moreover it is a partnership that will ensure that the people of Ontario will continue to have access to an abundant supply of farm products at reasonable prices.

Mr. Cassidy: Could you specify the farm products?

Mr. Belanger: At the same time, it is important that urban consumers recognize that the farmer is entitled to a fair return on his investment and that his costs, like everyone else's, are constantly rising.

Despite recent rises in the price of beef, which has been the source of considerable complaint on the part of consumers, the beef industry is only now recovering from a poor market of previous years. In my riding, for instance, many farmers are using their recent returns to pay off debts which mounted during the period when beef prices were really low.

J'étais heureux aussi de constater que le discours du trône propose de continuer le progrès fait par le gouvernement de l'Ontario dans le domaine des services français pour les francophones de la province. Comme vous devez le savoir, le comté de Prescott et Russell compte une population d'environ 82 per cent francophones. C'est donc dire que tout ce qui concerne l'amélioration des ser-

vices français est d'une importance fondamentale aux gens que j'ai l'honneur de représenter ici à cette assemblée.

Au cours des dernières années, la question d'augmenter les services français a causé beaucoup de débats en Ontario.

D'un côté, il y a des gens qui exigent que le français soit établi comme langue officielle en Ontario. D'autre part, il y en a d'autres qui s'opposent à augmenter les services français. Dans le milieu de ces deux groups, il existe une grande majorité de gens raisonnables qui désirent une solution juste et équitable à l'égard de cette question.

Comme représentant d'un comté à 82 pour cent francophone, et en tant que Canadien d'origine française moi-même je peux comprendre et réaliser l'inquiétude et la frustration que plusieurs francophones ont éprouvées au cours des récentes années. Je donne raison aussi à ceux qui prétendent qu'au cours de notre histoire comme province, la communauté francophone a été traitée injustement. Cette situation est un fait dans l'histoire de cette province.

Mr. Cassidy: Oui, et ça dure toujours.

Mr. Belanger: Mais en même temps je dois dire, que la situation est changée.

Au cours des dix dernières années, un progrès considérable a été fait pour établir un cadre solide qui permettrait aux francophones d'avoir accès aux services du gouvernement, dans le domaine de l'éducation, des soins de santé et des services sociaux dans leur propre langue.

Mr. Wildman: That is not true in the north.

Mr. Belanger: Pendant les dernières années, le gouvernement de l'Ontario a travaillé étroitement avec le conseil consultatif sur les services en français pour déterminer ses priorités afin d'augmenter ces services. En fait de politique, le gouvernement de l'Ontario étend ses services en français dans les régions de la province où existe une population francophone assez considérable pour justifier l'établissement de ces services.

Dans le domaine de l'éducation, un progrès considérable a été réalisé et 72,000 élèves ont accès à l'enseignement en français. Le Ministre de l'Éducation a constamment augmenté le nombre de livres scolaires, d'aides d'enseignement et de textes en français pour nos écoles françaises.

Mr. Cassidy: You know, this was written by the same fellow who wrote his stuff in English.

Mr. Belanger: Dans le domaine de la justice, plus de services légaux et de tribunaux sont fournis en français. Le discours de trône a aussi promis une législation qui pourrait en vertu de la loi des preuves donner un statut approprié aux statuts de l'Ontario en français.

Le gouvernement a voulu ainsi améliorer le niveau des services dans les principaux ministères afin de mieux répondre aux besoins de la communauté francophone.

Mr. Cassidy: Pourquoi il a refusé les demandes pour un français scolaire homogène à Ottawa?

Mr. Belanger: Plusieurs ministères, y compris ceux de l'éducation, de la santé et des services sociaux ont nommé des co-ordonnateurs pour les services français. Au sein du Ministère de l'Éducation, cette personne a le statut de sous-ministre.

Des mesures ont été prises pour s'assurer que les renseignements du gouvernement soient disponibles en français comme en anglais, et qu'un personnel bilingue soit disponible dans les ministères qui ont un contact direct avec le public, pour permettre aux francophones de s'adresser dans leur propre langue au gouvernement de l'Ontario. Le gouvernement provincial a aussi fourni de l'aide aux municipalités pour augmenter leurs services français.

Je pourrais continuer cette liste d'initiatives appréciables entreprises par le gouvernement Davis depuis 1971, mais n'attirerai plutôt l'attention des membres sur quelques réussites qui ont été réalisées dans les comtés de Prescott et Russell. Premièrement, permettez-moi de dire, monsieur l'Orateur, que depuis mon élection à l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario, en 1967, j'ai la responsabilité en tant que député de cette Assemblée, de m'assurer que tous mes électeurs ont accès aux services fournis par ce gouvernement dans le comté unis de Prescott et Russell, et dans leur propre langue en français ou en anglais.

Cette attitude a toujours été ma façon d'agir envers le problème des services français dans mon comté. Si la population est française, ce n'est que logique que les représentants du gouvernement qui traitent avec cette localité soient bilingues. En même temps cependant, je ne peux voir aucun avantage à fournir des services en français pour le simple fait de fournir un service en français. La première considération doit être la qualité du service afin de s'assurer qu'elle répond efficacement aux besoins des gens qui reçoivent ce service. Evidemment, le personnel expert parfois n'est pas toujours dis-

ponible dans certains domaines spécialisés, pour offrir le service dans les deux langues. Mais je crois fermement que si des personnes bilingues sont requises, les efforts devraient être faits pour donner un personnel bilingue afin de répondre aux besoins de la population francophone.

[4:15]

Dans mon comté presque tous les gens sinon tous ceux qui sont en contact direct avec le public sont bilingues. Ce groupe comprend des représentants auprès des agriculteurs et les employés du Ministère des Services Sociaux. Ce dernier ministère maintient quatre bureaux locaux à Hawkesbury, Casselman, Alexandria et Rockland. Ces services fournissent aux citoyens de ces régions l'accès bilingue aux programmes du ministère, comportant des services de garderies d'enfants, des services sociaux de la province, la réadaptation professionnelle, des programmes pour les citoyens âgés et des programmes pour les arriérés mentaux.

En plus des programmes déjà établis, le Ministère des Services Sociaux annonçait l'an dernier qu'il fournira environ \$272,000 pour les services de la santé mentale en français dans les Comtés de Prescott et Russell, y compris la nomination d'un orthophoniste pour aider ceux qui ont du mal ou la difficulté à parler.

La semaine dernière, j'ai eu le plaisir de voyager avec le Ministre des Services Sociaux (M. Norton), qui est venue à Ottawa. Il annonçait alors que \$450,000 seraient fournis à dix agences offrant des services sociaux en français. Cette subvention puis-je ajouter, était en plus du montant de \$500,000, qu'il avait annoncé précédemment pour appuyer les nouvelles initiatives pour augmenter les services sociaux en français dans tout l'Ontario. J'étais heureux de constater parmi plusieurs projets méritoires qui reçoivent des fonds, que la Société d'Aide à l'Enfance de Prescott-Russell comptait parmi les récipiendaires, et mettra en oeuvre un programme de prévention locale par l'entremise des centres communautaires pour adolescents et leurs familles dans cette région. Je peux ajouter que ces fonds sont destinés à améliorer la qualité des services disponibles aux francophones chez eux.

Je n'ai pas cependant l'illusion que tout est parfait en rapport aux services français. Bien que beaucoup de progrès ait été fait dans les services de la santé, j'ai écrit au Ministre de la Santé pour exprimer mon inquiétude sur le fait que l'Unité Sanitaire de l'Est de l'Ontario, qui comprend aussi Prescott-Russell, ne fournit pas un service

entièrement bilingue. Une partie du problème à mon point de vue, est le fait que le service de cette unité sert une grande partie de Cornwall. Dans ma lettre, j'ai indiqué qu'il serait plus pratique d'établir une unité sanitaire à Prescott pour servir les francophones dans les comtés unis, de même que dans les comtés de Stormont et Glengarry. Il me semble qu'il n'est pas très logique d'avoir une infirmière d'Unité Sanitaire qui parle peu ou pas du tout le français et qui visite les écoles locales où les élèves sont surtout francophones.

Dans le domaine de l'éducation, il existe quelque 28 écoles françaises qui fournissent un enseignement français à 6,923 élèves au niveau élémentaire. Il existe aussi 3 écoles secondaires françaises au service de 1,924 élèves et 3 écoles mixtes enseignant 2,400 élèves. En plus d'avoir accès à une éducation spéciaux en française, les élèves auront aussi besoin de programmes d'éducation spéciaux en français. La province a fourni environ \$900,000 pour aider 153 élèves au niveau élémentaire et 258 élèves au niveau secondaire qui ont besoin de programmes spéciaux d'instruction.

Ces programmes sont de bons exemples du genre d'initiatives entreprises par le gouvernement de l'Ontario pour aider les francophones dans leur milieu. Une importance a été accordée dans les domaines où les gens viennent en contact directement avec les agences du gouvernement. En plus de fournir des services en français, le gouvernement de l'Ontario s'est engagé à assurer aux francophones l'accès au plus haut calibre de l'éducation dans leur propre langue.

Pour répondre au mandat du gouvernement envers les francophones, des efforts considérables ont été faits depuis 1971. Cependant, je ne prétends pas que tout est parfait parce que ce n'est pas le cas. Je ne crois pas que comme gouvernement, nous pouvons nous permettre de nous asseoir sur nos lauriers, et demeurer satisfaits de ce que nous avons accompli au cours des récentes années. Nous devons continuer nos efforts pour nous assurer que les services sont augmentés dans les régions où existe une population francophone importante, et où un vrai besoin existe.

La population Canadienne Française a fait une contribution très importante à l'histoire et au développement de l'Ontario. Elle continuera à le faire et nous, comme gouvernement, pouvons encourager sa contribution en nous assurant que ce groupe a accès aux services dont il a besoin, et qu'il a les moyens pour bien instruire ses enfants. Nous avons fait un grand pas dans ce domaine et je sais que nous demeurons engagés à continuer

d'agir ainsi, par l'entremise de politiques et de programmes qui subviendront aux besoins fondamentaux des francophones dans tout l'Ontario.

I believe that the speech from the throne represents a continuation of the responsible approach taken to provide the people of Ontario with good, effective government. I would also point out to the members of the Liberal Party that the next time they visit my riding, I will gladly take them around and show them some of the accomplishments that have evolved since I was first elected to the Legislature.

Since I first arrived here in 1967, I have always regarded my responsibility to my constituents as my foremost concern. As members of this House, we all share a common commitment to improving the quality of life and the wellbeing of our constituents. We all share, for instance, a common concern for the elderly within our communities. In Prescott and Russell, we have approximately 6,500 senior citizens. Since my first election to this House, I have endeavoured to improve the level of service available to them and, with the support of my colleagues in cabinet, I believe that we have improved the level of service within the united counties of Prescott and Russell very much.

Last year, we opened a new facility for the elderly in Hawkesbury, and this government provided more than \$2,000,000 towards the construction costs. We have also assisted in establishing the Centre d'Accueil Roger Seguin in Clarence Creek, which provides some 110 beds for the elderly.

I would also point out that Prescott and Russell enjoys a bed rate per 1,000 senior citizens that is 13.3 per cent higher than the provincial average for nursing home beds. This is not a bad record for a nice little guy—which is the manner in which I was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) when he was in my riding. This is not a bad record for a nice little guy who is supposed to be a problem.

Since 1967, a consistent effort has been made to assist small municipalities to improve their water and sewage systems. I could point to many examples of this throughout my riding. Casselman and St. Isidore de Prescott are only a few of the municipalities being assisted by this government to improve the quality of their water and sewage treatment facilities. For instance, there is a \$7,000,000 sewage and water treatment project under construction in Rockland.

As another example, I had the pleasure of participating in the opening of the Casselman water treatment and distribution system last

summer. This project consists of a 350,000-gallon elevated water storage tank and approximately 22,700 feet of water main. A grant was provided by the Ontario government to assist in the construction costs. This grant was in excess of \$1,600,000. This government also provided 75 per cent, or \$1,700,000, to assist the village of Casselman with its water pollution control facilities.

I could go on and mention many other projects. Most of the small communities in my riding now have water projects and sewage projects under construction or being looked at. In doing so, we are effectively meeting the needs of the people of Ontario.

Another program that has greatly assisted the residents of eastern Ontario, as well as most other parts of the province, has been the Ontario Home Renewal Program. Since 1974, more than 20,000 residents have been assisted by this program. In my own riding, many people have been able to improve their homes, upgrade their heating, insulation and plumbing. Last year, well over \$250,000 was provided to municipalities in Prescott and Russell to be allocated to those who qualified under this program.

Since 1967, since I was elected to this House, we have made considerable progress in improving our roads throughout the united counties of Prescott and Russell. In the united counties, for instance, 83.3 per cent of our county roads have been paved or resurfaced since 1969. Only 52 miles of road remain as gravel roads.

Mr. Wildman: We've got highways in my riding like that.

Mr. Belanger: This is only one example of the improvements that have been made to the transportation system throughout the united counties.

The proposed extension of the Queensway east to Orleans will greatly assist the flow of traffic through this area for all those commuting in from Cumberland, from Rockland, from Plantagenet or Alfred.

Mr. Wildman: What about bridges?

Mr. Belanger: This year, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will provide municipalities in my riding with \$6,100,000 in grants to assist in the funding of both capital construction and repair work on those roads which fall under municipal rather than county jurisdiction.

Since I was first elected, some 20 new industries have recognized the great potential that exists in Prescott and Russell and have established in communities throughout the riding. Several of these were assisted by the Eastern Ontario Development Corporation

which, in the past year and a half, has provided about \$1,300,000 in loans. I had the pleasure of supporting these applications for assistance and their success will mean many new jobs in our area.

I mention these points not because I am interested in praise or because I want the credit for having accomplished these things.

Mr. Wildman: Don't worry, we like you.

Mr. Belanger: I believe that these things come about as a result of the process of good government and effective representation. This is the reason I am standing here in support today of the speech from the throne.

I recognize that there are many challenges facing the people of Ontario and I don't underestimate the magnitude of these challenges. I do believe the speech from the throne does provide us with a realistic and workable approach to the many challenges that lie before us in the economic and social spheres.

I look forward to seeing these transformed into policies and programs that are truly reflective of the needs of the people of Ontario. In doing so, we will continue to provide the people of Ontario with the type of good, responsive government that this government has always provided.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to have participated in the debate on the speech from the throne.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Viva Belanger.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the opportunity to participate in the throne speech debate, but before launching my brief remarks I would like to pay tribute to the Speaker for his continuing effort to conduct the business of this House in a very fair but most firm manner. I hope, sir, that you will convey my thoughts to the Speaker.

I would like to commend the former speaker, the member for Prescott and Russell, for the speech he made. I haven't had much occasion to hear him in this Legislature, not that he hasn't spoken before on many matters, but it may have been the case that I just wasn't present to hear him. He did have some very thought-provoking remarks.

I only wish I had the time—and I don't because my whip is cracking down on us saying that we have to end our remarks in a period of about 20 minutes so the rest of the speakers can contribute to the debate—to comment on the milk industry in Ontario.

Mr. Worton: I will make an exception. Take another five minutes.

Mr. Riddell: Suffice it to say at this time that the Tory government has been in power for something like 35 years and surely the

Tory government has had some role to play in the establishment of the marketing boards, including the milk marketing board. Certainly, the Milk Act was enacted by this government so if anyone is to blame for some of the inadequacies in the milk marketing system in Ontario, I would think the present government has to share some of the blame.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: That's right. You're right. Ottawa.

Mr. Riddell: After listening to the member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry and also the member for Prescott and Russell, I am somewhat alarmed that they are placing much of the blame for the closing down of cheese factories and some other inadequacies in the milk marketing system on the marketing board.

[4:30]

I would like to spend an hour to talk about marketing boards and the tremendous impact they have had on the agricultural industry, the beneficial effects they've had and the benefits the farmers have derived from these marketing boards. I'm getting a little sick of listening to people condemning marketing boards for high food prices. I trust that indirectly this is maybe what the member for Prescott and Russell was getting at.

Mr. Gaunt: This government is always looking for excuses; always looking for a scapegoat.

Mr. Riddell: I'll have more to say about marketing boards when I get into the Agriculture estimates. For the time being I want to comment briefly on the foreign ownership of land in Ontario, farm machinery legislation, mention a little bit about farm incomes and input prices, then I am going to end up with a very great concern that exists in my riding at the present time, and that's the present proposal of the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) to reduce hospital beds across Ontario.

Getting to my first topic, foreign ownership of land, I, like the former speaker, do not get up in question period for no other purpose than to get public exposure. I feed very little material back home, but when I have something to say in this Legislature I say it with all the sincerity that I can put into any questions or any comments that I make.

Back last session I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I asked him if he was aware of the great concern that has been expressed over recent purchases of blocks of agricultural land throughout Ontario, and more particularly in such counties as Bruce, Huron, Kent and Lambton,

by foreign interests. I asked the minister if he could tell us how widespread this practice was.

He gets up and he talks about how many of these people are now farming the land and how it's been good for our own farmers because this land now is available to the young people to be able to rent and this way they can get started farming. That's all right if these foreigners are coming over and competing with our farmers by buying and actually farming the land. But that is not what is happening. What appears to be a new flurry of Ontario land purchases by non-Canadians has sparked intense concern among some farmers and certainly county federations of agriculture.

This time the purchases seem to be concentrated, as I've already indicated, in southwestern Ontario. However, this has been a continuous concern for at least five years, with periods of more intense buying activity from time to time.

Few farmers feel comfortable in arguing that non-nationals should be prohibited absolutely from owning Canadian real estate or farm land. What causes worry is that large amounts of foreign investments, frequently concentrated in sizeable blocks of holdings, raise questions about future control of Canadian resources and communities.

I happened to be travelling with a colleague of mine this morning, coming up from a meeting we attended last night, and he tells me that he heard rumours to the effect that German money was coming into his part of the riding to purchase blocks of land consisting of 1,000 acres. There were two main sources of German money that were trying to procure this land.

This isn't a case of where the German people are coming over here to farm the land, to compete with our own farmers; it's a case of their money coming over. It's understandable why it's coming over; they feel that Canada is a safe place in which to invest. When I hear those anti-Trudeau, anti-federal Liberal people get up and spell doom and gloom for this country I have to wonder what they're talking about, when we see Japanese money, German money, Belgian money and Italian money all coming over. Where? No place but in Canada. Why? Because they feel Canada is a safe place in which to invest. Where is all the doom and gloom? I hope this message gets out to the people prior to the election coming up on May 22, because I have to ask the question, "What country, my friend, would you sooner live in at the present time?"

Hon. Mr. Baetz: The buck is cheap, that's why it comes. Our buck is so low. It's because our dollar is so low, you know that Jack. They wouldn't come here if our buck was 100 cents to the dollar.

Mr. Gaunt: Joe Clark the doomsayer.

Mr. McKessock: Switch to French now, Jack.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: A Canadian Liberal or an Ontario Liberal.

Mr. Gaunt: By the time the next election comes along it will be banned here.

Mr. Riddell: I mentioned this purchasing of sizeable blocks of land raises questions about future control of Canadian resources and communities. Let me tell you that if Rene Levesque's direction for Quebec is a threat to national unity, I would say the second greatest threat is—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Trudeau.

Mr. Riddell: —the foreign investment into our resources and into our industries and into our businesses. I think we've got to, somehow, bring a stop to some of this. It's not only affecting our resources, the control of our resources—

Ms. Gigantes: What do you suggest?

Mr. Riddell: —but is also having an effect, and will continue to have an effect, on our communities.

Mr. Ruston: Joe doesn't like Bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Joe is looking for him right now.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Huron-Middlesex has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not follow you. A few minutes ago you were welcoming all these Japanese and German moneys. Now you're saying you don't.

Mr. Riddell: No, I don't think I ever said we welcomed it. I indicated these people feel there is a future in Canada—

Hon. Mr. Baetz: You've got different speechwriters there, Jack. Get your speechwriters together.

Mr. Riddell: —that's why they're investing their money, but I think we have to be very careful allowing this to continue because we're going to lose our resources. There is no longer going to be Canadian resources.

Mr. Wildman: What you want to prove is there's no future in Canada.

Mr. Riddell: We're certainly going to be losing our communities. Enough nonresident foreign ownership in any one area can affect the whole social structure of a community. In other words, I can see the farm houses

and the farm buildings just being left to deteriorate. I can see a decreased population for usage of schools and hospitals.

Mr. Watson: That might solve our problem.

Mr. Riddell: There will no longer be the buying support for the local businesses and there certainly will be a lack of support for a project such as some of these new community arenas that have been established ever since the Wintario grants came into being.

Mr. Haggerty: Or Minaki Lodge, for example; you could buy that.

Mr. Riddell: Naturally, such purchases by outsiders push up land prices for local farmers wishing to buy. Local residents simply cannot compete with foreign capital under the present economic circumstances. The devalued dollar and lowered interest rates offered in other countries put Ontario buyers at a distinct disadvantage. Foreign interests can make money on their investment now, but should this situation escalate, our agricultural industry could become foreign-controlled. We could end up by growing crops totally unsuited to our domestic needs but entirely suitable to foreign interests for their own export purposes, a well known problem which has existed and aggravated conditions in third world countries.

Mr. Watson: Oh, Jack, come on.

Mr. Riddell: In other words, Mr. Speaker, if our lands fall into the ownership of foreign investment, then there is nothing saying that they won't, for export purposes, for purposes of making the most income, turn some of our land into, say growing coffee rather than corn.

Mr. Wildman: Coffee?

Mr. Riddell: Where is that going to meet the domestic need for a stable diet?

Mr. Watson: Jack, you can't grow coffee where there's frost.

Mr. Wildman: Do you feel the same way about mining, Jack?

Mr. Riddell: Also, much of the concern stems from the lack of knowledge about the extent of foreign ownership in an area, the source and nature of such large amounts of ready cash, the long-term intent of foreign purchasers regarding the use of the land and the lack of any effective control over such purchases. The Ontario government seems to have little exact knowledge about this phenomena as of the last five years. Its latest systematic survey of the problem was

in 1973 by the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism.

It is interesting that the present Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) happened to be one of the members on that committee. I am going to read a portion of the report that was handed down by that committee.

"The committee has reached a similar determination in respect of private ownership of agricultural lands. Foreign ownership of land under agricultural use is dealt with more fully in the chapter on commercial and corporate real estate ownership. The committee notes again the very great difficulty of distinguishing between property which may be under recreational as distinct from agricultural use, particularly in view of the current practice of converting agricultural land to recreational uses.

"The committee accordingly favours the extension of its previous recommendations to include agricultural land. In any case, the committee has concluded that apart from these difficulties, future acquisitions of land by individuals, including agricultural land, and the opportunity to farm in Ontario should be restricted to Canadian citizens and landed immigrants resident in Canada."

There is a little star after that and, when I look down at the bottom of the page, I see that it states: "Mr. Newman dissents from these recommendations."

I am beginning to think I am talking in a wilderness when I ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food if he will not endeavour to find out how extensive the foreign investment in our land is. I understand that he is not entirely interested. He thinks the more foreign money that comes in, the better. Maybe we would be better dealing with another minister rather than with the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

As it then appeared that only about one per cent of Ontario real estate was owned by non-nationals, the government did not see fit to monitor the trend. However, because of general knowledge about purchasing of Ontario real estate, including farms, in 1974 the government did amend the Land Transfer Tax Act to increase the tax on purchases of land by nonresidents of Canada to 20 per cent of the purchase price. In fact, this tax is easily dodged, as a local agent for the purchaser can register as an Ontario company. Registration can be accomplished without listing foreign-based principals, and the purchase is registered as to a domestic company.

I would just like to say that some of the ministers of agriculture in other provinces have taken more interest in this matter than

has our Minister of Agriculture and Food. Prince Edward Island and the three Prairie provinces have each taken legislative measures to restrict ownership of farm land by non-Canadian residents. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and tell you what Prince Edward Island has done, what Manitoba has done, what Alberta has done and what Saskatchewan has done but, in the interests of time, I will not delve into that. However, I will probably bring it up when we debate the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

I want to read a resolution that was passed at the last annual convention of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the organization that represents a great number of farmers in Ontario as well as a number of boards and other organizations.

"Whereas other provinces have found it necessary to regulate ownership of farm land by non-nationals, therefore be it resolved that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture requests the provincial government to immediately undertake a survey of current foreign ownership of rural lands in Ontario and monitor all new land transfers to private or corporate foreign ownership, and that this study be classed as public information; and, further, be it resolved that this study include an inventory of all farm land holdings of non-farm Canadian corporations; and, further, be it resolved that, if necessary, it regulate ownership by non-farm Canadian corporations and non-nationals."

They have presented briefs to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, but they seem to draw the same blanks I do when asking if the minister will not look into it and see how much of this foreign investment has gone on and is going on at present.

[4:45]

As I understand it, the federation is starting to conduct its own study. I do not think that should be necessary. With all the help the Minister of Agriculture and Food has to do this kind of work, he sent me a letter back, after I wrote him and asked, "Would you give me a printout on Kent and Huron counties?"

Mr. Gaunt: A lot of this is going on in Kent.

Mr. Watson: Oh, yeah, a little bit.

Mr. Riddell: He said, "In 1976 my ministry looked into allegations of foreign ownership in Kent county. It turned out that 6,000 acres, or 10 per cent of the land, were owned by people living outside Canada. Some of these were, no doubt, Canadians living abroad. At the moment, in answer to

renewed interest in this matter, we are updating these figures for Kent county and compiling data for Huron county as well." Big deal!

Hon. Mr. Welch: How many acres, Jack?

Mr. Riddell: Two counties in Ontario and he is going to undertake a study to see how much foreign investment there is. I think my friend opposite will find that much more than 6,000 acres have fallen under foreign ownership.

Mr. Watson: I'll bet it's not near that.

Mr. Riddell: I had better leave that subject, although we could carry on.

Mr. Laughren: Talk about cheese factories.

Mr. Watson: There are 6,000 acres in Kent county.

Mr. Riddell: The member for Prescott and Russell alluded to the great things mentioned in the throne speech pertaining to the agricultural industry. Well, he must have received a different throne speech than I did because there are exactly two paragraphs here. One deals with the foodland guidelines policy of the ministry. The other is a little paragraph which says special attention will be given to the need to ensure that farmers are protected by minimum farm machinery warranties and contract standards.

I was hoping the minister would, some time after the throne speech, come into the House and indicate what he had in mind as far as farm machinery warranties and contract standards were concerned.

Mr. Wildman: He needs to bring in legislation.

Mr. Riddell: We didn't hear anything. So I had to pick up a speech he made to some organization out in the country—I think it had to do with farm safety. So, in reading the speech, I find the Ministry of Agriculture and Food has decided to give manufacturers the opportunity to introduce a voluntary program of standard purchase contracts, minimum warranties and parts service.

"The Ontario Farm Machinery Board will be reconstituted to provide broader representation for both farmers and industry. I shall be initiating discussions with the industry in the near future, with a view to ensuring industry's participation in this program in order to protect the interests of all concerned."

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Ontario farmers have reservations about the government's recently announced program to help farmers with farm machinery problems. I am encouraged that the government has

finally recognized that the problem exists, but the suggested program falls short of legislation provided farmers in other provinces.

As a first step, the government is proposing a restructuring of the Ontario Farm Machinery Board. This move is welcomed and it is hoped that it will improve the effectiveness of the board's activities. Without legislated powers, however, the board will be like a toothless tiger in trying to get satisfactory service for farmers.

I am more cynical about the government's proposal that manufacturers, distributors and dealers develop a voluntary code of practice. Farmers have little faith that a voluntary code would make the industry provide the parts, service and warranties every consumer should have the right to expect.

Business today isn't done by word of mouth or on faith that some other institution will do the job. So how can farmers expect manufacturers to live up to any code of practice?

One of my colleagues got a call from a dealer not too long ago who said: "If you people are going to push for this farm machinery warranty and contract standards, or even farm machinery legislation, it means farm machinery is going to go way up in price."

To my way of thinking that's an admission that the manufacturer is not turning out a superior product. If he is going to have to live up to some kind of farm equipment warranty, all of a sudden he'll begin to think maybe he should make a tractor or a combine capable of withstanding all the rigorous functions it must perform.

Mr. Watson: What is the difference in the tractors here and in the other provinces? They are the same tractors you were just blowing up a few minutes ago.

Mr. Riddell: You know, it's rather ironic—

Mr. Laughren: It certainly is.

Mr. Riddell: —that farmers have more protection when they buy a \$400 refrigerator than when they buy a \$40,000 tractor or a \$60,000 combine.

Mr. Worton: How does that grab you?

Mr. Riddell: Yet the machinery is their livelihood. If it wasn't for the machinery the farmer wouldn't get his crops planted, he wouldn't get his crops harvested, he wouldn't make an income and he would end up going bankrupt.

Mr. Watson: And you and I wouldn't have jobs.

Mr. Riddell: Yet he can't get his government to realize that maybe it was time that we introduced some farm machinery legislation. Machinery problems are a major concern for Ontario farmers. A breakdown through faulty repairs or a lack of parts means disaster for an individual if these happen at a critical time.

The problem is primarily with the manufacturers and distributors, not the dealers. I really feel that the dealers are endeavouring to do a job, but I think the dealers probably have as much problems with the manufacturers and the distributors as do the farmers. If we do introduce farm machinery legislation it won't be so much to get at the dealer as it will to make the manufacturer and the distributor of the equipment more responsible.

I cannot and I do not accept the announcement by the Minister of Agriculture and Food as a meaningful answer to the machinery problems of farmers. Surely the minister will follow the example of his counterparts in other provinces and bring in legislation so at least the farmer knows that he has some kind of protection, knows that if his machinery breaks down the company is going to have to stand behind it, knows that if he breaks down on a Saturday he's going to be able to go in and get his part, rather than shut down for the entire weekend only to have it rain or something else happen and the crop lie in the field beyond the point where it's even worth harvesting. I think that we've got to take a look at this farm machinery legislation a little more closely.

I want to touch briefly on farm incomes and input prices. As at the end of 1977, farm incomes in Ontario had declined for two years in a row. The 1978 net farm incomes were predicted to decline even further, but this did not happen. Instead, farm incomes improved somewhat. Given an 18 per cent increase in farm cash receipts and an 11.4 per cent increase in farm operating and depreciation and expenses, it is reasonable to expect an increase of realized farm net incomes in 1978 slightly under 30 per cent as compared with 1977. This sounds very good, but I think it important that we put the farm income picture in its proper perspective. I would have liked to have spent considerable time talking about the input costs that the farmers are going to be faced with, dealing with it item by item, but I won't do it.

Mr. Watson: Who wanted it?

Mr. Riddell: I'll try to condense my remarks in connection with the input costs. I do want to say that recent statistics have

indicated that farmers may expect to pay 10 to 35 per cent more for fertilizer, seed, machinery and farm labour. There might also be a shortage in many products. All of this could quickly erode any advantages made in agriculture in recent years with our better production technique and higher output. The big problem could be in petroleum products. Price increases in diesel and gas are expected and there could be serious shortages. Allocation has already been declared in some areas of the United States.

Estimates indicate increases in fertilizer costs could range from 15 to 20 per cent. In fact, increases of 30 per cent over last year could be anticipated for potash because of the low supply and the transportation problems.

Mr. Watson: I thought the NDP had all kinds of potash.

Mr. Riddell: Small seeds such as alfalfa, clover and timothy are going to be expensive and in short supply because of the low yields of last year and because European dealers have bought up much of the supply. Chemical costs are expected to increase by 15 to 20 per cent. Coarse grain, such as oats and barley, are the only products where the price might drop slightly. General farm supplies will increase by 10 to 35 per cent, depending on whether they are from Canada, the United States, Europe or Asia. The main reason for the rise is the devalued Canadian dollar.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) in Ontario, and Ontario farmers, must be very conscious that we are in the spotlight as consumers grope for someone to blame for the so-called high food prices. We must give them a true picture of our problem. At the same time, farmers must be careful not to rest on their laurels as honest, hard-working, highly productive producers. They must strive for even greater output, expanded markets, increased and improved research and new managerial techniques. With this approach, farmers should be able to gain the support of consumers in their attempt to obtain the proper legislation to enable farmers to produce more efficiently and economically.

Farmers must look for initiative and resourcefulness from their own people, but they should also expect more initiative and commitment from the provincial Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Watson: You were doing too good until you came to that point.

Mr. Riddell: It is unbelievable that only one and one half per cent of the total pro-

vincial budget is devoted to the agricultural industry, Ontario's largest primary industry, which makes a major contribution to job creation and has a significant multiplier effect throughout the economy. We call that a commitment from the Minister of Agriculture and Food; one and a half per cent of the total provincial budget?

Hon. Mr. McCague: What do you want?

Mr. Riddell: Drop in on the estimates and we will tell the minister what we want.

Hon. Mr. McCague: You were quoting the minister there at the early part, weren't you?

Mr. Gaunt: Five per cent will be fine. Farmers represent five per cent of the population and should have five per cent of the provincial budget.

Mr. Riddell: Let me go on with my remarks by continuing where I left off during the emergency debate which was called by the leader of the third party on the Minister of Health's (Mr. Timbrell) hospital bed reduction program and some of his other proposals.

I indicated when I spoke in the emergency debate that the hospital bed reductions were a very real concern to the people in the riding which I represent. Coupled with the determination of the Ministry of Health to impose uniform restrictions across the province and to make no exceptions, these are acute concerns, acute needs, to which the people of Huron are reacting in a normal and predictable way.

I indicated when I spoke on Monday that I was deluged with letters from the people in my riding, many of which were coming from senior citizens who were terrified of becoming sick and immobile, with no place to go and no one to take care of them. Some of these senior citizens suggested in their letters it appeared to them that society, due to the action of this government, was moving closer and closer to legislation that would permit euthanasia. Men and women growing old in Huron county after a life of struggle and care are actually living in fear that they will be reduced to a little more than bothersome burdens without dignity or respect.

These are pretty harsh words and I know this government has no intention of moving in that direction; but when you read that type of thing in numerous letters that are coming into my office, you can understand the fear that these senior citizens have. They can't for the life of them understand why it is after all these years of making a contribution in building up these hospitals they find as they go to enjoy their retiring years, they are at the stage where they are going to encounter more ill health, and that being the case they won't

have a hospital bed to move into. I detect all kinds of sincerity in the letters they are writing and I really think it is a sad commentary, indeed, that we have to look for ways of cutting the provincial budget by actually cutting into the excellent health care program our people have come to enjoy over the years.

[5:00]

When I was making my comments I talked about the fact that you cannot formulate health care, Mr. Speaker; you can't build a health-care system on a formula and expect to apply that formula on a uniform basis across the whole province. My colleague from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) has indicated why that can't be done. We have distances, we have inclement weather, we have many things to contend with out in the rural parts of Ontario that they don't have in the urban areas. Why in the world should rural Ontario have to pay for the mistakes that were made by this government in earlier years, in the golden 1960s, when there was all kinds of money?

When we have that kind of an economy it is not hard for a government to spend money, and that is exactly what they did. They put up hospitals across the province that are now white elephants—and I could name some of these hospitals in the large urban centres—but who paid for them? Those people out in the rural areas who have built up the small hospitals, and have come to rely on these hospitals.

Now we have to accept the bed reduction on the same basis as they do in the urban centres and some of these urban centres are smiling because they are overbedded, but we, in Huron county, cut the fat to the bone. Why? Because the former Minister of Health marched into the county and closed down the most modern psychiatric hospital that existed in Ontario, or in Canada, for that matter. He closed it down and he attempted to close down the Clinton Hospital. He struck fear into the people of Huron county—the hospital boards, the concerned citizens—so they all cut the fat right to the bone, operating just as efficiently as they can possibly operate.

Now what are they told? The Alexandra Marine and General Hospital has been told that it has to cut its active treatment beds from 78 down to 37. That is over a 50 per cent cut.

If one of our senior citizens becomes sick, the ambulance takes him into the Alexandra Marine and General Hospital only to be told, "No beds." That patient is taken on to Clinton; same story, no beds. On to Seaforth, down to Exeter; same story, no

beds. So they take him into London only to find that London has something like 476 active treatment beds that it is going to be losing. They take him into London and it's the same story, "I am sorry, no bed for you." The sick patient is in the ambulance. What do you do, Mr. Speaker? Do you call the priest to come and administer last rites, and tell the patient, "Well, that's the best we can do. No bed for you"? Maybe it sounds like an exaggeration, but I tell you these people in rural Ontario are mighty concerned about what is happening.

The minister talks about applying his formula on a referral population basis. In Huron county it is our contention that he is not using the proper figures for his referral population, because we have a great influx of tourists in the summertime, and I hope to elaborate on that a little later.

In a question which I posed in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I expressed the concern that the ministry has not taken into account the fact that Goderich is a tourist town and, as such, has an increased population in summer months. I have seen figures which would substantiate a claim that the summer population in the area swells by 9,311 persons, including Goderich and surrounding townships and villages. Based on three persons per visiting car, 38,929 persons had called in to the Goderich tourist booth last summer. While we know that all these people do not require hospital care, the fact remains that the patient load at Alexandra Marine and General Hospital does increase during the summer months and some active treatment hospital beds are required.

In responding to my question, the minister indicated that Goderich's tourist population was taken into consideration and facts are facts, says the minister. Goderich does not qualify for one extra active treatment bed because of the increased number of people in the area. That's it. Just as plain as that. You don't qualify for any more active treatment beds, despite the fact that you do have these tourists coming into the area.

There is a formula to determine how many hospital beds are required for tourist populations. It is quite simple, really. In 1977, a hospital must have had one out-of-the-area patient each day for 365 days to qualify for one additional bed. Goderich does not meet that criterion and thus, no additional bed.

Let me be quick to point out that there is a big difference between rural hospitals and urban hospitals. We have distances to contend with. We have inclement weather

to contend with. We have referrals from a much broader base than do urban hospitals.

And we do have mines in the rural areas; I am talking about the salt mines in Goderich. There was a bit of a disaster there not too long ago. It was fortunate that more people were not hurt. But what happens if there is a mine disaster? What are they going to do with those people? There are no beds in the hospital for them.

The minister did not take this into consideration when he came up with this beautiful formula: 3.5 beds per thousand referral population. He did not go out into these areas and see that we do have some mines where there could well be a mine disaster.

Mr. Lawlor: Timbrell is going to bring the government down all by himself.

Mr. Riddell: Did the ministry take that into consideration? I cannot stress enough that you can't formulate health care, particularly in a rural setting. The formula is rigid and no rigid formula can work province-wide when you are dealing with such a personal thing as health services, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Laughren: They are in trouble on this one.

Mr. Riddell: It seems to me that, when the government introduced universal health care it made a commitment to the people; that the people had a right to expect quality care.

Interjections.

Mr. Riddell: It would appear to me that that commitment has gone the way of a number of other government commitments. The one which comes to my mind is the Edmonton commitment, but that is another matter. We won't get into that. But this government is great for making commitments and then backing away from them. If somebody can tell me why they have been able to stay in power as long as they have, I would certainly like an explanation.

Mr. Laughren: They buy it.

Mr. Watson: Good government, Jack.

Mr. Riddell: I tell you, your days are numbered.

Mr. Villeneuve: I heard that 20 years ago.

Mr. Riddell: It is very difficult for me to understand, in the light of the fact that Ontario is the province with the second lowest number of acute care beds in Canada and a rich province as well, why we must go to the bottom of the list for health care. I cannot understand it; the people of Ontario cannot understand it.

Mr. Laughren: Right on.

Mr. Lane: They understand it very well.

Mr. Riddell: They are going to be expressing their opinions to those people opposite whenever their boss decides to pull the plug.

Mr. Laughren: No. Whenever the Liberals support a no-confidence motion.

Mr. Riddell: The people in Goderich and surrounding areas are concerned enough about the plight of their hospital that they have committed financial support to keep the hospital beds open. However, in response to another question which I posed in the Legislature, the minister indicated he would not commit community hospitals to use alternative methods of financing for operating expenses.

In responding to my question, the minister indicated he was bent on providing uniform health care across the province. He felt wealthy areas would unfairly be able to offer a better standard of health care than less affluent areas. What is more, he indicated that he doubted if communities could continue to raise funds, year after year, to operate their hospitals.

Well, if we go back in history, that is how these hospitals were built. Many of the senior citizens who are presently living in fear of there not being hospital beds available when they require them were the very ones who built the hospitals in the first place. When they start to destroy local initiative, it is going to cost the government a heck of a lot more money, and that is for certain.

Mr. Laughren: It costs the people money, too.

Mr. Riddell: The senior citizens' worry is not the only one. A big concern is for long-term patients. Some are elderly men and women for whom a nursing home is the best answer. Some are younger people with permanent disabilities. Some are sick people with illnesses that will keep them confined for months on end. These are the patients that occupy the thoughts of many doctors and hospital board members.

Where will those people go? There are no hospital beds. For those who can be transferred to nursing homes, there is simply no place available in Goderich at the present time. One of the doctors said he recently put one patient on a waiting list that had 65 names on it; so his patient happens to be the 66th waiting for a nursing home bed. Obviously the hospital would have to care for these people—maybe in active treatment beds—until the time comes that they can be moved to another health-care facility. Some might qualify for home care for

chronic patients, but this service is not in place in Huron county either. The avenue provides no solution then for Alexandra Marine and General Hospital.

Another concern that is just as worrisome are the men and women in nursing homes in psychiatric wards who might have to be transferred to hospitals for active care. Where does the hospital put them? Since the closing of the Goderich Psychiatric Hospital and a residual psychiatric unit of 20 beds left in its place—this unit currently is located at the Bluewater Centre for the Developmentally Handicapped—this is a special situation. Patients from all over Huron county are referred there; if they need active hospital treatment, they are moved to Alexandra Marine and General Hospital. It is estimated that one or two beds at Alexandra Marine and General are often in use for just such patients.

This is something the Minister of Health did not take into consideration either; the fact that we have a little residual unit at the former Goderich Psychiatric Hospital and people are coming in from all over Huron and surrounding areas to that little residual unit. If they happen to take sick and require active treatment beds, where do they go?

Let me just remind you, Mr. Speaker, that 38 psychogeriatric beds were closed when the Goderich Psychiatric Hospital was closed two years ago. Certainly this has to affect the situation I have just alluded to. There seems to be little doubt that 15 chronic beds just are not enough for the Alexandra Marine and General Hospital. A more realistic number would be 25, and the board is working extremely hard to document the need for these beds in this area.

As a matter of fact, we have a very excellent delegation coming in from Goderich to meet with the Minister of Health tomorrow afternoon. The spokesman for that delegation will be none other than a renowned lawyer by the name of Jim Donnelly, whom I brought with me when the former Minister of Health tried to close down the Clinton Hospital. He was the spokesman. By the time he was done, the then minister had slumped down in his seat and had turned the colour of chalk. I know for a fact that, after we walked out of his office, he turned to his deputy minister, who I think was Backley at that time—a guy who came out from England; and I have always maintained—

Hon. Mr. McCague: Is there anything the matter with that?

Mr. Riddell: No. Other than the fact that some of these guys ruined the system in England, and then they come over here and endeavour to do the same darned thing.

I do know that, after we left his office, the minister turned to his deputy and said, "Are you sure we're doing the right thing?" In other words, after Donnelly was finished, the Minister of Health began to have some doubts.

Statistics show that Huron county has an unusually high percentage of elderly citizens—13 per cent—compared with the provincial average of 8.6 per cent. In fact, the ministry does recognize the fact and has built a weighting factor into the formula to adjust Huron's chronic beds to suit the needs. But there are just not enough nursing home beds in the area, and the government really is not compensating the community in that sense.

It is rather ironical that a recent application for more nursing home beds in Goderich was turned down by the ministry people in Toronto. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? They applied for more nursing home beds; they were turned down and told, "We're going to reduce your active treatment beds in the hospital regardless of the fact that you don't have nursing home beds or chronic-care beds or anything else."

I just cannot understand the conscience of the Minister of Health.

[5:15]

Mr. Haggerty: We're number one, eh Andy?

Mr. Riddell: There are other things that are concerning doctors and hospital board members about the 3.5 beds per thousand referral population: Things like the knowledge that 450 beds have been cut in London Hospital and will undoubtedly result in long waits for Huron county people who are applying for admittance in the city.

Things like having to make interim provision at Alexandra Marine and General Hospital for certain patients waiting to be admitted to other referral centres.

Things like having to turn down referrals back from those centres of patients who want to recuperate at home, closer to their families, but for whom there are no empty beds.

Things like realizing if the local hospital can't accept those referrals it is only creating more of a backlog in the city hospital and longer waiting lists for Huron county patients.

Things like knowing patients are paying insurance premiums for semi-private accom-

modation in hospital and that there will be no such luxury at Alexandra Marine and General Hospital as a choice of bed and room.

Things like having to turn people away or putting them in holding areas or in the hallways or in improper, inappropriate mixing situations that run the risk of new dangers of infection for patients. Upsetting things, degrading things, frightening things.

In Goderich the doctors, the hospital board members, the citizenry have been very vocal about their fears and their frustrations. They have been working hard and furiously to get the answers they need to keep the Alexandra Marine and General Hospital functioning safely and adequately.

They have called on the people of the community to think about the situation and to make their feelings known to government officials and their local members. And that is the reason why I have received, as has the Premier, and as has the Minister of Health, many heart-rending letters.

It isn't difficult to understand that senior citizens will be the most anxious about the implications of the ministry's actions. Senior citizens are naturally fearful about illness and old age; they too often go hand-in-hand. And where will they go? Who will take care of them?

I'm alarmed that the people throughout the rest of the province have been surprisingly mute about the bed cutbacks, which we all know had very little to do with health care and a great deal to do with budget problems. It is a sad commentary on the state of Ontario finances.

Maybe some of the senior citizens who have been writing to the Premier and to the minister and to me are more perceptive than this province would like to think. Maybe, just maybe, euthanasia would ease the financial crisis for the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Watson: I'm surprised at you saying something like that.

Mr. Riddell: Who knows? Who knows when that very suggestion would be made by someone?

I'm going to quit now, but I could go on all afternoon about this health care situation and the ridiculous policies that have been brought forth by the Minister of Health. I only hope that he gives a fair hearing to both the Wingham people and the Goderich people tomorrow afternoon in his office. And I hope there can be a solution found to the very real problem which these people are facing and will face if the minister doesn't change his attitude.

Mr. Watson: He gives you 20 minutes, so the member for Nickel Belt has lots of time.

Mr. Laughren: I shall make a very serious attempt to complete before the supper hour.

The throne speech we heard a short time ago was a disappointing one for many of us. I know opposition members are seldom excited and supportive of a throne speech or the policies therein. But I thought this one was a chance for the government to indicate some new directions they were going to take and put a few specifics into the speech—which, of course, they failed to do. They did nothing really except to offer a few reassurances.

For example, at a time when we've got real problems with our medicare system it would have been nice to have seen the Minister of Health insert in the speech from the throne a very serious commitment to maintaining our health care system. There was no such serious commitment in the throne speech.

The government is floundering, and it's responding in a very ad hoc manner, and in such a way that it doesn't seem to have any direction at all. It's responding to problems as they arise—whether it's medicare, whether it's unemployment or whether it's compensation—without providing any new direction, either social or economic. That's a sad comment; perhaps a natural one for a government that's been in power so long.

I'd like to make a few comments on what we anticipate in this party in the budget which is going to come down next Tuesday night, April 10. We cannot expect the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) to provide us with any details at this point, but I do think he should know what things we shall be looking for in that budget.

Mr. Haggerty: It should be more positive, that's for sure.

Mr. Laughren: I won't go into great detail either, but it is appropriate, I think, to serve notice to what we're looking for.

We're going to be looking very carefully at the job-creation proposals that will be contained in his budget document.

Very often there is a tendency to put the problems of unemployment at the federal level, but the federal government has not resolved the unemployment problem so there's a very real obligation on the part of this government to get seriously into the whole matter of the creation of jobs. There's lots that can be done in Ontario, and to have almost 300,000 people unemployed is unacceptable. It's unacceptable from an economic view and from a social view as well. That's something the government has not done a very good job on.

As a matter of fact, the Treasurer stood up today in the House and announced there was going to be some youth employment programs for the summer that will create employment for 40,000 youths. That's fine, but the 300,000 that we're talking about are not youths. They're not even in those statistics. We're talking about serious proposals for full-time employment.

The employment trends in this province are ominous. When you look at the employment trends by sector of the economy, if you look at the unemployment trends by regions in the province, you can see why the Treasurer should be very concerned.

In this country, we have the highest unemployment rate of any industrialized country. I know that the Treasurer wouldn't want me to make a statement like that without giving some of the details.

Canada has an unemployment rate of 8.3 per cent. Sweden has 2.1 per cent; Japan, 2.2; West Germany, 3.6; France, 5.1; US, 6.1; UK, 6.6; Italy, 7.5; and I reiterate Canada has 8.3 per cent. It's not getting better. In Canada, in 1975, it was 6.9 per cent. In 1976, it was 7.1; in 1977, 8.1; in 1978, 8.4; and the latest that we had this year was 7.9, but that's expected to rise as well.

From an Ontario viewpoint, it's very serious. The Treasurer, I hope, will take a look at the unemployment figures by the different regions of the province.

In selected cities—this is for February, 1979, the latest figures I could get—Windsor had a 10.2 unemployment rate; St. Catharines had 14.5 per cent unemployment; Toronto had 5.7; Hamilton had 7.9; London had 6.9; Kitchener had 6.6; and Ottawa had 9.2 per cent. Those are unacceptable unemployment levels for the most industrialized province in this country; and indeed many of those cities are in the industrialized parts of this province. So that's a serious trend that's happening with the—

Mr. Lawlor: For one of the wealthiest countries in the world, it's unbelievable.

Mr. Laughren: As my colleague from Lakeshore said, one of the wealthiest countries in the world. Probably this jurisdiction is the wealthiest jurisdiction there is, and to have those kind of unemployment rates; and all the social and economic costs that are entailed by those, that go along with unemployment, that really is unacceptable.

Mr. Lawlor: It's atrociously bad government.

Mr. Laughren: The Treasurer has not responded to those problems.

We're worried about what's happening in the manufacturing sector of the economy. We know that in 1978 there was a spurt in manufacturing, but we also know that spurt has not made up for the tremendous decline that occurred in the last 10 years prior to 1978. We know part of the 1978 spurt was caused by the devalued dollar rather than to any kind of action on the part of the Treasurer. The Treasurer, if he's thinking of the devalued dollar as a solution to our manufacturing problems, had better think again. Such a high proportion of our parts are imported to go into the manufactured product that we have a very severe problem there with inflation, and of course, with the whole balance of payments.

The other area we're concerned about is the industrial incentives program that the Treasurer and his colleague, the minister for global product mandating, have been talking about. They keep talking about providing incentives to the private sector in order to rebuild the Ontario economy. The government is just staggering around in responding to requests that come in. There is no direction in that incentives program. In the budget, we will be looking for some specific directions and some criteria and guidelines.

We do not accept industrial incentives that do not have contained in them guarantees for regional development, for jobs, for stimulation of particular sectors rather than spreading it over the whole economy, for environmental protection and, last but not least, the whole component of Canadian ownership. The problems of lack of Canadian ownership are substantial and are causing many of our problems.

Mr. Lawlor: You don't expect him to address himself to any of those problems, do you?

Mr. Laughren: I expect he will or he will not have our support when it comes to vote for the budget next December.

Mr. Lawlor: I have no hope, I have no faith and I have very little charity.

Mr. Laughren: Let him tremble in his boots at the thought of that. It will be very difficult for the Liberal Party in this province to support a budget that doesn't resolve some of those problems and some others I haven't even mentioned.

The third matter I wanted to talk about was the whole question of our OHIP system, our system of medicare in the province. We have the highest premiums in the country and, even at that, doctors are opting out of the program and charging consumers more.

So consumers are paying twice. They are paying through very high premiums and then they are paying extra to doctors who opt out of the system. That's unacceptable to us. I believe there are only three provinces in all of Canada that even have medicare premiums. It's not necessary. We want a reduction in the level of OHIP premiums. We want a shift to the more progressive taxes, such as corporate income taxes and personal income taxes.

Even the committee that looked into the problems of OHIP last year recommended that there be a tax credit for those people who should be receiving premium assistance but who are not. We know there is an enormous gap there of people who are eligible for premium assistance but are simply not getting it. The committee recommended that there be a form of tax credit to pick up those people. The government hasn't done that and here it is letting doctors out. We will be pursuing that.

We're worried about the whole regressive nature of the tax system in Ontario. I've heard members opposite say, "Other provinces are no better. Look at the province where your party is the government." I have done some looking at that and I have a comparison of personal taxes and charges between Saskatchewan and Ontario. I'd like to let you have them, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you'd be interested. This includes provincial income tax, tax credits and rebates, health premiums, retail sales tax, gasoline tax, car insurance, telephone costs, home heating and electricity. This is for a taxpayer with \$15,000 in total income with a spouse and two children. We have taken a fairly typical example.

In Saskatchewan, that family would pay \$577 in provincial income tax and \$599 in Ontario. Tax credits and rebates would be \$418 in Saskatchewan and \$115 in Ontario. There are no health premiums in Saskatchewan; the figure is \$456 in Ontario. Retail sales tax comes to \$197 in Saskatchewan and \$240 in Ontario. Gasoline tax is \$114 in Saskatchewan and \$114 in Ontario. The sub-total of those items, over which the government has complete control, is \$470 for Saskatchewan and \$1,252 for Ontario.

These are the figures for other elements over which the government has some control. Car insurance in Saskatchewan comes to \$224 and \$441 in Ontario. By the way, that is driving a similar car with the same kind of liability coverage and so on. Telephone charges are \$70 in Saskatchewan and \$103 in Ontario. Home heating amounts to

\$318 in Saskatchewan and \$584 in Ontario. Electricity is \$180 in Saskatchewan and \$202 in Ontario. That makes a subtotal of \$792 in Saskatchewan and \$1,330 in Ontario. [5:30]

When you add up those two categories you get \$1,262 in Saskatchewan, and \$2,582 in Ontario. There is a better way to impose taxes on citizens in a provincial jurisdiction. Saskatchewan has found a better way; Ontario has not.

I was looking at some of the problems of housing, for example, and this ties in with what this government is doing. In Toronto, if we look at housing prices, the average house in Toronto is selling for \$67,333 with a 10 per cent downpayment and the current 11.75 per cent mortgage rate. This means a carrying cost of \$611.45 a month over a 30-year mortgage. Translated into hourly costs, a worker would be paying \$3.53 an hour of his wage for his mortgage; it doesn't include property tax. That is more than half the wage of an average worker. Interest is \$2.56 of that \$3.53, so the lifetime cost of that house which has a selling price of \$67,333 becomes over the 30-year period of the mortgage, \$226,843. That is a handsome sum for a \$67,000 house.

Between 1972 and 1978, the average income of a manufacturing worker almost doubled. It sounds good, but if one allows for taxes, inflation and carrying costs which young workers have to face with their families, the worker can, in fact, not buy any more with the money he has left over. There are some statistics I would like to give you, Mr. Speaker.

Annual average gross income in 1962 was \$7,363; and in 1978, \$14,560. That is a 98 per cent increase in average gross income. Income tax—this is a married person with two young children—in 1972 was \$1,014 and in 1978 \$2,180, for a change of 137 per cent. Net income was \$6,445 in 1972 and \$12,380 in 1978, or a 92 per cent increase. The carrying cost of that 30-year mortgage was \$3,128 in 1972 and \$7,061 in 1978 for a 135 per cent increase.

The amount left over for other expenditures after those have been paid are \$3,317 in 1972 and \$5,319 in 1978, a 60 per cent increase or change in what is left over to buy other goods, except that the purchasing power of that amount in 1972 dollars, which was the base year, is \$3,317 in 1972 and \$3,160 in 1978, a five per cent decrease. Thus we have a case where workers earning substantially more gross income are in fact worse off than they were back in 1972.

I mentioned the problem of regressive taxation and one of the regressive taxes is property taxes. I dug up some figures on education costs paid for by the province versus the property taxpayer.

In 1975—this is the all-province average—the provincial government paid 61.4 per cent and the property taxpayer paid 38.6.

In 1979, instead of paying 61.4 per cent the province is paying only 51.5 per cent, which is the preliminary figure. It is almost 10 per cent less of the total education bill than they were paying in 1975—10 per cent less in only five years.

That is not acceptable to us. That is a regressive form of taxation. Surely, the province should be moving in the opposite direction so education costs are reduced as a component of property taxes. That is the direction in which we should be moving and those are the kinds of policy changes we will be looking for on Tuesday night.

In Metropolitan Toronto the figures are even more dramatic. In 1975 the provincial share of education was 35.1 per cent. By 1979 we estimate it will be 20 per cent. It has gone from 35 per cent down to 20 per cent in that five-year period, another way of shifting taxes onto a more regressive system. That is exactly what this government has done, and we find that unacceptable.

The other thing is, I suggested to the minister of global product mandating today that he might want to think about the whole problem of one company gobbling up another company; the squabble over Hudson's Bay Company between Weston's and the Thomson family comes to mind, of course. What I would suggest the Treasurer look at is a system whereby there is a tax on that. We could call it a takeover tax, if we like.

There are two reasons why I suggest such a tax. One, of course, is to get revenues for the province. We socialists are always worried about revenues and very cautious in our expenditures; so I want to stress the point that we are worried about increasing our revenues with such a tax.

The other and perhaps even more important reason is that there are enormous pools of money going to purchase the assets of another company; somebody is going to have to show me how that creates jobs or new wealth in this jurisdiction, or how that creates income for the people of Ontario so we can have social services that we require. That is not the way you build an economy, or rebuild a sagging one.

If that money is there as a pool of cash—and in these they are talking about cash deals—if that kind of money is available, it should

be going to rebuild the manufacturing sector of our economy. That is what has to be done. Here, we have these large corporate entities, in some cases, catering to the egos of the people who run them as much as to the accountants who advise them to take over other large companies. It is an asset grab which we think does not contribute anything to Ontario. That has to be looked at; it simply does not make any economic sense at all.

Speaking of takeovers, mergers and so forth, it would be appropriate if the Treasurer and his colleague the minister for global product mandating were to take a look at the whole question of takeovers by foreign interests in Ontario. We have in this country something called the Foreign Investment Review Agency, a federal agency. That agency peruses all takeover bids and all new enterprises started up in Canada by foreign interests.

Mr. Wildman: And okays most of them.

Mr. Laughren: They do okay most of them. This government has a say in every one of those applications in Ontario, and the review agency tells us that in 95 per cent of the cases the province agrees with FIRA.

I asked the Minister of Industry and Tourism—sorry; global product mandating—if he would table the guidelines under which he made his decisions. The minister tells the review agency what the province's views are on any proposed takeover. Yet he will not table in this Legislature the criteria or the guidelines on which he bases his decision. I do not think that is asking too much. But the minister simply has refused to answer the question.

I think it is time that you, Mr. Speaker, took the minister to task; he is there to answer questions like this. I think he would be particularly sensitive if a Speaker who had been a former Solicitor General were to make the point to him. I think that would encourage you to do that.

We think the minister should understand that we are no longer talking of small figures when we talk about takeovers. We are talking about some very large numbers.

When a company from outside the province takes over a company within the province, we know that one of the problems in the long run is that there will be interest and dividend payments flowing out of this country. That is something that is causing a problem with our balance of payments. We know that in 1978—and these figures come from the review agency—out of 310 foreign takeovers applied for, 282 of them were approved; that is 91 per cent. Many

of those were in the manufacturing sector, and many of them were in Ontario. For new businesses established in this country, out of 294 applied for, 92.8 per cent were approved. What we are saying to the minister, and requesting that he do, is respond to us. Tell us how it is he makes the decision to approve those takeovers. On what basis does he decide that a takeover is in the best interests of Ontario?

One other area that we need to take a look at is the whole question of a capital gains tax. At the present time, it is my understanding that the federal government taxes 50 per cent of all capital gains, and that leaves 50 per cent that could be picked up by the province. What we are saying, plainly and simply, is go right back to the Carter commission; that is income and should be taxed as income—not half of it. People in this country and in this province do not have half their income taxed. Most people have all their income taxed, except those people who achieve capital gains, and they only have 50 per cent of that taxed. We are saying there is room for the province to move and take up that other 50 per cent so that we have a more equitable tax system.

Mr. Lawlor: Clark wants to cut it even further.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Villeneuve: If you want to give jobs, that's the only way you can do it.

Mr. Laughren: It is strange that one of the Conservative members says that is the way we keep jobs. They have been doing it for years, and the jobs have been disappearing. Perhaps they need a different policy.

Those are some of the problems on which we will be looking for answers from the Treasury on Tuesday night. But I am not optimistic. There are problems over there that go partly beyond just different policies. There is a struggle going on over on that side. I have analysed it very carefully, and I even did some eavesdropping the other day.

Everybody knows the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) is attempting to muscle in on the traditional jurisdiction of the Treasurer. We know this; we can see it in the policies.

I was doing some light reading the other day, and it came to mind that what I was reading was the same conversation I had overheard while walking out of the chamber. Walking out of the chamber was the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) and the Treasurer. I will put their names in as I read it.

The Treasurer said to his friend the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: "Let me have men about me that are fat—sleek-headed men and such as sleep o' nights. Yon Grossman has a lean and hungry look. He thinks too much. Such men are dangerous."

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs answered: "Fear him not, Frank. He's not dangerous. He's a noble Tory and well given."

The Treasurer said: "Would he were fatter, but I fear him not. If my name were liable to fear I do not know the man I should avoid so soon as that spare Grossman. He reads much. He is a great observer and he looks quite through the deeds of men. He loves no plays and thou dost, Tom. He hears no music. Seldom he smiles and smiles in such a sort as if he mocked himself and scorned his spirit that could be moved to smile at anything. Such men as he be never at heart's ease whilst they behold a greater than themselves and, therefore, are they dangerous. I rather tell thee what is to be feared than what I fear, for always I am Treasurer."

That is part of the problem with what is happening on the front bench over there, and that is one of the reasons we have a mish-mash of economic problems over there.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: I thought the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) was the poet.

Mr. Laughren: He is; he's my inspiration. I would have never quoted from Julius if my friend had not moved down here beside me.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: Don't replace him. He has been doing a good job. Don't displace him as your poet laureate.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The member for Lakeshore is an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, he is.

Mr. Lawlor: I have never heard a more apt quotation.

Mr. Wildman: That has obviously inspired the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Treasurer; they're very poetic.

Mr. Laughren: So much for the general economic policy. I am serious when I say that the problems between the Treasurer and the Minister for Global Product Mandating are causing fuzziness in the general direction that this government's economic policy is supposed to be taking us. It is not clear, and I suspect that is one of the reasons; so it will be very interesting to see what happens during the budget address on Tuesday night.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It is not that it is not clear; it's just that it's not clearly where you would lead us.

[5:45]

Mr. Laughren: It's not clear.

I would like to speak for a couple of moments on a problem that is bothering a lot of us, and that is the question of how we got ourselves in a situation that is so unhappy for so many people in Ontario now, namely injured workers. It is a problem that, unless someone is injured they tend not even to know about it at all. But let a person get injured and there is a significant chance of them having problems in obtaining just compensation, speedily and humanely rendered.

It is a very serious problem in that sense, and it does not just exist in the Sudbury area. I recognize that I represent an industrial area with a lot of mines and a lot of accidents, but it is elsewhere too. Whether you have a back problem in Sudbury or in Cornwall, it is a serious problem. The Workmen's Compensation Board simply does not know how to deal with it. There are administrative delays; there are decisions that are unfair to the workers; it is an adversary system; it simply is not working in the province.

Let me give one example—and, so help me, there are dozens and dozens—

Mr. Watson: Claim number?

Mr. Laughren: No, I am not going to give an individual case—just one example of how the board invariably comes down against the worker and wonders then why the worker regards it as an adversarial system.

In Sudbury now we have a major industrial strike, the Inco strikes. Workers who are injured and would normally receive what is called 50 per cent benefits would be eligible for a rehabilitation allowance until their condition was improved to the 100 per cent level. If the injured worker's condition improves to the point where he can go back to work and do light duties, and if he goes to the board, the board says: "We are cutting you off to 50 per cent, and you are going to stay at 50 per cent. You are on strike and, therefore, you are not eligible for light duties. If there were no strike, you would be back at work performing light duties."

The worker says: "Well now, just a minute. If I were healthy, I could get a job, perhaps up in Timmins, or perhaps I could get a job in Elliot Lake, or at Lake Agnew Mines, or some other place in this country." He could try, as an experienced miner, to get a job someplace else but, because of his partial disability, he cannot get a job someplace else.

The compensation board says: "It's your fault and the union's fault that you are on strike. Don't blame the compensation board for your problem." But the compensation board misses the problem and it misses the point entirely: If the worker were not injured at all, if there were no disability, he could be out there getting a job someplace. The board says: "Well, we'll tell you what we'll do. We'll put you on a rehabilitation program. But, of course, you have to quit your company and your job to come under the rehabilitation program."

Is that not a fine, humane policy for the compensation board in Ontario? A worker with 10, 20 or 30 years' experience is told, "If you want to be qualified for our rehabilitation program to get your benefits up to 100 per cent, then you are going to have to quit your company." That is some kind of policy.

The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie) has told us that is not the policy of the board. The Minister of Labour and Manpower is wrong; that is the policy of the board, and we have many examples of it in the Sudbury area. That is the kind of system we have. We have fought for years with the board and with the Minister of Labour, and nothing changes.

I was in Saskatchewan, and I said to the Minister of Labour: "We have real problems with compensation in Ontario. How are things here?" He said: "When we formed the government, we appointed a new board and changed some attitudes. We said that the attitude had to change at the board. Mind you, we haven't solved all our problems; I am working on one right now." One! He was working on one! We have hundreds. Our constituency offices work almost full time on compensation problems.

I would say that not only is the board badly administered, and not only are the attitudes wrong, but also the entire system is wrong and needs to be replaced. In other words, plainly and simply, the Workmen's Compensation Board, as we know it in Ontario, must be abolished and replaced with a social insurance system. That is what must happen.

There is a tremendous gap in the provision of income to people who get hurt in Ontario. Someone out there is going to have to explain to me why it matters where someone gets hurt—on the job, in the automobile or in the home. Why does it matter? Surely what matters is accident prevention, income maintenance, and rehabilitation. That is what counts, and we have a system that does not do that. Quite frankly, I do not

think you will ever have a system that does it until you have three components of insurance: (1) Auto insurance; (2) workers' compensation; (3) sickness and accident—so that you cover people regardless of where they are injured and irrespective of fault. There is such a system in New Zealand. A commission in Saskatchewan has recommended they do it. The same was recommended in Manitoba when there was an NDP government there. In Saskatchewan they are now costing the whole proposal to see how feasible it is, what the costs would be and so forth. I certainly hope that they move in that direction, because we need a social insurance system in the province of Ontario.

I want to tell you that we have great difficulty coping with this compensation board, Mr. Speaker. You can replace the chairman, which the government is going to do. We saw that before when Hon. Mr. Starr replaced Mr. Legge. Nothing changed for two reasons: One, the attitude of the board did not change; two, the system did not change. A change of attitude in the senior people at the board would help, but in the long run the abolishment of the board and the establishment of a comprehensive system is the only way to resolve the problems in that area.

I mentioned earlier the Inco strike. It has been almost seven months since that strike began back on September 15, 1978. They have been seven long months, I want to tell you. Seven long months not just for the striking workers and their families but for the community as a whole. When you have 11,000 people off for that period of time in a community the size of Sudbury you really feel it. It is affecting the community in a very major way.

The union has looked after the membership extremely well. There are committees set up so that if people get into trouble they work through a committee at the union hall. They have done a magnificent job in administering the strike, there is no question about that at all.

The basic premise from which I begin, though, is that Inco has not made a decent offer to the workers in Sudbury. That is where it all breaks down. They had not even responded this week to the last demand of the union, nor have they given any consideration to the impact they are having on the community. They have not worried about the community which gave them all they have.

What has this government done? Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something:

This government has done some things in the past; they have done them for Inco. I will give you some examples. I am glad the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) is here; he was part of the system of being very kind to Inco. One, they have given Inco a processing allowance to allow them, contrary to Section 113 of the Mining Act, to process their ores offshore. Then two, as though to add insult to injury, they are allowing them to write off those offshore processing costs against their Ontario profits. That is adding insult to injury, and it is exporting jobs. Three, the government gave them last year 60,000 acres north of Sudbury on which they would have exclusive exploration and development rights, just like that. Four, they reduced the control order which was imposed upon Inco directing them to get their pollution emissions, their SO₂ emissions, down from about 3,500 tons a day to 750 tons a day by the end of 1978. They virtually cancelled the control order in that the limit is not changed. They have not said, "You will progressively get down to that date." They didn't give the extension with specific tons per day, they virtually, to all intents and purposes, cancelled the control order.

Those are things that this government has done for the company. What we say is that it is time the government moved in and said to that company: "You are not going to continue to abuse the workers and the community in which you operate any longer."

This is what the government should do; it should use the leverage it has, because of those favours bestowed on Inco, to tell the company to make a decent offer so the people can get back to work in Sudbury. But if the government thinks the workers are going to go back without a decent offer, it is sadly mistaken. The workers have suffered too much now to go back for nothing.

Then we have Inco's behaviour. I was reading *Business Week*, as New Democrats so often do. I read in the section on Corporate Strategies some comments on the president of Ray-O-Vac, which is part of ESB in the United States, a subsidiary of Inco which Inco purchased for about \$250,000,000 a few years ago.

Referring to Dawson, who came from Inco to take over the presidency of Ray-O-Vac Corporation, the writer said "Now it is clear that, under Dawson, ESB will rely in a major way on Inco's enormous financial resources for the first time to help solve its problems. Aided by \$50,000,000 annually from Inco, ESB will now double its capital spending to an estimated \$40,000,000, with most of the

money going to modernize run-down plants and to build a few new facilities as part of an effort to reduce the company's above-average production costs."

At the end of the article, he wrote: "Dawson is confident that the corporate parent's commitment of roughly \$50,000,000 a year is assured. 'It's large for us,' he says, 'but it's small for Inco.'"

Isn't that lovely? Inco is going to give \$50,000,000 a year to Ray-O-Vac Corporation in the United States to prop up its plants down there, while in this country it makes a different offer to the workers in Port Colborne and a different offer to the workers in Thompson than to the workers in Sudbury. They gave a different pension offer to the workers in Port Colborne last year when the layoffs occurred than to the workers in Sudbury. And here they are taking \$50,000,000 a year earned in Sudbury, sending it to the Ray-O-Vac Corporation in the United States and giving the back of the hand to the workers in Sudbury again—not just to the workers either but the entire Sudbury community.

That is pushing their rights too far. I don't know how this government can sit back and look at that and not do anything. The case is clear; the evidence is overwhelming. I've never advocated the nationalization of the public ownership of a resource corporation for punitive reasons. I think that a government should bring the resources in this province into the public sector for social and economic reasons, not punitive reasons. But I am reaching the point of adding punitive to my list of social and economic reasons in the case of Inco for the way they have treated the Sudbury community. If ever there was an example of bankrupt policies, it's this government's policies on resources. They have none.

Mr. Lane: You've been saying that for eight years.

Mr. Laughren: That's right. And I'm going to keep on saying it until the government learns that it is totally wrong on its policy on resources.

Mr. Lane: You'll be a lot older than you are now.

Mr. Laughren: Let me tell the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, that the value of mineral production in Ontario in 1975 was \$2,300,000,000 and the revenue to the province from that was \$91,000,000, representing 3.9 per cent of production. In 1976, the value of mineral production, was \$2,500,000,000 and the revenue was \$66,000,000

As a percentage of production, that represented 2.6 per cent in revenue to the province. In 1977, the value of mineral production was \$2,700,000,000 and revenue from the mining sector was \$39,000,000, representing 1.4 per cent of the value of production. We have production between 1975 and 1977 going from \$2,300,000,000 to \$2,700,000,000 while revenue goes from

\$91,000,000 to \$39,000,000, and as a percentage of production, from 3.9 per cent to 1.4 per cent.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Would this be a suitable time for the member for Nickel Belt to break his speech?

Mr. Laughren: Yes, it would.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 5, 1979

Transmitting estimates, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	715
Point of privilege re charges against LLBO employees, Mr. S. Smith	715
Charges against LLBO employees, statement by Mr. Drea	716
Youth employment program, statement by Mr. F. S. Miller	716
Special education, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Grande	717
Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Lawlor	718
Convention facilities, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. di Santo, Mr. Eakins	719
Property taxation, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Laughren	721
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent, Ms. Gigantes	723
Westinghouse Canada, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. S. Smith	724
DREE program, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Rollins, Mr. Eakins	725
Employees' health and safety, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Cassidy	726
Family benefits, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Peterson	727
Ambulance services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Van Horne	727
Health service, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	728
Compensation for Victims of Crime Amendment Act, Mr. Kennedy, first reading	729
Workmen's Compensation Amendment Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	729
Business of the House, Mr. Welch	729
Supply Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first, second and third readings	729
Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. Belanger, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Laughren	729
Recess	757

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Baetz, Hon. R. C.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
Belanger, J. A. (Prescott and Russell PC)
Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Rollins, C. T. (Hastings-Peterborough PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 17

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, April 5, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Resumption of the debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Laughren: It is with an unusual amount of pleasure that I rise to open the debate this evening. I know the polls are not complete—and I'm never one to count my chickens before they're hatched—but I do think members of the chamber, who aren't aware, should know the latest counts available, at least to me, in Scarborough West and in Wentworth.

Mr. Sargent: Is it necessary?

Mr. Laughren: In Scarborough West, the polls show the NDP candidate, Mr. Johnston, with 6,981 votes; the Conservative candidate, 5,165 votes, and the Liberal candidate, 4,361 votes.

In Wentworth, the polls show Mr. Isaacs has 5,137 votes; the Progressive Conservative candidate—I cannot recall his name at the moment—has 4,218 votes, and the Liberal candidate, 3,331 votes.

It is gratifying indeed to see that the people in those two ridings have spoken again and reaffirmed the wisdom of their earlier decisions in years gone by. I would just make a small comment. In the last four by-elections we've had in recent months, the government has won two and the New Democrats—the real opposition in this Legislature—have won the other two. We believe, as well, that there's a reason the people in those ridings have spoken the way they have.

We believe they believe as we do: that this government lacks imagination; it is immobilized; and it's time to give it a rest. We believe the people know the government is tired. The people themselves are tired of a government that persists in its regressive taxation policies; persists in a shoddy resource policy; persists in anti-labour legislation and policies; persists in neglect of regional development, particularly in the northern Ontario, southwestern Ontario, and Peterborough areas.

As well, the people in those two ridings understand that industrial giveaways, with no guarantees, are not acceptable in this province. They understand, as well, that the neglect of children with learning disabilities cannot be allowed to continue. They understand that the incredible mistreatment of injured workers has gone on far too long, and that the government continues to do nothing.

They understand, as well, that this government is not moving the way it should to protect our medicare system. They know, too, that the failure to rebuild our economy, particularly in the manufacturing sector, will lead to more problems in the future, but the government has continued to do nothing.

The people are angry and upset about the government's casual indifference to the almost 300,000 unemployed people in the province at this time; as well as the failure of this government to make any move whatsoever to repatriate our economy so that we can put those people back to work. Also, the government is failing to protect consumers from rising prices, particularly in the supermarkets.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that in recent months there has been some comment about how difficult it's been for this party to move from a leader with the stature of Stephen Lewis to a new leader. We would be foolish indeed not to recognize that to move from a leader of Stephen's stature to any new leader would cause tremors in any political party.

The picture is clear that this party, under Michael Cassidy, has addressed itself to the major problems of Ontario. Our leader himself has talked about the issues of the day, whether they are food prices, unemployment, our medicare system, labour issues, the environment, public transit or social services. He is carrying on the tradition of great leadership in this party, Mr. Speaker, and I would say to you that we are a healthy, aggressive and clear alternative to this government and its alter ego, the Ontario Liberals.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch briefly on some portions of the speech from the throne.

In total, I thought the throne speech was a good one, and certainly very positive as far as national unity is concerned.

I will quote just one paragraph from the throne speech, where the Honourable Pauline McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor for the province of Ontario, points out:

"Some may wish to argue as to whether the primary emphasis of this session should be directed to improving the economic climate of Ontario or to improving the social services available to our people. In truth, extensive attention must be given to both, for it is clear that only if the economic circumstances in our province remain strong will we be able to maintain and develop the programs that contribute to a fair and balanced society."

I think that quotation makes it very clear that our economic climate and our social service programs go hand in hand. There is no use in telling about plans to improve our social programs until we can show how we can improve the economic climate in Ontario. We must do that in order to provide the social benefits that obviously are needed.

Other important matters dealt with in the throne speech are as follows: (1) an immediate province-wide campaign urging consumers to buy Ontario-grown fruits and vegetables to help curb rising food costs; (2) beefed-up assistance to the Ontario tourist industry, including a scheme to train 25,000 hospitality workers; (3) the extension of special transit accommodation and self-help programs for the physically handicapped; (4) continued free drugs for senior citizens; (5) extended home care for the chronically ill; (6) a renewed commitment to the Children's Law Reform Act, to move to consolidate provincial children's aid services and to recognize the best interests of the child in custody in access cases; (7) intensive programs promoting immunization of children; (8) extension of poison control services at children's hospitals and increased funding for programs to control child abuse; (9) extended television services to northern communities to help overcome the sense of isolation that some people feel there.

I would like to make some comments about the health-care plan of this province.

The throne speech made it abundantly clear that there would be no cut in quantity or quality of health-care services. It has also been abundantly clear for a number of years that the NDP would have the doctors working on a salary or fixed income.

Mr. Young: Who said so?

Mr. Lane: You said so, many times.

Mr. Wildman: When?

Mr. Young: Give us proof.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) tried that yesterday at the Ontario Medical Association, and they booed him.

Mr. Lane: I listened to the NDP critic yesterday speak for an hour about what terrible people the doctors are.

Mr. Wildman: He never said anything about salaries.

Mr. Lane: The NDP are spending much time these days speaking in this House and in the federal election campaign about the downgrading of the health-care system. It is my conviction that putting doctors on a salary or a fixed income would be just exactly what we need to downgrade the health-care system in this province.

I personally feel that if a doctor chooses to opt out of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan, that should be his privilege. Forcing him to remain in the scheme would again, I feel, downgrade the quality of health care we now enjoy.

However, I think it is only fair, if a doctor does opt out, that he is required to advise his patients and would-be patients that he is no longer in the plan and to advise them what additional costs they could be expected to pay for which they would not be reimbursed.

While I agree that we need a new formula in northern Ontario, and some more doctors, one gets a little tired of hearing members from the third party continually condemn our doctors for the lack of interest in their patients and try to portray them as a group of money grabbers.

Mr. Wildman: Do you support the cuts in beds in the north?

Mr. Lane: This is very unfair. For the most part, the doctors in this province are a very dedicated group of people. I also think most doctors feel the OHIP program is an excellent one. While some doctors are opting out, I have yet to find one doctor in the position of not having himself and his family covered under the program.

Mr. Wildman: That's a double standard.

Mr. Martel: That's definitely a double standard; cover yourself, boys.

Mr. Lane: I would think that this indicates Ontario's health-care scheme is one of the best in the world and is so recognized by our doctors.

Mr. Martel: Cover yourself, but not the peasants.

Mr. Lane: Going back nearly eight years ago when I was involved in my first provincial election campaign, my number one

plank was to try to do something about the transportation services in the north, and in my riding particularly. Much has happened since then. There has been a great improvement in transportation, not only in my riding, Mr. Speaker, but also in yours and in all other northern ridings.

Mr. Wildman: A lot of the hospitals didn't get enough money.

Mr. Lane: I had the unique experience on Monday morning of this week of holding a press conference in Sudbury on behalf of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) to talk about the budget he is prepared to put into transportation in the north this year. It amounts to approximately \$52,000,000. I won't go into details of the expenditures.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Northern Affairs couldn't make it.

Mr. Martel: Watch that he doesn't talk you out of that airport because that is what he wanted to do at one time, I recall. He wanted to sell norOntario; do you recall that?

Mr. Lane: I don't recall it.

Mr. Martel: Yes, he did.

Mr. Lane: I recall very well when I first came into this House all members opposite saying what a white elephant we had in norOntair.

Mr. Martel: You wanted to give it away to the private sector.

Mr. Lane: No.

Mr. Martel: Yes.

Mr. Lane: The member is getting more mixed up all the time.

Mr. Martel: You had better look back on the speeches of your colleague.

Mr. Lane: I won't go into detail about the expenditures, any more than to say many of the transportation problems I had seen back in 1971 have been looked after in the past eight years by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Martel: They were going to sink the island with pavement.

Mr. Lane: I would just like to take this opportunity to say how much I enjoyed working with the minister for nearly two years as his parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Wildman: You should have been the minister.

Mr. Lane: Now that I am parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs, I find it very commendable that we are now spending \$52,000,000 this year to try to

continue to improve the transportation system in the north.

Mr. Martel: We stopped you from selling it.

Mr. Lane: One of the things I am trying to convince my minister to do, which I think would be of tremendous advantage to the senior citizens of northern Ontario, is to co-ordinate the efforts of the Ministry of Housing, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and Social Services in the sparsely populated areas in northern Ontario where it would be impossible to support either nursing homes or rest homes for the elderly on an individual basis. By grouping the rent-geared-to-income units from Housing with the rest homes from Community and Social Services, together with nursing home beds from the Ministry of Health, we could have this type of umbrella complex in many areas throughout the north in which it would otherwise be impossible to keep our elderly people in the area where they have made their life contribution and in many cases where their families now reside.

I think it tragic that many times people who are no longer able to take care of themselves are forced into homes for the elderly or nursing homes many miles away from their family and friends. In many cases the lives of these great people to whom we owe so much is shortened by the fact they must be parted from their families and friends at a time when they need them most. If our ministry could co-ordinate the services of the three above-mentioned ministries without additional cost to the taxpayers of this province, we could bring great peace of mind to thousands of people who are now very concerned about where they will be when the time comes when they can no longer take care of themselves.

We sometimes take for granted that Ontario just by accident is a great place to live. We have to look a little deeper and realize that without the people who are now in their sunset years, having made the great contribution they have to this province, we would probably not be enjoying the many things we now take for granted. As the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, I want to say I want to do my part to make sure no stone is left unturned in providing the best possible facilities for these people in their sunset years.

I won't take any more time of the House. I am sure a lot of members want to speak.

[8:15]

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, along about now, the member speaking usually has a few kind words to say about the Speaker.

Mr. Lane: Terribly difficult, Ed.

Mr. Sargent: I can say it's a tough job, and I'll leave it at that. But I guess you'll have to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Worton: You both speak well of one another and that's why—

Mr. Sargent: —and I guess we have to give you some credit, that you're quite a showman.

The daily Speaker's parade is something else. When the officer at the top of the stairs barks and bellows: "Make way for the Speaker," you have to believe in the awesome power of the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Hennessy: Oh yeah? He'd need an umpire to throw you out.

Mr. Sargent: But that shaggy group preceding the Speaker, following the man in the three-cornered hat—

Mr. Hennessy: Napoleon, Napoleon.

Mr. Sargent: —it reminds me of kids playing in the backyard.

Mr. Hennessy: He reminds you of Napoleon.

Mr. Sargent: It should really be a film for the Gong Show. You could arrange to have a couple of bunnies going ahead strewing flowers over your path, and give it some class. But the participants don't look too enthused. I suggest maybe you might get a sergeant-major in and give them some drill in marching.

Mr. Hennessy: That's right, keep it up. You're on your way, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: But anyway, speaking of sergeant-majors, a few weeks back I was at a warden's banquet and we were going to be piped in to the head table by the pipe major. One of the ladies in the head table party said to the pipe major, resplendent in his tartans and his kilt: "Pipe major, is there anything worn under the kilts?" He said: "No ma'am, everything's in fine working order."

I think after 16 years in this hallowed place that things are not in very good working order, according to my way of looking at it. You get to be pretty objective after 16 years here and you think of the concerns—

Ms. Gigantes: You mean objectionable.

Mr. Sargent: —I have for my area. We have no rail service, we have no air service, we have—

Mr. Hennessy: No member.

Mr. Sargent: —a 48-mile-an-hour traffic rule. The fact is today I have lost my licence to drive—15 points are gone. My chauffeur

Bob McKessock has 11 points gone. I say how in the hell—

Ms. Gigantes: Better to stay home.

Mr. Sargent: —do you make time driving 120 miles an hour—I mean 120 miles?

An hon. member: No wonder you lost your points quickly, Eddie.

Ms. Gigantes: Take it easy, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: I've got 128 miles to go and I have to go at 48 miles an hour. It's a long trip.

An hon. member: Bad road too.

Mr. Sargent: So we have our problems living in the north. Especially after—what is it, 35 years, Bob?

Mr. Nixon: Thirty-six years.

Mr. Sargent: Thirty-six years of oppressive, corrupt rule.

Mr. Speaker: I think really the member should not use language like that.

Mr. Sargent: But I have facts to back it up, Mr. Speaker, if you want to—

Mr. Speaker: I think the honourable member should choose his words a little bit more—

Mr. Sargent: Well, I may use it many times tonight, I'm sorry, but I really feel it.

Mr. Hodgson: Settle down or else you will get thrown out again.

Mr. Sargent: The trouble with a free-wheeling speech like this is when we criticize the government they accuse us of being paranoid and untruthful. I can never understand why we should tell lies about them when the truth is bad enough. The members have to admit that we don't have the best of all governments in the world.

Mr. Hennessy: The occasional member.

Mr. Sargent: This province is the richest and has the greatest resources in North America. In every respect we are the best, but we are in the most serious financial position since Confederation. At this point in time with our technology we can almost do anything—put a man on the moon—but tonight, on the news, we heard that every hospital in Toronto has 16 to 20 patients lying on cots in the emergency sections.

We can commit ourselves to \$30,000,-000,000 in nuclear power, shooting craps with destiny, yet be so negligent of the needs of our people. I am talking about cutbacks and hospital closings. We collect the charges for hospital care from our people but we don't deliver the service.

Mr. Hennessy: You don't believe that.

Mr. Sargent: The government tries to take our hospitals away from us in the north, playing politics with people's lives.

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: You really don't believe that.

Mr. Sargent: After 32 years in control here, the government has plundered the treasury to the extent that now it is \$14,000,000,000 in debt. I guess by this time next week it will be \$15,000,000,000 in debt, by next Tuesday.

Mr. Haggerty: That is a good estimate.

Mr. Sargent: According to accounting principles—it is treading so dangerously close to a default position—

Mr. Hodgson: One more drink, Ed, one more drink.

Mr. Hennessy: One more for the road.

Mr. Sargent: It is so bad that it has raided every pension plan scheme—the teachers, the civil service, the Canadian Pension—to the extent of \$7,000,000,000 and not five cents is left in these plans.

A lot has happened since we had the last budget debate. Mr. McKeough took us from a \$36,000,000 credit position, a surplus, to a \$2,000,000,000 deficit. In three years he had three successive budgets of \$1,000,000,000 or more a year, but he kept telling the people of Ontario that he would balance the budget by 1980. He said it repeatedly, and every time he would say this the trained seals over there would thump their desks as though they really believed it.

Mr. Haggerty: It is a good speech, Eddie.

Mr. Nixon: Here is the minister, he has been out to lunch.

Mr. Sargent: I think it must be embarrassing to know what they have done to this province. Mr. McKeough was part of the architecture; he and John White and the Premier (Mr. Davis) brought us to this position. However, he saw disaster on the horizon and resigned to save face. But he said he was going to keep his views on politics before the people. He might start today to tell the people of Ontario how he arranged to cancel a \$600,000 debt owed by the estate of the president of Chrysler in the Ronto deal because he had promised it to this lady at a party.

Last week we had three episodes on television of the organization and corruptness in the rackets. Let me tell the House that the past 10 or 15 years around this place would make a great TV documentary. It would make Watergate seem like peanuts. Let me set the scenario in this.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You will be right on the front bench.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister had any brains he would be embarrassed with this.

Here is this picture with smiling Bill Davis as the godfather.

Do you recall the Fidnam affair; when I got bounced out of the House because I produced a \$50,000 cancelled cheque payable to Mr. Kelly from the president of Fidnam, a payoff to get a \$20,000,000 contract for the building of the Workmen's Compensation Board project? And that from a company that could not even pay a \$1,500 bill? They got the no-bid contract.

Do you recall the Moog and Davis affair across the road? It was a \$41,000,000 project, a no-bid contract to a friend of the Premier. A year before they got the \$25,000,000 OISE contract. It was a no-bid contract, a friend of the Premier's got that. We could go on and on in documenting, with ministers resigning like flies. The minister opposite is one guy who survived, because of inside deals in real estate.

This is part of the scenario of the Davis government, with Eddy Goodman, a director of Cadillac and also the bagman for this party. Cadillac Fairview was just an ordinary company then. They were building housing for OHC, but Eddie Goodman had arrangements to get funds for them quickly. Today Cadillac Fairview is one of the largest corporations in North America, across the border. They got their start here in Queen's Park. That is a great setting for a movie or for a television series.

The members know all about the Saltfleet scandals and land deals in Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Saltfleet?

Mr. Sargent: Land was appraised at \$3,000,000 and was selling for \$6,000,000—a \$3,000,000 payoff. The director of housing resigned because he would not stand for that kind of hanky-panky. He is now a director of Central Mortgage and Housing in Ottawa and will back this up. The reason he resigned was he could not stand the corruption here.

Mr. Nixon: Tell us about Bronte Park.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No corruption there, Eddie.

Mr. Hennessy: No prompting, please.

Mr. Sargent: Many of the cabinet ministers involved in land deals have resigned. We do not have in this province, in this area of Toronto, an investigative press that will go out and do a Watergate like the Washington Post did in Washington. We have lots of material here. After 15 or 16 years in this

business I wonder what is wrong with our people, because an informed public is a strong public. We are not informed about the inside deals going on. If a man gets up to bring a good question to this House he has to get the terminology right. He gets kicked out of the House if the phrasing is not proper.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You are not telling the truth, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: Then we come to the deal, a \$30,000,000,000 nuclear project, making millionaires of friends of the government. That is the basis of The China Syndrome, greed, in this nuclear power program. We made a lot of millionaires in this deal and they are all friends of the government. Look around on the opening day of the House. It is the people who are doing business with the government paying tribute to the establishment. That is what fills up the front part of the deal here.

Mr. Nixon: There they go now.

Mr. Sargent: Now we go down the line and—

Hon. Mr. Wiseman: Eddie, you will have to go to confession.

Mr. Hennessy: You will have to write a book.

Mr. Peterson: Too bad you cannot read, Mickey.

Mr. Sargent: —we have the payoff again. We have a \$7,000,000,000 contract,—

Mr. Peterson: How much is Mickey taking? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Sargent: —to go to the year 2010, with Denison Mines, which will give Mr. Roman and his friends a \$2,000,000,000 guaranteed profit before they even start. They do not put any money into the deal. The government will loan them \$339,000,000 as front-end financing to get the project on stream. They have no risk whatsoever, and they get a \$2,000,000,000 profit on the sale of uranium at \$40 to \$60 a pound. The Wall Street Journal says that material is worth one dollar at the minehead. These are facts.

Hon. Mr. Snow: And you believe them.

Mr. Sargent: The minister asks if I believe it. Well, I will tell him something in Latin. If he went to school, he will know what this means. I got to fifth form Latin. *Populus iam dudum defutatus est*. It means, in translation, the consumer has been screwed long enough.

Mr. Nixon: Must have been quite a teacher you had.

Mr. Van Horne: Relatively plain and simple.

Mr. Mancini: I think Mickey understands that.

[8:30]

Mr. Sargent: I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this Ontario government contract—it is not a Hydro contract; it is an Ontario government contract with Denison Mines and Preston Mines—is a disgraceful government contract. I call on the Premier to show cause why this should not be cancelled in view of recent developments. We are locked into this deal for 30 years, to pay between \$40 and \$60 a pound for uranium, when massive recent discoveries in Saskatchewan, Australia and Africa reveal that, according to the Wall Street Journal, it can be produced for \$1 a pound. That is quite a spread.

The contract calls for delivery within about 10 months, by early 1980. Mr. Roman and his friends got a \$339,000,000 advance, but they have only drawn down \$75,000,000 of that money; so they have nine months to get in action to start deliveries.

As the Toronto Star says in its editorial, any other company with a government contract for \$7,000,000,000 would have gone to the banks and got its own financing. But what does the Premier do? He hurries this deal through the committee, gives them a deadline date to have the deal finalized and sold, and gives them \$339,000,000 up front. That \$339,000,000, according to the Toronto Star, is going to cost the taxpayers of Ontario \$1,000,000,000 in interest for the loan alone, on top of the \$7,000,000,000—committing our kids to the year 2010—with a built-in, guaranteed profit of \$2,000,000,000 at absolutely no risk.

The Hydro committee was advised by Burns, Fry Limited, a Toronto firm, that by 1980—in eight months—uranium production could exceed demand by 82 per cent. The committee knew about this, the Premier knew about this; but he hurried it along. I am calling on the Premier to renegotiate this contract because of the misleading advice that was given to the committee that the world scarcity of uranium would justify these scandalous prices.

There is nothing new about calling for a rollback. Westinghouse in the United States were involved in the same type of deal; they went back and renegotiated the contracts. It is time we got some action in this regard in Ontario.

Not a single insurance company in the world will guarantee anyone in the world—in Ontario or elsewhere—one cent against nuclear power radiation with all its defects. But, here we are, going down the line with a \$30,000,000,000 program. In Douglas Point, we have swimming pools full of spent uranium rods—thousands of them, deadly

dangerous. They are stored in swimming pools, temporarily, until they can find a burial ground. These rods have to last 2,000 years, but we are storing them in swimming pools until we can find somebody who will let us bury them some place. That is what is going on in our riding.

The Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) assured the House there is no problem with our nuclear program. A release I got on my desk today from Mr. Taylor says: "If a similar series of malfunctions did occur at a Hydro nuclear station, the public would be protected by our 'defence in-depth' safeguard." Mr. Taylor says there is absolutely no cause for concern about the safe operation of Ontario nuclear plants. Well today I asked the Premier, as all members heard, about his concern over secret documents telling AECL about a series of malfunctions at Douglas Point and Bruce 1 and 2. I had no response from him that we could measure. Secret Hydro documents, known to many top Hydro officials, reveal that a series of potentially-catastrophic disasters could have occurred at the Douglas and Bruce plants, but they have been kept under cover as classified secrets.

Following are the highlights of some of the shocking revelations of human error and excessive mechanical failure: the containment structure at Douglas Point nuclear station could not withstand the pressures encountered at Harrisburg at Three Mile Island. The Three Mile Island plant was built to withstand 80 pounds of pressure; the Douglas Point plant is not built to withstand the same pressure as Three Mile Island. Douglas Point has been restricted to 70 per cent power, mainly because of inadequacies.

The important part is this. The Babcock and Wilcox boilers used in the Three Mile Island plant, and which are being investigated in plants across America as being possibly faulty, are used all across Ontario in Hydro plants.

The following is a series of happenings at the Bruce NGS. If they had all happened at once, it would have been catastrophic. It goes on to list many points here, three pages of happenings, which I will be developing at a later time. Because of these secret documents, called Internal Significant Event Reports and dealing with malfunctions and accidents at Hydro's nuclear stations, I think it's high time we did a total house-keeping job. Reports of all these secret documents should be coming to the leaders of the opposition parties and to all government agencies in Ontario and Canada.

Today, we had the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) talking about the small entrepreneur. In Canada 63 per cent of all taxation revenues come from the small entrepreneur, the small businessman. We have here pictures of Ontario's men abroad. The Ministry of Industry and Tourism has offices in Frankfurt, in Brussels, in Vienna, Los Angeles, Sao Paulo, Mexico City, London, Tokyo, New York, Stockholm, wherever around the world.

Mr. Peterson: What about Marvin Shore?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, Marvin Shore and the group in London. The ministry spends millions of dollars on this type of operation. But in my city, when a small businessman goes to a ministry office for a loan, the answer is: "We don't have any money for you. We can't loan you any money; but we can give you advice."

Here are a bunch of guys all across this province in these small offices; guys who couldn't make a go of it in business. They're broke themselves, but they get jobs with the ministry advising other men how to run their businesses. But they have no money for them. This is the ridiculous part; the stupidity of the whole arrangement. The ministry has men all around the world. It's spending millions but it can't lend a small entrepreneur in Owen Sound, Burlington or the Sault—any place—any money because it hasn't any money for them. But it can give them advice. That's like the blind leading the blind.

Mr. Van Horne: Send an expert in bankruptcy to Istanbul.

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Mr. Mancini: That's true and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wiseman) knows it.

Mr. Sargent: We don't have all the answers. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we had the answers—

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: We don't have the connections the government has with the establishment, that's it. We don't have that.

Mr. Peterson: Now Mickey Hennessy is establishment in my opinion; that shows how low I've sunk.

Mr. Sargent: Three years down the line since the establishment of the Niagara Escarpment Commission the president of our local Niagara Escarpment ratepayers association wrote to the Premier on March 3 or 4 and asked him about the new boundaries regarding the escarpment commission.

On March 6 he got a letter back from Premier Davis saying: "Dear Mr. Davenport: I am not aware of any official announcement being made recently regarding this boundary, other than the statement made on May 9, 1978, by the Honourable Rene Brunelle."

This comes after the greatest announcement in history, that they've made an 80 per cent cutback in Niagara Escarpment boundaries. But that shows how much the Premier knows about the Niagara Escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Are you for it or against it, Eddie?

Mr. Sargent: The minister is sitting there being so smart. Let him tell me what he would do in this case. Doesn't he believe that a farmer should own his own development rights, that he should not be denied the right to split his property if he has a chance to sell it or develop it?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Right.

Mr. Sargent: Those fellows down here, the minister and his friends, are making millions by redevelopment in southern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We are?

Mr. Sargent: He and his fellow ministers. One of the ministers made \$1,000,000 on a land deal out here. The week before the escarpment boundaries became law they held the date back until he sold his property. He got his money and they dated the transcript after he sold his property—Mr. Yaremko. Doesn't the minister know about that one?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No.

Mr. Sargent: Well he should know about it. He does know about it.

An hon. member: It was in his backyard.

Mr. Van Horne: Another log on the fire.

Hon. Mr. Snow: How much do you have, Eddie? How many millions did you make, Eddie? You don't want to tell about those.

Mr. Sargent: It isn't a case of how much I made, it's how much I owe. That's what I'm worried about.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. This isn't question period.

Mr. Sargent: A basic tenet of democracy is that the title of one's land is sacred, and no one should tell you what you can do with it.

If you and your family have been paying taxes for generations on a piece of land, what right has some egghead friend of the

Minister of Transportation and Communications or some political hack from Queen's Park to tell you what you can do with it?

Mr. Cooke: I thought you guys wanted to save land.

Mr. Sargent: I say to the minister representing the Treasury, as he does with all his great whack, if his government wants to control land development in my area, or whatever—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Tell me more.

Mr. Sargent: —let them put their money where their mouth is, and don't forget that; that's our position.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You own Brant, Norfolk, Oxford and Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that thousands of our farmers have had their land frozen and can't get severances. Yet they have to keep on paying taxes.

Mr. Peterson: It's theft.

Mr. Sargent: Business in Bruce is in limbo because of the Niagara Escarpment Commission. I say title to one's land in Grey-Bruce doesn't mean a damned thing. You're even told what colour you can paint your outhouse, if they'll let you.

An hon. member: Paint her blue.

Mr. Hennessy: Blue and yellow.

Mr. Sargent: Land use power under the provincial escarpment act overriding local zoning authority with some sort of wider ranging master planning has everyone scared. The outcome will be disaster, disrupting the local tax base.

Zoning has always been a local responsibility—what is good for the local economy. Now the province is taking over control; it is taking over local planning functions. I can warn the government that we are going to block this. If I had my way and the member for Grey (Mr. McKessock) had his way we would abolish the Niagara Escarpment Commission. We would abolish the whole thing. With the restraint program the government has on now it's simply ridiculous to take our land rights away from us and spend \$1,000,000 or so in salaries for a bunch of political hacks.

[8:45]

We have, in the Grey-Bruce area, what everybody wants. We have our own acres of diamonds. We should be capitalizing on our assets. We would have a big boom if you would leave us alone and let us operate our programs for resorts and boat areas. You're going to be hearing a lot more from us about the Niagara Escarpment.

In closing—I've got the wheels down a bit now, coming in here.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Flaps down.

Mr. Sargent: You're the one who is doing the flapping.

The intrusive power of government in our lives doesn't give us much hope. I think we're giving government more power than is absolutely necessary. I think freedom is something which we have to guard against the intrusive power of government.

I'll give you a brief example of how big government works; government power coming into our lives.

You recall, a few years ago, a drug raid in Fort Erie? There were 150 people in a night club. The Mounties got word there we're going to be drugs there. So, arrogant with the dragnet search power they had, they stripped naked all the 150 men and women. They did vaginal and rectal searches for drugs. It was a shocking, abusive use of power. It happened in our province. One hundred and fifty people were taken in, stripped naked and subjected to vaginal and rectal searches. The Mounties used more power than was needed. Can you imagine the parallel, if the Mounties got a tip that there would be drugs at an Argo game and they used the same procedures, the same powers there. You would have the biggest half-time show in history.

Mr. Peterson: All Tories.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It would be quite a game.

Mr. Worton: It would look like a Tory annual conference, wouldn't it, Jim?

Hon. Mr. Snow: It would be just like the Bruce County Liberal Association.

Mr. Sargent: The Mounted Police in this province have broken every rule in the book, committed every crime.

Hon. Mr. Snow: All under the Liberals.

Mr. Sargent: There is arson, break and entry, opening of mail—but not a single charge has been laid.

Hon. Mr. Snow: With the approval of the Liberals.

Mr. Sargent: I'm conscious of that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Are you on their side or on my side?

Mr. Sargent: Where were you before tonight, Jim? Did you come straight from home? Where did you come from? Have a bit more water; you need it.

We have great concerns in the area of the tax base in this province. We have our budget coming up next week and I feel you're going to see about a billion and a half dollar budget.

It's time that the people of Ontario had some decent government in this province.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very brief this evening because I want to get out to Scarborough West to celebrate with our colleagues and the press.

I'm glad to see the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) is here tonight. He holds the seat right near Scarborough West and I understand that he worked very hard with Richard Johnston and brought that riding in on his coat-tails.

Mr. Wildman: He is soon going to have a couple of people sitting beside him.

Mr. Cooke: I think the two by-elections the New Democratic Party won this evening are especially significant because, since the beginning of this session, the New Democratic Party has stressed the issue of health in this province. I have a feeling that the issue of universal medicare and adequate services in hospitals had a very significant impact in the two by-elections. I think that's one of the reasons we did so very well this evening. In the New Democratic Party we believe the health system in this province is threatened by the federal Liberal government and by the provincial Tory government. The New Democratic Party fought for universal medicare and it is the New Democratic Party that will fight to maintain universal medicare in this province and in this country.

I want to spend some time talking about some of the health-care problems in the city of Windsor because they adequately demonstrate the problems all across Ontario. When the minister took part in the emergency debate in the Legislature regarding the deterioration of our health care system, he spoke very proudly of the Windsor agreement which took place very recently among four hospitals in the city of Windsor and Essex county. He said that was a very significant agreement and that health care in Windsor and Essex county was now planned adequately and that the overlap of services and some of the problems that have existed in Windsor for a number of years would be solved.

I should point out one of the major hospitals in the city of Windsor—Metropolitan—did not take part and did not sign that agreement. That is a very significant thing. Also, the basic decisions of that agreement, namely, the number of active-treatment beds of four per 1,000 as of April 1 of this year and 3.5 as of April 1, 1979, were not made by local people and were not made by the local district health council. That decision was made by the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell).

It is the same old story. Decisions are made in Queen's Park, while the local people have the local information and know the local needs are not a part of that decision-making process. That is why the overall implementation of this four per 1,000 and 3.5 per 1,000 is going to be a failure. The people who know the needs of local communities are the local people.

If the Minister of Health really wanted to implement a plan that would work in Windsor, he would have said to the Windsor and Essex District Health Council: "Talk to the people of Windsor and Essex and find out what the needs are of those people. We are not going to tell you that it should be four per 1,000 or 3.5 per 1,000 active-treatment beds. We are going to let you make that decision and let you make that recommendation because you know your community best."

But, no, that is not what has happened. Some bureaucrat here in Toronto has said four this year and 3.5 in 1981 is what Windsor will have and for all the cities and municipalities in southern Ontario and in northern Ontario it will eventually be four per 1,000. That is not the way decisions should be made regarding the priorities of health to the people of Ontario.

Last Sunday 109 beds were to be closed in the city of Windsor to meet the four per 1,000. We closed those beds and we don't have the alternatives in Windsor. Where are the people to go who are at present in active-treatment beds? With respect to nursing homes in Windsor, we have a one-year waiting list to get a nursing-home bed. When they do get into a nursing home, we have a Nursing Homes Act and nursing-home inspections which are deficient in many areas.

I introduced a private member's bill in May 1977 that indicated the feeling in the New Democratic Party was that nursing homes should be non-profit, charitable corporations. I took a survey in my riding that indicated the vast majority of the people of Windsor agreed with that. I am sure there will be a time in the future when we will again introduce that. When the time comes that we don't just have an election involving two by-elections but a provincial election, one of these days the New Democratic Party will form a government and will set up a nursing-home system in this province where the first priority will be service, not profit.

Mr. Warner: The people will be heard.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You will be an old age pensioner. You will be in one of those homes.

Mr. Cooke: Rest homes are the other alternative in the city of Windsor for people at present in hospitals. Take a look at the rest homes in the city of Windsor and rest homes in this entire province. They are unregulated. The bylaws have to be passed by the local municipalities. There is no requirement for local municipalities to pass bylaws. They do it if they want to do it and then the inspections that take place are deficient in many areas.

I visited the rest homes in the city of Windsor on many occasions. Some of them are excellent. Some of them are very nice. If one looks at the per diem, the cost per day for the residents, they are very nice also.

The people who have to go in rest homes, and who have to rely on the welfare department or the social service department to pay for their per diem, they go in the second-rate rest homes. Those people who have large savings and can afford the per diem of \$50, sometimes more, per day, can go in the very expensive and extravagant rest homes and their needs are well taken care of; but the ordinary people who have their old age pension and their Gains cannot afford to go into the good rest homes in the city of Windsor or any other place across this province.

Chronic home care is another area that was very much lacking in the Minister of Health's agreement among the hospitals in Windsor. Chronic home care will not be implemented in the city of Windsor until this fall, and it will not be implemented unless savings have been realized by the agreement that was made among the hospitals.

So what have we done? We've eliminated 109 active-treatment beds; we're going to convert some into chronic-care beds, but we would like some people who could benefit from chronic home care and could make it on their own, to move out of the hospitals and we do not have chronic home care in the city of Windsor, we do not have adequate good rest-home beds and we do not have enough nursing-home beds.

So in my opinion, and in the opinion of the people of Windsor, what has happened is that the Minister of Health has put the cart before the horse. What he should have done is put the alternatives in place and then decided to close some active-treatment beds and transfer people into the appropriate settings. But no, the Minister of Health has instead decided to close the active-treatment beds without the appropriate alternatives being in place.

Recently in the city of Windsor the district health council decided to make a study of who was in each bed on a particular day—in all rest homes, nursing homes and hospital beds—to find out whether or not people were placed in these beds inappropriately. The results of that survey are not in, and yet again the Minister of Health has implemented very significant changes in the health-care system in the city of Windsor without really understanding and really knowing what those changes are going to be.

We don't know whether or not there are people inappropriately placed in nursing-home beds in the city of Windsor; we don't know that, because the results of the study are not yet in. We don't know whether there are people inappropriately placed in active-treatment beds in the city of Windsor, because the survey results are not in yet. We don't know whether there are people who are in chronic-care beds who need chronic-care beds, again because the survey results are just being fed into the computer and even the members of the Windsor and District Health Council do not know what that particular study will show.

I don't think the Minister of Health should have implemented the changes he has implemented without fully understanding and fully realizing what the present situation is in the city of Windsor and Essex county.

You can't close active-treatment beds, Mr. Speaker, unless you have the alternatives, as I have said; and you can't close active-treatment beds unless you know whether or not those 109 active-treatment beds that are at present being closed are needed in Windsor.

Recently I raised a problem within the Legislature about people who were being placed in emergency rooms and in hallways because there were not enough active-treatment beds, and that was before April 1 when 109 beds were to be closed. I had my legislative assistant call around to the various hospitals yesterday to find out what the effect has been since the beds have been closed. Members must realize that the beds were just closed on April 1, on Sunday.

At Hotel Dieu they tell me they haven't closed their beds yet, they're going to have to accept the financial penalty because they just don't think they can impose the closure of 35 beds that were supposed to be closed on the people of Windsor. They are going to attempt to cut back in other places to try to make up the savings, because as you know, Mr. Speaker, the ministry has de-

cided to impose I believe a \$12,000 or \$15,000 per year penalty on beds over the four per 1,000 ratio that the bureaucrats in the Ministry of Health have set.

So Hotel Dieu has found it impossible to implement this move, because they were one of the hospitals that on an average of three nights per week before the bed closures were having to use the emergency rooms and the hallways for people who normally would have been admitted but couldn't be because of the lack of beds.

Grace Hospital has closed its beds, but again they're having to use their emergency room, because of lack of beds, to admit people.

[9:00]

At Western they have had to cut back on all elective surgery. The waiting period for elective surgery is now extremely long in the city of Windsor. I can't impress enough on the members of the Legislature the stress that puts on an individual. They get ready to go into the hospital, the surgery is needed and they don't know when they can be admitted. They get themselves psyched up, they realize the surgery is necessary, but they can't have it done until a bed becomes available. At times their date is scheduled to be admitted, they get all ready to go in and then they find out that there is no bed available because of an emergency the night before and their surgery is cancelled.

At Metropolitan, I gather from the people I have talked to, the situation is most crucial. That is where the case that I raised in the Legislature took place, where a 78-year-old man, a Mr. Turski, went into emergency suffering from headache, shortness of breath, dizziness. They did an examination of him and the admitting doctor at emergency said that under normal circumstances he would have admitted Mr. Turski, but there were no beds available. The alternative then became whether to admit him into an emergency bed and keep him in emergency overnight or send him home and hope things were all right. He sent Mr. Turski home and four hours later that individual was dead.

There is a coroner's inquest that has been ordered into the case. Dr. Broadwell, the coroner who presided over this case, has quite clearly indicated in an article that appeared in the Windsor Star that he feels one of the contributing factors in the death of Mr. Turski was the fact there were no active-treatment beds available for this individual to be admitted for observation. Let me quote from the Windsor Star so the members of the government who are here tonight will

not think this is just a figment of the imagination of an opposition member:

"Coroner Dr. Douglas Broadwell has called an inquest for April 27 into the death of 78-year-old Anthony Turski of 1806 Alexis Road in Windsor because he believes overcrowding at Metropolitan Hospital was a factor in the death. Dr. Broadwell said overcrowding at the hospital was the reason for calling an inquest in response to concerns expressed by Mr. Turski's family. He said he personally feels the fact there were no beds available was a factor in the death."

That is pretty clear. But when I raised that point in the Legislature, the Premier (Mr. Davis) said I should be embarrassed to make such an accusation. I had talked to the coroner and I had talked to the emergency doctor and I knew what I was talking about.

The Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) said it was an irresponsible statement. I suggest—and I think the members of the opposition parties agree—the policies of this government that contributed to the death of Mr. Turski were irresponsible and should be changed.

The doctors in the city of Windsor have said in an article that appeared very recently in the Windsor Star that risks are being taken in the hospitals of Windsor—and I would assume in the hospitals of Ontario—that normally would not have been taken. Let me quote from an article that appeared in the Windsor Star on March 8 of this year. It says:

"Doctors say the Ontario-government cut-back in active-treatment hospital beds in Windsor is hurting the community and forcing doctors to make choices they should not have to make. But stacking them in emergency rooms is becoming more common and with 259 active beds scheduled for closure by 1981, one in every five in the city, the bed shortage can only get worse.

What it means to the community is a definite deterioration in health care, according to doctors interviewed by the Star. Dr. John Greenaway, president of the Essex County Medical Society, said he and other physicians are slowly being limited in seeking out the best possible care for each of our patients. 'It is possible the whole system could be jammed with patients requiring early admission.'"

The article goes on to say that doctors are taking legal and medical risks in the city of Windsor they never would have taken in the past. But because of the lack of active-treatment beds and the backup in emergency

rooms they are having to take these risks—risks that involve people's lives. As I said before, people are being forced to stay in hallways and emergency rooms when normally they would have been admitted.

Let me quote part of a letter I received from a constituent who had to bring his grandfather to a hospital to emergency. I think it gets the point across very well. It is addressed to the Minister of Health.

"On March 5, 1979, Dr. Yee from Windsor, Ontario, after examining my grandfather, Mr. Alfred Bellehumeur, decided to have him admitted to Hotel Dieu Hospital. My grandfather, accompanied by my father and myself, went to the emergency ward at approximately 5 p.m. on the above date. Please bear in heart and in mind while reading this letter that Mr. Bellehumeur, a lifetime resident of Ontario, is currently 88 years old and had never been admitted to a hospital. The experience of an emergency room can be uncomfortable, and not the most relaxed. Therefore, I am certain that you can empathize with the trauma this man, 88 years, underwent.

"The emergency ward was at the time filled beyond capacity and I was informed by the nursing supervisor that the medical staff was at a minimum. My grandfather was placed in a small room where he was examined by Dr. Gopinathan. At this time the physician confirmed a diagnosis of internal bleeding and that he should be admitted. An intravenous of plasma was then started.

"Approximately one half-hour later my grandfather had to be moved from his present room to another area as the examining area was needed for an overdose admission. Mr. Bellehumeur was then wheeled into a much larger room where his stretcher was parked beside six others, barely leaving enough room to walk alongside of any other bed.

"Dr. Gopinathan explained to me that there were not enough available beds in the entire hospital, and that my elderly grandfather would have to be placed in an out-patient room overnight."

The letter goes on to say what a stress this was on this 88-year-old individual, and how difficult it was that he had to stay in emergency in the out-patient room all night. He was moved the next day to a semi-private room, and then had to be moved again to a ward room.

I think we have to keep in mind, as the letter says, this 88-year-old individual had never been admitted to hospital in his life, and the first time that he had to be admitted, for a fairly serious problem that eventually was diagnosed as a bleeding ulcer, he had to stay in an emergency room overnight and go

through several transfers. That kind of pressure on the individual obviously could have a very serious effect on whether or not the person could come out of it without suffering maybe death, or at least making the problem much more complicated than it would be otherwise.

I would like to read briefly one other letter that I have received. I must say that over the course of the last number of weeks I have been flooded with a number of phone calls and letters that I have received on this particular problem in the city of Windsor. This letter is also addressed to the minister.

"I am writing to protest about the alarming deterioration in the health services in this province, brought about either by decisions made by your government or by its failure to take action. I refer of course to the continuing cutbacks in hospital services, to the \$9.80 per diem surcharge for hospital care after 60 days, and to the opting out of doctors from OHIP.

"Firstly, hospital cutbacks: In September I was taken to Grace Hospital in Windsor by ambulance because of an acute attack of back pain which immobilized me for five weeks. I was unable to stand for more than five minutes without pain, let alone walk or climb stairs. I was told very apologetically by the emergency-room doctor that I would probably need a series of tests in order to diagnose the problem and that these could probably be done in a day by the hospital, but they would have to arrange through my family doctor because, unfortunately, there were no beds available.

"Indeed, they were short of emergency-room facilities because they were occupied by patients who were awaiting admission. Certainly, my life was not endangered by failure to be admitted, but it required five days of trips to my doctor's office and to go to the downtown radiologist and to the orthopaedist's office. Each trip was followed by several hours of extreme pain from the aggravation of so much movement. During all of this, the treatment prescribed was complete bed rest. I have since discovered that my situation was by no means unusual in Windsor. So much for the alleged surplus of hospital beds."

The letter goes on to talk about the \$9.80 charge to chronic-care patients, as well as the doctors opting out. This is just another example of an individual who had to go through not just inconvenience but pain as a result of this government's lack of funding and lack of planning on hospitals in the city of Windsor. I think there are examples that apply to the rest of Ontario.

Let's also examine what the effects of these cutbacks have been on the workers in the hospitals of this province. A couple of weeks back, my leader came to Windsor and we met with a number of the unions and workers involved in the hospitals, along with my colleague the member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bounsall). The workers told us very clearly that what is happening in the hospitals is that the workmen's compensation cases have been increasing because the workers don't have two people to help move somebody from one bed to another. One worker has to do that, therefore there are more back injuries and other injuries in the workplace.

The emotional stress is incredible on the workers. The sick days that are being used by the people who work in our hospitals have also increased dramatically. I think the best description that any of the workers gave to my leader and to my colleague from Windsor-Sandwich was, "Hospitals used to be happy places to work; but now I get up in the morning and I have to go to my hospital to work and I don't want to, because it is no longer a happy place to work."

When a worker is not happy doing his job, then we all know what happens to the quality of the service; it obviously decreases.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Does that mean you're not happy in your job?

Mr. Cooke: I'm very happy in my job. I would be much happier if I were in the minister's position though, and we will be one of these days.

Mr. Rotenberg: Don't hold your breath. You won't be over here for half a century.

Mr. Grande: It won't take that long.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cooke: The way the members opposite are handling the problems in this province and the problems of health care, let me tell the House, they won't be there too long.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cooke: I do want to speak very briefly also about the problem of doctors opting out, because it is one and the same problem. I must start off by saying I think the doctors who are involved in the health insurance plan in this province do have some very legitimate complaints. The number of weeks they have to wait to be paid for their claims is incredible. They shouldn't have to wait that long. There must be a way of simplifying the bureaucracy and the number of forms they have to fill out. Other provinces have done so.

My leader in his response to the throne speech pointed out that in Saskatchewan only two per cent of the doctors have opted out. The doctors in that province don't seem to be dissatisfied, as they are here in Ontario. The fact is that Ontario, of all the provinces in this country, obviously has the most serious problem with doctors opting out. That is why, in the federal campaign, Ontario is the focus of the attack of our party for the erosion of universal access.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health, if he were here this evening, how the people of Amherstburg, for example, are going to benefit from the announcement he made last week. He said a Zenith number would be available and people from all over the province could phone and find out where a doctor who is opted in to the system is located so that they could then use the system.

The people of Amherstburg have six doctors; all of them have opted out. How will a direct line to Toronto to talk to the OMA benefit the people of Amherstburg? Quite clearly it won't benefit them at all. In fact an article appeared in the Windsor Star last week, after the Minister of Health made his statement. The headline read, "Timbrell says Ride to City for Doctors." I'll read part of the article:

"Amherstburg residents who want to go to a doctor still in OHIP will have to continue to drive to Windsor or somewhere else where one is available. The provincial government changes to the health-care procedures announced Thursday do not help the people living in communities like Amherstburg, where all doctors have left the health-care scheme."

[9:15]

The article goes on and it quotes the Minister of Health. It also quotes Dr. Vail, who is the president of the OMA. Both seem to indicate that driving 17 miles to Windsor shouldn't be all that difficult.

It may not be difficult for Dr. Vail, because I am sure he has one or more cars. It wouldn't be difficult for the Minister of Health, and it wouldn't even be difficult for me because I have a car. But how about a single-parent mother, for example, on mother's allowance through no fault of her own, who doesn't have and can't afford a car? How is that individual to travel from Amherstburg to Windsor? The public transportation between the two communities is very poor.

How is the senior citizen, who may not be able to drive because of poor eyesight or

doesn't like to drive during winter months because of the snow—something I think we can all understand—going to travel from Amherstburg to Windsor to find a doctor who's opted out?

Clearly, the announcement made by the Minister of Health last week will not solve the problem for the people of Amherstburg. It won't solve the problem for the people of Peterborough, where 70 per cent of doctors have opted out. It won't solve the problem for the people of Orillia where, I believe, 50 per cent have opted out. The Minister of Health is, obviously, from articles which appeared in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, having extreme difficulty in convincing doctors that this is a problem.

I think we also have to look at the number of specialists opting out. In Windsor, as of April 1, our only neurosurgeon, Dr. Kleider, opted out of OHIP. Where does that leave the people of Windsor when they need a neurosurgeon? They could maybe travel to London, which is 120 miles away. They could travel to Detroit but the cost there would be extremely high.

Let me give the House an example of what is going to happen to the people of Windsor—to individuals. There's an individual, Mr. Sayegh, in my riding who I assisted in getting a disability pension through the Ministry of Community and Social Services. He got his disability pension. I believe he and his wife and, I think, two children receive something in the neighbourhood of \$425 a month. That's what they have to live on. He can't work. He's totally disabled because of a back problem.

He had surgery performed on him by Dr. Kleider a number of months back. The surgery was not totally successful and further surgery is required. He had an appointment to go to see Dr. Kleider in March of this year. Dr. Kleider's office called and rescheduled the appointment for April. I'm not saying that necessarily had anything to do with the fact that Dr. Kleider was opting out on April 1. It was probably just a coincidence. But, nevertheless, when Dr. Kleider's office called, they indicated to Mr. Sayegh that it would be advisable for him to bring \$75 to pay for the office appointment. This individual has to put up \$75 from his own pocket to see Dr. Kleider, the only neurosurgeon in the city of Windsor.

There's no alternative. And all he gets is \$425 a month from the Minister of Community and Social Services on a disability pension. That is completely unacceptable to the people of Windsor. I should think it would even be unacceptable to the govern-

ment; I hope that it would be unacceptable to the government. There are going to be other cases similar to that. I hope to have the opportunity to raise them with the Minister of Health, either by letter or during the question period.

It is a real problem—doctors opting out. It is a real problem of doctors in certain specialties opting out. The statement by the Minister of Health last week that all services would be offered at the OHIP rate in hospitals doesn't comfort me at all because I don't know how it's going to be accomplished; the minister doesn't know how it's going to be accomplished; the OMA doesn't know how it's going to be accomplished; and the OHA doesn't know how it's going to be accomplished. I am really concerned for the people of Windsor and for the other people across this province who are experiencing similar situations.

If, in fact, the minister does get some kind of agreement with the OMA and the OHA and we have all services offered in hospital at the OHIP rate, I would suggest that what is going to happen is this. If the only way some people get medical care is by going to a hospital for that medical care, then they will use the hospital. I don't blame them. But the implications for the Ministry of Health budget are very significant.

What will happen is that they will be using the hospitals for their care; they will be using the hospitals and the emergency rooms. That is the most expensive way to get a checkup or to see someone about an earache or a throat infection. Services in hospitals should not be used for that purpose. We should be using family practitioners or clinics, because those are much more appropriate and much less expensive for the taxpayers of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've indicated to you and to the members of the Legislature some of the problems we're experiencing in Windsor with our health-care system. I do want to spend just a very few minutes on the area for which I'm critic for the New Democratic Party, the area of colleges and universities. I'm not going to go into it in any great length because it won't be too long before we'll be debating a bill to amalgamate the ministries of Colleges and Universities and Education, and I think we can get into that in great depth at that particular time.

I do want to point out that the level of funding to colleges and universities is also extremely inadequate at this time.

Mr. Grande: Is the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) ever coming back to the House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh, yes. She is out of the country on government business.

Mr. Cooke: Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker—I'm sure you'll appreciate this—that some of the universities, in particular the small universities, are suffering very severely from the cutbacks by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and by this government.

For example, Brock University in St. Catharines, a university that should be close to the heart of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Welch), got an increase of only 4.9 per cent in its operating grant for 1978-79—that despite the fact that inflation is running around nine per cent, close to 10 per cent. Really, inflation for colleges and universities is running well over 10 per cent, because energy costs have increased well over 10 per cent and the cost of paper and other supplies has increased well over 10 per cent. Therefore the inflation rate for colleges and universities is really much higher than the nine-point-something per cent that is reflected by the CPI.

Carleton got only a 3.6 per cent increase in their operating grants for 1978-79; Guelph got only 4.5 per cent; Lakehead, 4.6 per cent. I note that the Minister of Northern Affairs is here this evening. Lakehead, a university in northwestern Ontario, got only—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a great institution.

Mr. Cooke: It is a great institution. I had the pleasure of visiting it last fall.

Mr. Grande: You are starving them to death.

Mr. Cooke: But those people over there are starving it—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Enrolment is up; everybody is happy.

Mr. Cooke: —and if they stay in power for many more years they'll see the doors of that university close because of your inadequate funding.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No way; dedicated, loyal people.

Mr. Cooke: Laurentian University, another northern university, got a 4.6 per cent increase. So much for the commitment to northern Ontario by the Minister of Northern Affairs.

McMaster University got a 3.7 per cent increase in their operating grants. Maybe that's one of the reasons the people of Wentworth from the Hamilton area tonight decided to elect a New Democratic Party member instead of a government member.

Trent University, a university that's represented in this House now by a Tory member, got only a 2.3 per cent increase in its operating grants. Not only have 70 per cent of the area's doctors opted out of OHIP and not only is the government trying to destroy their universal access to the medical care system, but the government's also trying to destroy their universal access—a right that should exist in this province—to post-secondary education.

Mr. Grande: The member is not doing his work.

Mr. Cooke: The University of Western Ontario got only 4.9 per cent. The University of Windsor, a university that has special significance to me, Mr. Speaker, got a 3.5 per cent increase in its operating grants—that in the light of well over a 10 per cent increase in the cost of living for universities. Finally, York University got only 4.1 per cent. Those are the universities that got under five per cent increases in their operating grants for 1978-79.

What's happening is that universities like Trent and Brock—well, I would think that this government will never close a university outright. The former Minister of Colleges and Universities who was here a few minutes ago made the commitment last year in estimates that they will not close any universities. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, they'll do the same thing to the small universities that they're doing to the small hospitals of this province. They won't close them; they'll starve them. And the local boards of governors will have to make those decisions themselves.

When you continually have to stop offering courses and close down programs because of a lack of money to finance those programmes and courses, the only alternative is to close the institution. There does come a point where a university is no longer a university because of the lack of variety of courses that's offered.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that universities like Trent and Brock, Laurentian and Lakehead are going to be in that position very shortly, if they're not in it already. I visited all those institutions, all four of them, and I know their situation. I know the plight they're in. They're not any longer cutting fat, they're now cutting muscle. They're now cutting programs, and they're now into a cycle that's going to be difficult to stop. When you cut a course, that makes the institution not quite as attractive as it was before and then enrolments decline. And when enrolments decline because of the formula

funding we have for universities in this province, you're cut back further from less funding. So it's a never-ending cycle.

Mr. Grande: No wonder the students refuse to go to universities. We are losing them.

Mr. Cooke: I think what we have to do is to look very seriously at the method of funding for universities in this province. We have to go into something different from the formula funding, which not only penalizes small universities by declining enrolment, but also creates competition between universities. We see now advertisements by the University of Toronto, by York University, by Windsor University—all the universities—attempts to compete with each other. You can't blame them, because the formula funding encourages that, but the fact is they are competing with taxpayers' money.

I've said it before and I'll say it again: I don't mind Ford competing with Chrysler and GM, with their money, but I don't like the idea of taxpayers' money being spent to compete among public institutions. I think that's a misuse of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Grande: As long as they compete with one another they won't put pressure on the government.

Mr. Cooke: The other sad thing about the present situation is that the universities, when they are competing with each other for bodies, are competing for the same 62 per cent of grade 13 graduates who have always attended university. The participation rate among working-class students has not increased over the last number of years. We have the same types of students attending university today as we had 10 years ago. We have more of them, but the same types.

I would really like to see an effort on the part of this government, by funding. There can be financial incentives for universities to get into special programs to encourage students from working-class families to enter the post-secondary system. But we can get into that in great depth during the debate on the bill to amalgamate the two ministries and the estimates debate that will be coming up shortly.

I want to spend a little bit of time on one institution in particular that has received considerable press but has offered something—

Mr. Grande: I hope the minister will be here for that.

Mr. Gregory: What happened to restraint?

Mr. Cooke: Restraint for what?

Mr. Gregory: What you said in your speech.

Mr. Cooke: I'm sorry, but when one looks at the problems in this province it's difficult for an opposition member to talk for only a short period of time because there are so many of them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What are the alternatives? There is no alternative but doom and gloom; no ideas, no imagination, no creative ability.

Mr. Gregory: And you have nothing to say anyway.

Mr. Cooke: Ryerson, an institution in this province that has contributed far and beyond what many institutions have contributed, is being starved by provincial funding. Ryerson got only a 5.4 per cent increase in operating grants last year and as a result is suffering and suffering significantly. There was an article that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday outlining some of the problems.

Let me read from the throne speech just one short paragraph and then go on to talk about Ryerson just for a few minutes. This is from the throne speech: "The present education structure does not meet fully today's needs for highly skilled persons in the manufacturing and service industries. In answer to this need, my government will implement a comprehensive business and industrial training program involving our secondary schools, colleges, organized labour and the business community."

I would agree with that goal, but I would suggest Ryerson is one institution in this province that produces graduates that are needed in our economy. The programs offered at Ryerson are directly related to the needs in our province and in the economy, and it's quite clear the types of graduates that come from Ryerson are needed in the economy because they're placed in jobs. Their job placement record is second to none in this province. The applications for that institution for first year are something like 12,000 when they can accept just over 3,000.

What is this government doing? In the throne speech it says it's committed to producing students and graduates who are needed in the economy and who come out with practical skills, yet it is starving Ryerson. It is starving them to the point where the president of that institution has indicated that 70 to 100 part-time faculty members are going to have to be laid off this fall unless something changes.

[9:30]

Last year there was quite a fuss made about the metallurgy program that might be

cut out of that institution. Thank goodness some interim funding was made available by the institution itself; they went to private industry and got some funding. That is not going to be ongoing funding. That institution is in trouble.

They get funding on the basic income unit which is comparable for Ryerson to an arts and science student. The fact of the matter is, the cost to put a student through Ryerson is much higher than it is for an arts and science student. It is much more expensive because of the equipment needed and because of the low faculty-student ratio which is so very important to an institution like Ryerson.

While the low faculty-student ratio is very important, the fact of the matter is that ratio has increased dramatically over the last number of years. I am trying to locate how much of an increase we have experienced at Ryerson. In 1971-72 the ratio was 14.5 to one at Ryerson. Because of the inadequate funding at that institution, the ratio has now increased to 16.1 to one.

In Britain, where they have quite a number of polytechnics, the ratio is eight to one. I would suggest to you that if a polytechnic is going to turn out quality graduates, we have to have a small faculty-student ratio in order to make sure what they learn can be very intense and a number of hours of individual attention that an instructor can give to the student is available.

In ending, I would like to say over the next number of weeks the Ryerson issue will be raised time and time again. I am looking forward to the day the Minister of Education returns to the House so we can question her on this. I look forward to the debate which will be taking place when the legislation to amalgamate Colleges and Universities and Education comes before this House.

I can indicate to you now, Mr. Speaker, one of the things this party will be attempting to do is to refer the bill to amalgamate the two ministries to the social development committee, so trustees of local boards of education, as well as boards of governors members, presidents of universities and colleges and Ryerson, as well as students, can all come before the social development committee, and talk about the amalgamation and the inadequate funding taking place in our education system in this province.

Education is critical to an industrial strategy. Ryerson is critical to an industrial strategy in this province and in this country and I certainly hope the meeting which will be taking place between Ryerson officials

and the Minister of Education in the next few weeks will bear fruit. I hope the government recognizes Ryerson is a unique institution which requires unique attention and unique funding.

I have been very pleased to participate in this throne speech debate and, as I say, I look forward to discussing these issues during question period and debates on particular pieces of legislation.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The honourable member for Kenora.

Mr. Gaunt: Bringing in the heavies again.

Mr. Havrot: Physically or mentally?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It has been some time since I entered a throne debate in this legislature. I checked my records and I believe it is the first time since the Speaker of this House was elevated to his post that I have had the opportunity to speak in a throne debate.

Mr. Gaunt: That's the reason for the bou-tonnière.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I want to take the opportunity to congratulate you, sir, on your selection for that very important post and of course to commend you on the excellent manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this House for the past several months. Sometimes we all share with you the onerous responsibilities you have. We realize your task is not an easy one; it's most difficult on many occasions. I'm sure the compliments you receive from both sides of the House are warranted and certainly justified. I think, Mr. Speaker, your control of the Legislature has been one of justice and fairness. I think as northerners we are doubly proud of your selection. In fact some of us in northern Ontario like to think it's your moose-calling voice that comes to keep law and order in this Legislature—

Mr. Wildman: It's his conductor's voice.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —when those on the other side of the House are so unruly and so noisy.

For that very unique quality you've not only brought pride to your specific area, but I say to you in all sincerity—

Mr. Peterson: How do you feel about John MacBeth?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —you've brought a great deal of pride to all of us who live in northern Ontario.

Mr. Peterson: I will tell you his is the smartest and most successful one. I will tell you that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: On a very serious note: Last fall we in this Legislature lost a very

close friend, a colleague, a dedicated public figure. To all of us he was just a great guy. I'm sure you realize I'm referring to the late John Rhodes, the former member for Sault Ste. Marie.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, he was a very close friend of mine. He was my seat-mate in this Legislature. He was my parliamentary assistant for a number of years and one on whom I depended for a great deal of support, consultation and advice on many northern issues.

I want the record to show that it has been several months since he passed away. I also want the record to show very clearly that those of us in this Legislature have not forgotten him. We have not forgotten his wit, we have not forgotten his humour, his sincerity, his love for his community and for his province. I can assure his wife and family that he will be ever remembered by those of us in this Legislature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The late John Rhodes has been replaced in this Legislature by a very able individual by the sound-thinking people of Sault Ste. Marie. He is a northerner who has excelled not only in his own community, but right across northern Ontario and indeed the entire province.

I want to extend to him my very personal compliments on his victory in that very important by-election. I also wish to compliment him on his maiden speech in this Legislature, when he seconded the speech from the throne. Following that speech, I had the pleasure of mingling with my colleagues and some of the members of the opposition. I want to put on the record today a comment I heard after the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Ramsay) made his maiden speech. The comment was, "another northern star has been born." I'm sure you'll agree with me when I say there is a long and productive career ahead for the new member for Sault Ste. Marie in this Legislature.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the efforts of our other new member, the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson). His excellent presentation during his motion for accepting the speech from the throne was certainly indicative of the type of remarks and presentations we in this Legislature have been used to accepting from the riding of Chatham-Kent—truly in Chatham-Kent style. I predict too, that he will have a long, fruitful and productive life here in the Legislature, as did his predecessor, Darcy McKeough.

Earlier tonight, I believe one of the former speakers mentioned that the by-election was

one in which he could take pride, one in which his party had elected two members.

Mr. Wildman: Elie is going to take a little more than that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just want to put on the record some facts and figures that clearly display that the Progressive Conservative Party of this province is on the upswing again.

Mr. Martel: You ran on Ian Deans' shirt-tail and name.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We fought the Chatham-Kent by-election with success.

Mr. Wildman: You even used our colours.

Mr. Martel: Since when did you use yellow and brown?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We fought the Sault Ste. Marie by-election with success and I can say that we fought the Wentworth by-election with, indeed, a great deal of success—

Mr. Martel: That is why our guys are here and yours are sitting at home.

Mr. Hennessy: No violence, Elie, no violence.

Mr. Martel: That is the kind of success I like.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —because in 1975 the New Democratic Party member was elected by some 9,000 plurality.

Mr. Wildman: How much did Darcy win by compared to Watson?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In 1977 the New Democratic Party representative was elected by a 10,000 plurality and in 1979, in this by-election, he was elected by about a 400 plurality.

Mr. Martel: Will you give us the same figures for Chatham-Kent?

Mr. Wildman: Will you give us the same figures for Chatham-Kent?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The trend is truly there; the swing is to the Tory party of Ontario in the last three by-elections.

I am most pleased that we on this side of the House—

Mr. Cooke: Tell us about Chatham-Kent.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —can take a great deal of pride in the quality of the candidates that we had and the success that they have shown at the polls today—

Mr. Martel: Our guys will be sitting here and yours will be at home.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and I know the members behind me want to extend to both of those candidates our sincerest congratulations and, of course, compliments on their efforts.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: We'll win them next time.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We certainly will. The trend is there and I would predict that following the results of Chatham-Kent and Sault Ste. Marie and, indeed, of Wentworth—

Mr. Wildman: You had two before and we had two before. Now you have still got two and we have got two.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —that we will not see from the other side of the House any thrust for a provincial election until, as my leader said, 1981.

Mr. Havrot: We will have another rump there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They will be scared to go to the polls because the trend is there, the feeling out there is for those of us on this side of the Legislature.

Mr. Martel: Come out now and vote on Monday.

Mr. Worton: How far out?

Mr. Martel: Come and vote on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Two-two; four-zero.

Mr. Martel: I like that.

Mr. Wildman: You had two before and we had two. We have still got two.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am most pleased to take part in this debate on the speech from the throne, a speech which in my view was one of the most thoughtful expressions of concern for the future of Ontario we have heard in this House for some time.

Her Honour has presented us with a number of challenges which all of us in this House, I am sure, wish to consider carefully as we approach the current session of this Legislature.

Mr. Wildman: The Year of the Child.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The first of these is a concern for the continued economic viability of Ontario as a leader among provinces in pointing directions which other jurisdictions may wish to pursue. She has stressed to us the need to re-assess our goals, our priorities and our ways of looking at our economy, our social concerns and our place within Confederation, and she has challenged us to be both realistic and responsive to the changes which have taken place all around us.

These changes are reflected in increasingly difficult world markets upon which we have normally relied, particularly in the United States, and which are changing in response to new pressures placed upon the United States and are reflected in inflation, energy shortages and loss of its competitive position in key industries.

All members of this House share a number of concerns, regardless of our political affiliation. We all wish to see greater strides to ensure social and economic justice for all our citizens of this province. We all wish to see a greater utilization of the wealth to guarantee to those less able to provide for themselves a fair share of our provincial wealth.

Mr. Martel: But?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We wish to see a greater equalization of services to all regions of this province; the north, the eastern and western regions, so that our programs are equally available to all our citizens. Where we differ we do so because of the different priorities which we place on those to be achieved and the means that are best suited to achieve them.

[9:45]

As a northerner, I am particularly concerned about the needs of my constituents and all those who live in small communities, some of them isolated communities, such as Sachigo—well known to you, Mr. Speaker—Ogoki, Deer Lake, Big Trout Lake, Armstrong, Nakina, Minaki, my own home town of Hudson, which do not as yet have a municipal organization able to represent their citizens in day-to-day dealings with the provincial government. I am concerned also with the larger northern communities, such as Atikokan, Manitouwadge, Marathon, Dryden and Kenora, all of which depend on a single-resource for a major part of their employment opportunities and their economic viability.

Hudson is perhaps an excellent example of a community which has known prosperity and adversity from the time it was founded to serve as a transportation base for supplies being shipped to the Red Lake gold camp, a role which has long since vanished. For a number of years Hudson existed as a dormitory community to Sioux Lookout until a viable forest product company began operations. Since then it has known every fluctuation in the woods industry—at times prosperous, at times holding and hoping that an upturn in the market would occur before the inevitable shutdown.

Like other small communities, Hudson's single forestry industry has known a number of owners, some better than others in their understanding of how to operate in the north. But through all these experiences the community and its people developed a degree of resourcefulness, independence of spirit, and determination to survive.

Mr. Martel: In desperation.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Sometimes. Growing up in a community such as Hudson has brought home to me the fundamentally important role government plays in the day-to-day lives of people. Governments that are remote from the north cannot possibly understand the concerns of its people or respond to the changing forces of the economy. Changes of only a few cents in the value of minerals, timber products, fur prices, fish prices, higher gasoline and heating oil costs, hydro costs and taxation policies can mean the difference between employment and unemployment, a sound community industry or no industry at all.

If northerners place a higher priority on jobs in primary-resource industries than other citizens of this province, it is because we have lived through literally dozens of fluctuations in our economy. We know all too well the consequences of changes in world prices for minerals. Northerners also feel a strong loyalty to the land, its resources and the part these resources play in the economy of Canada as a whole. We also feel a strong sense of community identity and, more often than not, we tend to return to our home community to live and raise our families.

It is because of this pride in being northerners that we at times look impatiently upon our critics in other parts of this province who seem to feel that we exist for their pleasure—a fishing resource to be kept for them, a wilderness to be screened from development for their interests and for their needs, not our own. Because of the vast distances which separate northern communities from each other and from our provincial capital, we have traditionally felt neglected, isolated and apart from the decision-making process of the government.

When I was first elected to this House in 1966, I travelled back and forth to my constituency by train. Because of the travel time—about 30 hours—I was only able to go home a few times each year. Today I can travel to Kenora, Dryden, Sioux Lookout or Hudson each week. All of these communities are as far from Toronto as Halifax, Nova Scotia, or Memphis, Tennessee, or Tampa, Florida. That this is possible reflects a significant change which has taken place within Ontario and here at Queen's Park in basic attitudes towards the north.

Over the past number of years this government has listened to the needs of northerners more carefully than any previous administration in history. The Premier of this province, during the years that he served as Minister of Education, was a frequent visitor to the

north. He showed his interest and his concern through support he gave us in providing funding for educational institutions which are now equal to any in Ontario; by holding cabinet meetings in the north; policy field meetings in the north; meetings with the chambers of commerce; with unions in the north; and with municipal associations. In many other ways, this government has shown its concern and its interest in the north, an interest which has been reflected in new highways, new airstrips, new hospitals, new telecommunications installations, and sewer and water projects in many small communities. Perhaps most important, this government has affirmed the right of northerners to participate directly in the decision-making process.

I also feel northern members of this House have worked well together in putting forward the needs of the north; members like yourself, Mr. Speaker, the member for Rainy River, and the members for Sudbury and Algoma-Manitoulin. Indeed, all the members on this side of the House have put forward policy suggestions which have been reflected in the decisions this House has taken to benefit northerners.

As I mentioned earlier we have differences about our priorities. I feel the emphasis Her Honour has placed on the need to promote the economic wellbeing of the province as a whole by strengthening the private sector, deregulating government programs and encouraging plant modernization in the pulp and paper industry, is of fundamental importance.

Right now, in my own riding, the Reed mill at Dryden is a source of great concern, not only to this government and to the members of this House, but to all the residents of Dryden and northern Ontario. The Reed mill is the main employer of that community, and the wealth which it creates is the base economy for that entire community. This mill, like a great many others in this province, is an old mill which needs to be modernized and made more efficient, not only to protect the environment of the north but to be competitive in today's market.

I must confess to a certain impatience, which I share with the residents of Dryden, when I have to listen to the critics of Reed because of the narrowness of a vision they have of the needs of this community. Indeed, at times there is a callous disregard of these needs. There are some here in the south who would like to see this mill closed because they do not like the Reed company; or because of a narrow political point of view that

Reed, because it's a foreign-based multinational company, should be kicked out of Canada and the mill taken over by Ontario.

I am far less interested in the base operation of Reed or the location of its boardroom than I am in making sure this company behaves as a responsible corporate citizen, obeys the laws of this country and the laws of this province; and provides social and economic security for the many thousands of people who are its employees and who serve them.

Right now the company, like other pulp and paper companies, is enjoying a mild period of prosperity; not because it has been able to modernize its plants and lower its costs, but because of the weakening Canadian dollar. This is small comfort for a government or a Reed employee. If our paper industry cannot get its house in order right now, there is very little likelihood that it will survive the inevitable downturn that will come when the dollar strengthens and we again have to compete against mills in the United States which are newer and have considerably lower wood costs than our mills can achieve.

To be realistic, the time has come for government to take a longer view of the needs, not of this industry, but of the men and women who make up its work force—people who live in the north and are determined to continue living in the north. If the government listens to some critics of this industry who would hobble it, nationalize it or destroy it in some other way for the sake of environmental purity, this would have catastrophic consequences on literally dozens of small communities such as Dryden. Nor do I believe it is the proper role of government to take over major resource industries and invest hundreds of millions of public dollars, obtained through taxation, to do what the private sector can do best, if given leadership by government.

Mr. Wildman: And yet you are giving them grants.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The time has come for government to take advantage of the profitability this industry is now experiencing to require that some of these profits now be reinvested to help guarantee that Dryden, Kenora, the mill at Sault Ste. Marie and many other communities, will continue to have a pulp and paper industry for many years from now on.

Mr. Wildman: What about the sawmills?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, the sawmills too.

The formula which the government has developed—a formula of assistance on the

ratio of \$1 for every \$3 invested by the company—is I feel a responsible position to take, providing that the government remains in control of the direction of these investment funds to ensure that the public's long-term interest in these mills is protected.

A few weeks ago members of the resources development committee heard Mayor Tommy Jones of Dryden put the case for his community in his very eloquent terms. I felt that the committee listened carefully to him and I congratulate both the chairman of that committee and its members for the concern they showed for the needs of the town of Dryden.

At that time Mayor Jones suggested that members of the committee visit Dryden and see the town for themselves, visit the Reed mill and meet local residents to clarify in their own minds the needs of this community. I support Mayor Jones in this suggestion. I would invite any interested members of this Legislature to visit Dryden and to spend enough time in the area to visit other communities as well, communities such as Minaki—we all know what's going on in Minaki.

Mr. Martel: Yes, nothing.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There will be, just give us a few weeks.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You will be sorry you said that, Elie.

Mr. Martel: Will I? I hope so. Did you get a buyer?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is another community solely dependent upon a single resource industry, the tourist industry. And Atikokan in the riding of my friend from Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid) a community experiencing the consequences of depletion of mining resources. We can take a Nordair 737 and fly first to the riding of the new member for Sault Ste. Marie—

Mr. Lawlor: Surely a minister of the crown doesn't read his speeches?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh, this one is so important I had to get it on the record. I didn't want to get interjections from the opposition, so I thought I would put my remarks down and make sure that they were properly recorded.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you just hand them to her and she will record them and have them printed in Hansard?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And then to the riding of the new member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy) and then land at the Dryden municipal airport in my own riding. However, we will have to book well in advance, because Nordair is now generating 20 per cent more traffic on this run than Transair did a year ago—

Mr. Wildman: Because it's owned by the government.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and despite the fact that they are using larger aircraft it is not always easy to get a seat.

Mr. Martel: Good government project, eh?

Mr. Wildman: Joe Clark wants to sell Nordair.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would hope the members of the House would come to Dryden before any hard decisions are taken which could affect the well-being of that community.

I would hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) would come with us; he has said he would. It would add to his knowledge and his understanding of the north and perhaps it would help him to develop a more sympathetic and more flexible attitude to the basic needs of northerners.

Mr. Peterson: He knows more about the north than you will ever know. He can understand more in five minutes than you will ever learn in a year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, made a trip to Sault Ste. Marie and said he hoped he would never have to return.

An hon. member: That was Transair!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: With all his weaknesses and all his faults, I still extend my invitation to him to visit northeastern Ontario and northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Haggerty: What about Minaki Lodge?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Minaki Lodge? I said earlier today, sir, that the member for Erie would be first on my list of those to be invited, because it's going to be a gala opening in the not too distant future.

In her speech Her Honour also recognized the strategic importance of tourism to the Ontario economy. She noted that last year this industry experienced a 16 per cent growth in revenue. The government has committed itself to an expanded promotional program instituted by my former colleague and that great northerner, the late John Rhodes. The "We treat you royally" program has been accepted by this industry as one of the most effective promotional programs this province has ever known.

This past weekend I had the opportunity of visiting the Minneapolis sports show to meet all the tourist operators from northern Ontario who are participating in this year's show. If the enthusiasm that they reflected from the response they are receiving in Minneapolis and a few weeks ago at Milwaukee translates into border crossings and bookings at our camps, the northwest tourism operat-

ors, in 1979, will have one of the best years they have known.

[10:00]

Many of the operators were displaying "We treat you royally" badges and other badges distributed by my ministry—"Travel north", "Fish north" and many others.

Tourism in the north is everyone's business. The retail merchants, the restaurant owners, the automobile service attendants; all profit from tourism. What has been lacking has been a training program for employees in this industry and this year the government intends to offer training programs for 25,000 of these people.

After leaving Minneapolis I went to Thunder Bay to announce there the capital highway construction program for this year, which was also announced in Sault Ste. Marie by my colleague and parliamentary assistant, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane).

Mr. Peterson: Another great Canadian, John Lane.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In this House you will recall that my colleague the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) made a similar announcement.

Mr. Haggerty: Tell us about your new office in—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This year's highway construction projects total \$52,000,000—a significant increase over last year, about \$1,500,000. The total value of projects, including those initiated last year, comes to approximately \$90,000,000.

I might say that in addition to the \$52,000,000 which was in the regular highway capital construction program, we in the Ministry of Northern Affairs—for your information, Mr. Speaker, since I'm sure those of us who live in northern Ontario would be interested to know this—my ministry will add from the regional priority budget another \$11,000,000. So we can see about \$63,000,000 of new construction begun in the north in this fiscal year.

The lack of an adequate transportation policy for the north restrained our development for decades, as we all know. Not too long ago travel between communities was severely and seriously restricted, just because it took so long to travel the dusty, gravel roads which separated us.

In the far north, residents of our isolated communities did not have a year-round source of supply because they were dependent on float-equipped or ski-equipped aircraft. This year three more of these communities will have their first air strip—Deer Lake, Sachigo and Ogoki.

You would be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, because I believe Ogoki is in your own riding, that we will be parachuting bulldozers into Ogoki, through an arrangement with the federal government. It is the only means of getting equipment into that community. Also in your riding, we will be extending the length of the air strip at Pickle Lake.

Mr. Haggerty: Any new fire trucks?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes. We will also pave the highway shoulders from Keewatin to the Manitoba border. We will widen more miles of the Red Lake road; we will build 16 new passing lanes throughout the north and we will improve air strip facilities at Geraldton—all important parts of a dramatically improved transportation network for the north.

Just as northerners in this province have needs which are unique to them, so too have the residents of southern Ontario who account for by far the majority of the citizens of this province. Very similar conditions exist in our sister provinces.

In recognition of our common concerns, ministers responsible for northern affairs met for the first time last fall in Fort McMurray, Alberta. The conference resulted from a number of visits I had made to ministers in several provinces of Canada shortly after the Ministry of Northern Affairs was established. I'm particularly pleased to announce that Ontario will host a similar conference at Thunder Bay from September 5 to September 7 of this year, again focusing attention on northern Ontario. These conferences are designed to be relatively informal to permit ministers to share with each other both the problems they encounter and the steps each is taking to deal with them. Last fall was our first meeting.

A great deal of discussion centred on identifying our major concerns. Some approaches taken in other jurisdictions differ from those taken in this province in the degree to which responsibility is assumed by the province for the administration of unorganized communities. Some provinces emphasize a co-ordinating role; others, direct administration; and some provinces designate regional development priorities as a major focus of attention. Our approach in the Ministry of Northern Affairs was to attempt to achieve a balance between direct financial responsibility for projects we identified as being of importance to northern communities, such as our regional priorities program, our highway capital program, the access roads program, and encouraging development of local service boards made up of local residents.

Mr. Haggerty: What about that nickel policy for—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It will come.

Mr. Grande: Is that a rose in your lapel there?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a beautiful carnation to celebrate our success in Wentworth tonight.

We will have an opportunity to discuss each of these approaches in greater detail at another time, but I think it is important, in the context of this debate, to point out the approach that we have taken in this House. The establishment of the Ministry of Northern Affairs has given us perhaps the most comprehensive and effective means of dealing with the unique needs of the north to be found anywhere in Canada.

This ministry, which I am pleased to head, is only two years old and has a long way to go before we'll be able to fully assess the wisdom of the course we have taken. However, it is also the first time any government in this country has attempted to respond so directly to the individual needs of a region.

Mr. Haggerty: What have you done?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Our staff is small in numbers and I hope it will always remain small, because we are not, and should not be, attempting to duplicate the responsibility of other ministries.

Mr. Haggerty: Time.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Time? Where was I?

Mr. Cureatz: Your staff; you hope it stays small.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We certainly don't want to duplicate the responsibilities of other ministries of government which appear to be taking any responsibility away from municipal governments and boards. We see ourselves as a catalyst for northern communities, providing the necessary financial resources to make things happen that otherwise would not be funded at all, such as participation in the Hornepayne Mall; the development of municipal medical clinics; a bursary program for medical and dental students—programs which cut across each of the policy fields and other ministries and which are designed by northerners to benefit northerners. Undoubtedly, we will make mistakes. We are far from perfect, as I am reminded from time to time by members of this House. But we are trying, to the best of our ability, to work with each community, whether it has an organized structure or not.

We have worked closely with the federal government's DREE program. Last year I

was pleased to sign, on behalf of the province, DREE subsidiary agreements totalling more than \$90,000,000 for essential services in the north. These Ontario DREE projects are currently important for the north and they provide both governments with a greater degree of flexibility in meeting local needs than has ever been the case in the past.

We can, on the one hand, share the cost of the upgrading of the airport at Kenora, owned and operated by the federal government; on the other hand, we can invest millions of dollars in sewer and water services. I do not feel we in Ontario have benefited as generously as we should in the DREE program. I have made this point on a number of occasions with officials from the federal government, and I intend to pursue this matter further after May 22.

Speaking about the May 22 event, I just want to make a brief comment concerning my period as a backbencher and as a member of the select committee on election laws. I have to admit I was a little taken aback when I read the Prime Minister's announcement that there would be a federal election on May 22. When I read further that this was a 59-day election campaign and it would cost this country in excess of \$50,000,000, and when I recalled the 37 days the statutes allow for the calling of a provincial election in this province, it struck me very very forcibly that the time period is far too long.

As all members realize, since those statutes went into place and those laws went into the record books we have television coverage of both legislatures; the House of Commons has the daily debates televised right across Canada. I think it is fair to say the members of the House of Commons, and indeed the members of this Legislature, are receiving far more resources today than they did five or 10 years ago to assist them in communicating with their constituents on a regular basis.

As members are well aware, the transportation system of this province and this country has improved tremendously. It is no longer difficult to get from Ottawa to Vancouver or from Toronto to Kenora. We can do that in a minimum amount of time. We can move very effectively around this country and this province.

Mr. Haggerty: That's not by air from Niagara. It takes three hours to get to Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Our airstrip development program in the remote areas of northern Ontario makes it much easier for all candidates of all parties to move around. I am convinced

that 59 days for an election campaign at the federal scene and 37 days at the provincial scene are far in excess of what is needed. Something like 30 days for a federal election campaign would be more realistic.

Mr. Haggerty: Nineteen days.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It struck me more forcibly than ever because I had to say to myself, what else can they possibly say? We have been on the verge of a federal election now for 18 months? The leaders have said it all; what else can they say? They'll first repeat what they said in the last 18 months.

I am in a similar position to those across this Legislature and across this province.

Mr. Gaunt: How are you going to vote?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: My mind is made up.

Mr. Wildman: What are you going to do for Ralph Stewart?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They don't need 59 days to tell me how to vote. We as legislators should recognize the intelligence of the public out there. They don't need 59 days to be convinced how to vote.

Mr. Peterson: It's not the intelligence of the electorate of Ontario you should be worried about.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, we are not.

Mr. Wildman: It is going to take the Tories 59 days to make Ralph Stewart the candidate in Cochrane.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are doing an injustice to the public out there. They are more intelligent than that.

Mr. Peterson: There is no question about that. They are much smarter than you are.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We as legislators should start recognizing that and shorten up that period. Other jurisdictions have two-week and three-week elections, and we should have that too. That is my feeling.

Mr. Grande: Is that the essence of your speech?

Mr. Peterson: What are you going to do about Ralph Stewart? That is what I really want to know from you. Will you trade him for the Minister of Industry and Tourism. (Mr. Grossman)?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No way. Never, never.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thanks.

Mr. Wildman: What about Jack Horner?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The late Jack Horner?

Mr. Wildman: The question is, will Clark appoint Ralph Stewart to the Vatican?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, when I say we have a great deal of catching up to do all over

northern Ontario. I hear suggestions in this House that more attention should be paid to the need for secondary industry in northern Ontario. It is true, but unless essential services such as sewer and water, highways, airports, schools and hospitals are in place—not just planned but in place—it is impossible to have a viable secondary industry locate in northern Ontario.

In North Bay and in Sault Ste. Marie we are funding industrial parks, and also in Parry Sound, as members are very much aware. We are improving the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission. We have expanded new ferry service from Tobermory to Manitoulin Island. I could go on at length as it relates to those particular items.

We have a long way to go before we can be satisfied that the needs of northern Ontario are completely met. As I have said, I would like to see a much greater interest in the needs of northern Ontario on the part of the federal government. I will say on that point, Mr. Speaker, as you are from northwestern Ontario, we have consistently returned federal Liberals to the House of Commons. Believe me, you know what we get from the federal government. They close up a post office here and there and they give us a wharf. They give us a little dock once in a while. That is about all we get in northern Ontario.

I would predict to the men in the opposition across the way that there will be a change in northern Ontario this year, there will be a change. We have had it right up to here.

Mr. Haggerty: Now you sound like Rene Levesque.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, not a new province, but a new way of thinking when it comes to selecting our representatives.

[10:15]

As I said, I would like to see a much greater interest in the needs of northern Ontario on the part of the federal government. I would like this interest reflected in development dollars which we are prepared to match on an equal basis, on a 50-50 basis.

We need improved telecommunications throughout the north. Far too many communities are locked into one television channel. That is not good enough in the year 1979.

We need to pay more attention to the needs of the agricultural industry in northern Ontario. We can develop outstanding beef herds but we need more research to

develop seed strain that can thrive in a northern climate. We need to develop cereals, such as wild rice, to benefit the entire north.

Until northerners enjoy the same level of public services as are taken for granted in the south, until more of our isolated and unorganized communities feel their interests are being taken into account in the decisions of this House, we cannot relax our efforts one bit.

Mr. Haggerty: It's your government.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The major interests of northerners are the same today as they have been for many years.

Mr. Haggerty: They were promised jobs by the government for seven years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are job security, community stability and an improved quality of life to attract and keep a well-trained, efficient, workforce.

I feel we must do a great deal more to attract northerners who have left to seek post-secondary education elsewhere back to northern Ontario. There are new opportunities for professional people in the north. Through my ministry's bursary program for doctors and dentists, I hope to show young people that they can have the same economic opportunities in these areas as others living closer to our professional training facilities.

I am pleased that Her Honour's speech highlighted the need to improve training programs for skilled workers. Never before has there been a greater demand for skilled, highly-trained workers in the various trades in the mining and the pulp and paper industries than there is today.

We have excellent training facilities at Confederation College, Lakehead University, Algoma College in Sault Ste. Marie, at Laurentian University at Sudbury and many other schools and facilities in northern Ontario. We must find new ways to train more and more young people, born and raised in the north, who will now have the opportunity to benefit from these educational institutions so that they can take advantage of existing employment opportunities there.

It is also a major responsibility of the government to do its part to guarantee that the communities in which these young people will live are modern, attractive and well planned communities in which they can live with satisfaction. To do this, we must be able to respond to the needs as they arise, to build access roads, arenas, industrial parks, medical and dental clinics, and fund

our regional priorities budget so that we can make it happen.

In 1971, this government accepted the recommendations of Design for Development, phase II—a program blueprint for development of northwestern Ontario for two decades. The report called for the creation of 18,000 new jobs over a 20-year period, a target which some felt was too high and unrealistic. Yet within the first five years more than 10,000 new jobs were created in northern Ontario.

Since 1971, major mining companies have invested more than \$220,000,000 and created 1,100 new jobs. Very recently, Mr. Speaker, as you may be very much aware, the Campbell Red Lake gold mine announced a \$10,000,000 expansion for its mine at Red Lake and the creation of another 50 jobs.

Since 1971, 11 new sawmills and particle board plants have been built in northwestern Ontario. Two pulp mills have undertaken major expansion programs and one new pulp and paper plant has been built. Together, these projects alone have accounted for the creation of 3,000 new jobs in this region of Ontario.

Clearly, the private sector has an important role to play in the north. It can provide new jobs and create new wealth for Ontario and for Canada. Our responsibility, as legislators, is to assist the private sector to do the job that it can do best and provide the climate of stability and confidence which attracts new capital investment.

We must also continue to provide the essential services to the small communities necessary to attract and keep a well trained labour force on projects; such as those which have been undertaken to provide major services to communities such as Thunder Bay, Dryden, Kenora, Ear Falls, Red Lake, Ignace, Pickle Lake, Nakina and Geraldton funded from our regional priorities budget. These have already gone a long way towards the goal of revitalizing northern towns and communities.

We have also taken important steps since 1971 to strengthen the financial base of northern Ontario municipalities through the provision of support grants equal to 18 per cent of the municipal tax base over and above the normal funding provided to all municipalities.

Among other grant and support programs initiated by this government are full provincial coverage of the cost of various forms of social assistance for those living in unorganized areas, special grants to community hospitals, a special grant formula applied to

Ontario-funded programs to libraries and community recreational centres to compensate for higher costs in northern Ontario.

Nine years ago the government established the Northern Ontario Development Corporation to assist tourist operators and manufacturing companies. The corporation has lent more than \$35,000,000 to industries and has transformed the quality of many small businesses throughout the north. The corporation is a lender of last resort, assisting businesses that banks cannot help; yet our success ratio is so high that we have been able to maintain an interest rate considerably below market rates or those offered by the Federal Business Development Bank.

The needs of our native people have always been a high priority of this government's northern policy. Since 1971 this government has provided telecommunications services to many remote areas of northern Ontario, including the isolated communities north of the 50th parallel. Today, if you wish to visit Big Trout Lake, Sandy Lake or almost any other remote community, you can telephone throughout Canada via satellite and you will see colour television sets. Neither of these existed before this government's northern policy came into effect. I invite the members opposite to come up there this summer with me to see it for themselves.

Mr. Peterson: We would all very much enjoy visiting you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Would you, seriously?

Mr. Peterson: We would; we are very fond of you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well come on, gentlemen. Each member has financial resources to go anywhere in the province, to take four trips a year, which will allow you to go into northern Ontario.

Mr. Peterson: What is your address, because I am going to come to your house for dinner. I want to come to your place.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If the members are sincere and want to do something for that great resource base part of this province, then I will see them up there this summer. I will look forward to it.

Mr. Peterson: We want to come to your house in person. What is your address?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just go to northern Ontario. They will tell the member where I am. They know me up there.

Mr. Peterson: They will say you are down south.

Mr. Gaunt: Northwestern or northeastern?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Anywhere. Native people are employed to maintain and operate

remote community airstrips, built and paid for by the Ontario government. We have provided funds through the municipal assistance program to maintain and improve roads within native communities. Through the northern assistance program and the rural and native housing program, we have attempted to meet the housing needs of our native people. We have instituted programs to train native teachers and classroom assistants and to provide other assistance to those students who attend secondary schools away from their home community.

Despite the fact that the needs of our native people are supposed to be met by the federal government, we have not taken a narrow, legalistic approach to the problems which they confront in their own communities or when they leave to live and work in other communities. We have been prepared to provide assistance to municipalities to aid them in responding to the needs of native people. We are making a sincere effort to try to find ways and means—

Mr. Martel: Is this a filibuster?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —of extending all provincial government services to native communities.

Mr. Martel: I am waiting for my money.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have worked closely and well with both Treaty 3 and Treaty 9 councils to help them achieve their goals on behalf of the communities they represent.

One of our most successful programs across the north has been establishment of 29 Northern Affairs offices. Each is equipped with well-trained Telex operators who are in regular contact each day with all departments of the provincial government, and with the federal government as well. This program was intended to deal directly with personal needs of northerners, particularly those living in the smaller centres. Lack of an adequate communications link with the provincial government has always been a major factor, at times very critical for those of us who live north of Parry Sound.

Through our Northern Affairs offices and the many satellite offices that have been located in small communities, almost everyone in the north now has immediate contact with Queen's Park. Answers to questions can normally be obtained within 24 hours at no cost to the individual. While we do not receive any reimbursement from the federal government, we will assist persons applying for federal assistance such as unemployment insurance benefits, Canada Pension Plan benefits, passport applications—indeed, any matter at all that it is within our capacity to handle.

Northern Affairs officers have been encouraged to work closely with volunteer organizations wherever they are located. I am sure that all northern members of this House know who their local officer is and respect him highly for the effort he is making on behalf of his or her constituents.

Since 1971 the government has moved in a number of major ways to overcome long-standing grievances of northerners. We have made major strides in transportation, communication, housing, community planning, economic planning, industrial development, greater equality of opportunity for young people in education, trade training and accessibility of post-secondary institutions.

We still have a long way to go. My own ministry exists for the sole purpose of working daily with every community in the north, regardless of its size, to try to respond as quickly as possible to the needs as they arise, to correct mistakes and to recommend ways in which provincial programs can be made more relevant to the needs of northerners.

There is more we would like to do and could do, of course, if funds were available. But a start has been made. As Her Honour's

speech points out, a strong economy is the base on which social programs can grow. I would like to feel that when this session of the Ontario Legislature ends we will have taken the necessary steps to guarantee the future of communities such as Dryden and Atikokan, the quality of life for unorganized communities such as Hudson and Armstrong, and provide better communications for the whole of the north and attract more professionals—more doctors and more dentists, more nurse practitioners, just to name three groups who would be encouraged to live and of course work in northern Ontario.

Finally, on a somewhat lighter note, I would like to remind the members of this House as we approach the final games of the National Hockey League, the Kenora Thistles, believe it or not, won a Stanley Cup back in 1907. Who knows, with continued prosperity and with the help of Wintario funds and a little luck, Kenora might come back into the league some day and bring the Stanley Cup back home to northern Ontario.

On motion by Mr. Blundy, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 5, 1979

Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Lane, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Bernier	763
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Blundy, agreed to	790
Adjournment	790

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wiseman, Hon. D. J.; Minister without Portfolio (Lanark PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)



No. 18

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Friday, April 6, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1979

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT BY GOVERNMENT

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, honourable members will know that the report of the Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability has made 165 recommendations designed to address the problems it has discovered in the management of the federal government. I am delighted by the thrust of the recommendations and have asked my staff for an extensive review of the report in the hope that some of the recommendations can be used to strengthen our own management system.

As members will recall, this commission was established by the federal government about two years ago in response to warnings by the auditor general that the federal government had lost, or was close to losing, control of the public purse. Although the Lambert commission, as it is called, pertains primarily to the scene in Ottawa, there are several aspects of definite interest in Ontario.

Among the reforms put forward by the Lambert commission is a management control organization patterned on the system that was put in place here in Ontario, following the report on the Committee on Government Productivity in 1972. Using the basic framework of Management Board and cabinet committees, we are continually refining the management process to ensure we have control and that accountability is properly placed. The speech from the throne notes that effective management must be the hallmark of all areas of government operation. Recent organizational changes indicate this government's commitment to better management and fiscal control.

I am not suggesting that all our management problems have been solved at Queen's Park. However, we have learned enough during the past four years of spending restraints to know that if Ottawa is indeed serious about curbing its spending, it must be prepared to adopt some of the control procedures recommended in the report.

Bringing government spending under control is a difficult and painful adjustment that is now being made by governments across the continent. As a note of caution, I would point out that attempting to solve deficit problems on an ad hoc basis without a management control system in place will result in haphazard and abrupt adjustments that could be very damaging to staff morale and program delivery.

The Lambert report has an important message for all levels of the public sector in Canada. I would strongly urge the federal government to act on these recommendations without delay.

NATIONAL STEEL CORPORATION

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, as members will recall, National Steel Corporation of Canada Limited announced on January 15 last that it intended to close its Moose Mountain iron-ore operation at Capreol, Ontario, effective April 1, 1979. The decision announced in January was based on an oversupply of iron-ore pellets on the market.

The announcement gave rise to understandable concerns in the town of Capreol where the 250 employees of National Steel constitute a significant portion of the population. In an attempt to avert the April 1 shutdown, the government immediately initiated discussions with National Steel and with the major potential customers in the Ontario market. The Premier (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Crossman) and I intervened personally and were able to arrange a series of meetings to explore marketing possibilities for National Steel.

I am pleased to announce today that the final obstacles to a transaction that will prolong the life of the Moose Mountain operation now have been removed and that an immediate shutdown has been averted. As a result of our discussions, Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited has agreed to purchase a quantity of iron-ore concentrate from the Moose Mountain mine on an experimental basis. If the Moose Mountain concentrate is technically compatible for additional feed to the Sherman mine, Dofasco is prepared to consider placing further orders.

At the same time, National Steel has arranged to ship concentrate to a customer in Detroit, Michigan, again on the same experimental basis and relationship. The combined effect of these two commitments for concentrate will enable the Moose Mountain operation to remain open for a period of time.

The continuation of operations that I have described would not have been possible without the co-operation of National Steel, Dofasco, Canadian National Railways and the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, all of whom have worked together with the Premier's office, my ministry, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the Ministry of Northern Affairs to ensure that the test product can be shipped on an economic basis. Reasonable concessions were made on all sides and the government, through the Ministry of Northern Affairs, has contributed approximately \$25,000 to enable the experimental transactions to go forward.

While I can give no assurances as to what may occur following the testing phase, it is my sincere hope that the parties will be able to come to satisfactory arrangements to permit National Steel to maintain its Capreol operation over the long term. In this regard the government will continue to work with both companies and, in particular, will continue in its endeavours to assist in the location of customers for the iron-ore pellets.

I hope the effort expended in this matter by all concerned not only will preserve employment for Ontarians but also will be seen as evidence of our capacity to work constructively and co-operatively to minimize the economic hardship caused by what I hope are only temporary problems in iron ore market conditions. I want to express my appreciation in particular to the officials of both companies, the railways, the town of Capreol, the local member—

Mr. Foulds: Name him. Elie Martel.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: —interested citizens and the United Steelworkers union, all of whom have played important roles in achieving this result. I look forward to working with all of them in an effort to achieve a permanent solution.

NEW MEMBERS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a statement or a matter of personal privilege: I would like to take this occasion to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition—the leader of the New Democratic Party—

Mr. Swart: A Freudian slip. The real opposition.

Mr. Eaton: Pretty close.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am congratulating the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) too.

Mr. Foulds: They were third yesterday, and they're going to be third for a long time to come.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It cost him \$1 to the Canadian Cancer Society. There will be no tax receipt, I think.

I also want to express a sincere welcome to the two new members of the Legislature, who I assume are in the gallery this morning. If they are not here—yes, I think they are here. I would like most sincerely to welcome them to the House and congratulate them on their victory.

Before the leader of the New Democratic Party assumes that this means for him a sweep of the province, I would remind him that the majorities were down, in Scarborough West by 60 per cent and in Wentworth by 90 per cent. As they say in Britain, if that trend continues we'll have a majority government. But, most sincerely, I welcome the new members.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I saw a button yesterday in Scarborough West that said, "Make April 5 a PC day." I want to tell you April 5 was NDP day, and it is with great pleasure I introduce two men who are in the gallery today but who will shortly be making their mark as MPPs in this House: Colin Isaacs for Wentworth and Richard Johnston for Scarborough West, the new MPPs for the New Democratic Party.

I want to assure the Premier that his Freudian slip didn't go far enough, because I have aspirations not just to that particular position but to the Premier's job itself. I look forward to the day when I can bequeath this particular chair to the Premier. We are working at it.

I would remind the House that the share of the votes we had in the ridings of Scarborough West and Wentworth was identical to the share of the vote that has the Conservatives in government right now. What we intend to do is simply emulate that across Ontario and we will shortly be on that side of the House.

Mr. S. Smith: Being Friday morning, it seems I ought to say something as well. I want to congratulate the two gentlemen in the gallery for having waged strong campaigns in each riding. They were very clean campaigns and I certainly want to congratulate them on their victory.

I might just say, with regard to the aspirations of the leader of the third party, as he is considering these aspirations he might consider that one out of every three voters who voted New Democrat in those two ridings in

1977 voted for one of the other two parties this time, and our vote increased by a factor of 50 to 60 per cent in each riding.

Mr. McClellan: You have lost four straight by-elections.

Mr. Wildman: Zero for four.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. S. Smith: Will the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) be here, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The minister is, unfortunately—I was going to say under the weather; if you had come from Brampton this morning you would understand that. No, he is not well this morning.

Mr. S. Smith: Sick?

Mr. Cassidy: We are sick of him as well.

Mr. Wildman: His doctor opted out.

Mr. Peterson: Is he at home or in the hospital?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Ambulatory care, is that how you describe it? Ambulatory care, or whatever.

Mr. McClellan: Chronic care would be more appropriate.

Mr. S. Smith: I hope he is getting some kind of care that isn't ambulatory or any other kind of tory.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. S. Smith: In the absence of the Minister of Energy yesterday, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) put a question to the Premier. I think it is important that the question be reput, because I don't believe the essence of the question was responded to yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean? How can you make that accusation?

Mr. S. Smith: Could I ask the minister if he is aware of reports within Ontario Hydro that are called Internal Significant Event Reports and which deal with problems that arise from time to time with regard to the nuclear stations?

Is he aware of these reports and does the minister in fact see these reports? Do they come to his attention on a regular basis? If he does, can he comment on them in the House and tell us what assurance he takes from them? If he doesn't, does he not agree it is something he should be seeing on a regular basis?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am aware of the reports but I don't see them on a regular basis. They are mainly of a technical nature. They are given to the Atomic Energy Control Board,

I believe, on roughly a daily basis and then they are filed in the public reference library so that any member wishing to see them can go down to the Hydro library and see them.

Mr. S. Smith: Can the minister tell us what assurances he may have taken from these reports and, more specifically, can the minister make a statement with regard to the boiler at Pickering and the nature of the problem there that has led to a delay? Was this an anticipated delay or was this something that has been rethought in view of recent events? [10:15]

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will have more information, some of it of a technical nature, on the boilers at the Pickering second-unit construction site on Tuesday. I can tell the honourable member that in routine testing of the boilers late last fall there was some concern because the boilers for the new unit there are of a slightly changed design and a different metal, I believe, to those for the first part of Pickering and the first part of Bruce. As a result of the testing, the manufacturers were notified to stop construction about mid-December until there was a little further look at them.

There has been further inspection and testing by Hydro. I would assume the Atomic Energy Control Board is aware of this too because I believe the same style of boiler was to be used in La Prade, in the new plant in Quebec and in the new one in the Maritimes. I'm not in a position at the moment to say exactly what the solution is or what further action will be taken, but I can assure the House that this has no connection with the event in the US. It came to notice, as I say, in mid-December last year.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: I had difficulty hearing what the minister was saying. Was he talking about the boilers?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Correct.

Mr. Sargent: The Babcock boilers? I have knowledge that there is a series of happenings with dates on them that is of great concern to me as a citizen. If he has seen these reports, would the minister be so good as to supply the Leader of the Opposition and both parties with copies of these reports as they come out. I know they're classified as secret, but what is more important at this point than that the members of the Legislature know what's going on in this very serious field?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are down in the Hydro library. Read them on the weekend.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I said, all the member has to do is walk down the street and they

are in Hydro's reference library. They are not secret reports.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Take them home.

Hon. W. Newman: Why don't you do some reading for a change?

Mr. Sargent: That's a deal.

[Later (10:59):]

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it very clear, because I didn't—

Mrs. Campbell: You never do.

Mr. T. P. Reid: What's new about that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and repeat what I said the other day in the statement. The boilers the Leader of the Opposition was asking me about are, of course, of quite a different design from the boilers I believe the same firm designed and manufactured for the plant it built in Pennsylvania.

[Reverting (10:17):]

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. S. Smith: In the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) and given that the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) is probably unaware of these matters, I'll ask the Premier—

Mr. McClellan: You can be sure she's unaware of them. She is unaware of everything.

Mr. S. Smith: —whether he is being forced to rethink the way in which his minister is applying holus-bolus across Ontario certain so-called bed ratios. Given, for instance, the problem reported at the Queensway Hospital, where an administrator within the Ministry of Health says no complaint was ever made, though we were told, and so was the newspaper told, that the complaint was made last July that people are being treated in the emergency room instead of in hospital beds, can the Premier give us some assurance that he will look again at the matter of chronic care specifically, recognizing there are scores of patients in acute hospital beds who should be in chronic beds and that that's causing a backup and a misutilization of facilities all the way down the line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the minister has said repeatedly that where the need for additional chronic beds can be identified the ministry would move in to assist. This is the situation at Queensway.

Mr. McClellan: He says it but he doesn't do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am informed that some ministry staff will be at Queensway today—

Mr. Wildman: Only five or six months late.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —discussing with the administration the proper placement of chronic-care patients.

Mr. Foulds: It's a problem at Thunder Bay too.

Mr. McClellan: Why weren't they sent out in July?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I also understand the West Park Chronic Hospital will be opening in July this year. It is in the same general area.

Mr. Foulds: Why don't you wait until it opens before you cut back on active-treatment beds?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It will have about 154 chronic beds.

I'm not sure of the exact geographic location, but it's quite clear that the minister has said in those areas where needs are identified, to the extent it is humanly possible, we will be moving in the direction of providing chronic-bed facilities. As I say, the staff of the ministry will be out at Queensway today discussing with the administration ways and means by which they can help to resolve the situation.

Mr. S. Smith: I recognize that the Premier obviously can't possibly know what every civil servant in every ministry is doing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Only 90 per cent.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. His mandarins keep him informed as to the marionettes in the other ministries. Could the Premier ask the Minister of Health to explain to us how it could be that Mr. Keillor within the ministry would say the Queensway never complained about this and never brought this matter to the ministry's attention, when Mr. Box, the administrator there, has confirmed yet again this morning that the matter was dealt with in a letter to the minister in July and was responded to by a sort of noncommittal letter from the minister in July? Would the minister, therefore, tell the House how it could happen that a member of his ministry would say that no complaint had ever been received?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure the minister would be delighted to deal with that on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. McClellan: You are going to leave him hanging by himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition is quite right. I only know what goes on with about 90 per cent of the public servants. I am well informed by my office staff. I would just say that the marionettes or martinets are over there, not in the Premier's office.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: In view of the fact that people in Thunder Bay have brought this question of backups in emergency wards to the attention of the government in the last couple of months; that the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) has brought the matter to the attention of the government in relation to backups in emergency wards at the Scarborough General Hospital; that the same thing is happening at St. Joseph's Hospital in Peterborough; that the people in Hôtel Dieu Hospital in Windsor brought the matter to my attention when I was in Windsor two weeks ago; that these backups in emergency wards are now occurring in hospitals all across Ontario, and in view of the fact that the government is intending to cut a further 1,272 hospital beds just in Metropolitan Toronto alone and more than 4,000 hospital beds across Ontario—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the honourable member come to the question?

Mr. Cassidy: —can the Premier explain whether it is the government's intention that emergency-ward backups are going to become a chronic condition in every hospital of the province and, if not, how does the government intend to cut all these beds and not have these kinds of situations occurring in every hospital to the grave detriment of the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not the intention of the government to have this situation develop.

Mr. Warner: It is just happening by accident. Do something about it.

Mr. Cassidy: If the Premier says that is not the intention of the government, will he acknowledge that is a result of the government's policy, and will he explain why it is that in Etobicoke, where the specific situation at Queensway Hospital is taking place, there is not now in a borough of more than 300,000 people one single chronic-care bed? Why is the government making people back up for emergency beds in the hospitals in Etobicoke, when there is no provision at all in that community for chronic-care patients?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not our intention to have chronic-care people in the emergency part of any hospital.

Mr. McClellan: Why is it happening?

Mr. Mackenzie: You haven't got an answer.

PHYSICIANS OPTING OUT OF OHIP

Mr. Cassidy: I have another question about health for the Premier.

Mr. Gregory: I hope it is better than the first one.

Mr. Swart: I hope the answer is.

Mr. Cassidy: We are looking for some answers in health and we are not getting them from the government these days. In view of the fact that the Ministry of Health has been monitoring the opting out by physicians and by specialists in different communities across the province for a year now, since the great opting-out binge began, can the Premier explain why it is that the government has not yet responded to questions in this House by tabling information which we have been assured we would have so that the Legislature and the public can have accurate information about how high a degree of opting out by specialists and GPs is taking place in every community of the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the Minister of Health has already dealt with that question.

Mr. McClellan: He hasn't, not to anyone's satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You asked him the identical question.

Mr. Cassidy: The Minister of Health has not dealt with it. Having promised the information, he has refused to bring it up. I am asking the Premier, will he not ensure that the information is made available.

As a supplementary, I would ask the Premier, in view of the fact general practitioners are now saying to me and members of my party they cannot reliably refer patients to specialists without knowing which specialists are in OHIP and which are not, and in view of the fact that doctors have been complaining publicly, at medical forums and places like that, that they are having this difficulty because they don't know which specialists are in the plan and which are without and to which, therefore, they can afford to send their patients, will the government exercise its powers and use the information available to OHIP in order to publish lists of doctors who are opted into medicare across the province so that the people of Ontario, as well as physicians of Ontario, can know where to find care at the insured rates?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Once again, I believe the Minister of Health dealt with this almost identical question—

Mr. Warner: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —some few days ago and indicated his conversations with the OMA and ways and means to make it possible for patients and certainly other members of the

profession to find which of their colleagues were in or out of OHIP.

I am not as familiar with Metropolitan Toronto, but in the great city of Brampton the members of the medical profession do know which of their colleagues are in and out without any question.

Mr. Warner: Yes, it is just the people.

Mr. Grande: You are not familiar with the people of Ontario.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the Premier indicate whether or not he personally has met in the recent past with the senior officials of the Ontario Medical Association and whether or not during such encounters he has given that group any personal assurances? If that is the case, could he share those personal assurances with this House this morning?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it all depends on how recently the honourable member wishes me to go back in my memory and what he means by "personal assurances." If he can further define that for me I will try to recall just what was said and when.

Mr. Peterson: Fortunately nobody takes them at face value anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How recent is recent?

Mr. Swart: May I ask the Premier whether he personally agrees or disagrees with a reply sent by Mr. C. J. Friday, the claims manager, Hamilton district office, to Mr. Gerry Michaud, the insurance representative of local 199 UAW in St. Catharines, when he was sent a list of physicians for the city of Welland by Mr. Michaud and asked if he would tick off those who have opted out and return the list at his earliest convenience?

Mr. Friday replied: "We are only allowed to furnish information in regard to the person who provided the service or to the person who received the service. I am, therefore, returning your list of doctors and respectfully suggest that they be contacted individually or through their local medical academy."

Does the Premier not agree personally that the people of St. Catharines and the people of Welland should have the right to know through OHIP whether their doctors are in or out of OHIP?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The honourable member has asked me whether I personally agree with a letter that was sent by a member of the ministry to the—

Mr. Swart: No, the reply.

Mr. Warner: The reply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said a letter that was sent from a member of the ministry. A letter

is a reply; a reply is a letter. Are we talking about the same thing?

Mr. T. P. Reid: A letter from you is not a reply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A reply from me is a reply. It may not be the kind of reply the member always wants, but it is a reply.

I would say, not being totally familiar with it, that I assume the ministry official is acting within the general framework or policy of the ministry, so I would agree with him operating within that framework. As to the policy itself, I would have to think this thing out to see whether or not it is an appropriate policy and—

Mr. Swart: Do you agree with that framework?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I am sure the minister would be delighted to deal with it. But certainly I agree with an official of the ministry dealing within the existing policy of the ministry.

Mr. Swart: Do you agree with the policy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would also point out to the honourable member if he, as I know he does so actively, works on behalf of his constituents, there are probably X number of doctors on that list. It would be the simplest thing in the world for him to accommodate his constituents, make half a dozen phone calls and get them the answer.

Mr. Swart: But they won't answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure, they will. Call the doctors; they will tell you.

Mr. Cassidy: Since the basic approach of medicare when it was introduced in Ontario was that every Ontario resident should have medical services without having to pay extra over the insured rates, can the Premier say whether he now agrees with that principle which underlies medicare? If so, what steps will the Premier take to ensure medicare is provided to every citizen in the province without his being forced to pay extra?

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the basic principles with respect to medicare have changed from the day the program was introduced until today.

Mr. Swart: You believe in the people having to pay.

Mr. Wildman: You haven't believed in it all along.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The government is in the process of dealing with the profession to resolve those problems.

Mr. Warner: Nonsense.

HOME INSULATION PROGRAM

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Energy. Since Ontario Hydro has now deferred its decisions on system expansion for another couple of weeks, and since those decisions may also be influenced by the consequences of the accident in the United States, and since its expansion is going to be financed by borrowing on the credit of the province of Ontario to the tune of close to \$2,000,000,000 a year, has the minister informed himself of the benefits in terms of conservation and saving of energy of a major program of home insulation in Ontario? Is he aware that such a program could reinsulate every home in Ontario in 10 years and create 8,000 jobs in the process? What action will the government take to bring in that kind of conservation program in order that we can start energy saving in a world increasingly short of it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I believe Hydro indicated about a month ago they would be reviewing their expansion program or their construction program, and as expected would be making some decisions and announcing them at the next meeting, which I believe is next Monday or Tuesday.

As far as a home insulation program is concerned, the honourable member is aware of the Canadian Home Insulation Program that the government of Canada initiated some time ago and which has had a slow start, as I understand it, but is proceeding.

As far as a major program of insulation by the province is concerned, we have looked at this. My predecessor has made statements about it in the past. I should remind the honourable members this province, I think, was the first to remove the provincial sales tax from insulating materials, which has encouraged sales. I have to say I have benefited from that myself and I am still in the process of doing a little further insulation in my own house. I can tell the honourable members the greatest incentive I have found is a month ago I got a notice from the gas company saying my 12-month billing was being reduced by \$22 a month because our consumption had dropped considerably. That is the greatest incentive I have had so far and I commend this to the honourable members.

We are in the process, and the process has speeded up—the federal election may only be a coincidence—of negotiating with the government of Canada on a program. It will be worth about \$58,000,000, a very broad, jointly shared program in terms of conservation,

energy from waste, and a variety of programs. I think we are on a good route.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain why this government made a solemn promise in the 1977 election campaign that there would be a \$100,000,000 program of low-interest loans for insulation for home owners and residents of Ontario and backed down on that election promise at a time of increasing energy shortages in Ontario and in the world? Isn't it time for the government now to reconsider that abandonment and to bring back such a program so we do, in fact, start to save energy by insulation and conservation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, my recollection on that is that the government was looking at a program—

Mr. Cassidy: It was a promise.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and the federal government went ahead with one so we felt it was not necessary for us to do so.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary: The minister will recall, of course, this issue was discussed at great length in the last campaign and his response was the government had no place in the attics of our nation. A very catchy piece of rhetoric.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I said that.

Mr. Peterson: I want to ask the minister this question because it is serious.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Please do.

Mr. Peterson: Would you consider entering into discussions with the energy distributors—principally the oil distributors and the gas distributors in this province, but there are more, obviously—to develop a program whereby they can assist in the upfront capitalization payment for insulation, then pay it back over a period of time along with the monthly energy bill? Would the minister discuss that kind of program with the distributors, so that there is not necessarily a large front-end financial burden for people who want to insulate but who can't afford the upfront cost? Would he consider that kind of imaginative program and discuss it, then come back to this House with some kind of proposal along these lines?

Mr. MacDonald: That is a steal from the NDP program.

Mr. S. Smith: That was our platform in 1977. Why don't you go back and look at it?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, consideration has been given to that kind of scheme in the past. It may well be one of the things that will be discussed again with the feds.

The real question, of course, is who is going to subsidize the interest rate? And if, in fact, we are going to subsidize insulation, what is the best method of subsidizing the people who need it most?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the federal CHIP, on which the minister is resting his case, involves only older housing and provides loans for only part of the cost and not the whole cost, would the minister explain now how the government can argue that Ontario can't afford to get into an insulation program, when such an insulation program would create large numbers of jobs and cost far less than the \$1,800,000,000 a year Hydro is now spending on new investments in generating stations?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't know that I can put it any more clearly than I did to the member for London Centre. I have just been given a reminder, which I can mention at this time, that we understand Consumers' Gas has entered into such a program in Toronto. I can't give the details of the interest rate et cetera, but I think something in the order of 50,000 people have taken advantage of it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a switch from oil.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: I want to say it is my privilege to receive a certain amount of equalization from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) in return for the results of last night's campaign, and my colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) expects to receive likewise from the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. New question.

HUMAN RIGHTS CASES

Mr. McGuigan: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Does the minister condone the procedures of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, whereby a complainant is forced to take an instant, on-the-spot decision to proceed with or to drop a complaint? The minister is frowning; should I repeat the question?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Yes, would you mind? There is some noise.

Mr. Peterson: Oh, just take it under advisement.

Mr. McGuigan: The problem is when a complainant is asked by caseworkers whether or not he should accept an offer from a respondent without the complainant having the opportunity to look at the files to see whether the file items are correct, misleading or circumstantial in nature. The complainant

has to make an instant decision, and it is rather unfair to put people in that position. The adviser has the experience of his position and all the information available to him, while the complainant does not.

Does the minister feel this is fair, especially in the field of human rights, where the very act is meant to counteract such situations?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: First of all, I would like to comment on the fairness of the activities of the human rights commission. I think no one should suggest, and I don't think you are suggesting, that they don't endeavour to be fair. I have never met a group of people who are more dedicated and who try to be fair to the utmost of their ability.

But that doesn't mean one should always be concerned about the fairness of the process. It was for that reason that the chairman and I did have a meeting about a month and a half ago. She is conducting a review of the process within the commission, with the very point that my friend has brought up in mind. I cannot tell the member the results of that review at the moment, but I want him to know I share his concern. However, I emphasize I am very proud of the fairness the employees of the commission demonstrate and have demonstrated.

Mr. McGuigan: I wish to assure the minister we are not concerned about the fairness of his employees but about the procedure.

Could the minister speed up this decision so that any changes could be made very quickly and so we do not have to wait until the complete revision of the code is brought in?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It was for that very reason that I did meet with the chairman one and a half or two months ago.

GO TRANSIT SERVICE CONTRACT

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Could the minister inform the House as to results of meetings he has held concerning the Canadian National employees who are members of local 76 of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers and whose jobs may be lost as a result of GO Transit inviting bids to supply the services that these employees have been providing for many years?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and I did meet with representatives of the Ontario Federation of Labour and the CN employees' union about a week ago, I guess, it was, and I expect to be meeting with them again, perhaps next week.

Mr. Mackenzie: Can the minister assure the House that these 80-odd employees, who have been performing these jobs for many years, are not going to find themselves deprived of their jobs as a result of these bids?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I cannot assure the honourable member that there will be no changes in the procedure of operating the ticket offices for GO Transit. The new contract that was signed last year between Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority and Canadian National provided for the phasing out or the changing of the lakeshore line from CN employees to TATOA employees or others.

The way the TATOA organization is set up, with it growing and with the new line that will be coming on stream in about two years, I think it is necessary for TATOA to make some changes in its operation.

What I did say to the representatives of the union was that we would give consideration to a different system, some method of phasing this out over a period of time, so that these employees could be phased back into the CN organization. They are CN employees and, of course, they have their union security with the CN union. The number is about 80, of whom I believe about 25 are almost at retirement age. I think we can work out something that will be satisfactory to the union and to TATOA.

Mr. Mackenzie: Does the minister not recognize the very point he makes about the seniority of some of these members and that, where the livelihoods of 80 people with some time on the job are at stake, part of the condition of any such arrangement should be that it is not the workers involved who are going to suffer as the result of whatever rationalization is being done in the operation?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The Minister of Labour and I are certainly taking this whole matter very seriously as far as the workers are concerned. I am sure, as I said, we will come up with a solution that will not be a hardship on the workers.

[10:45]

PENSION FUNDS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations; he is reflecting on liquor prices, I guess, but I want to ask him a very serious question. In view of the difficulties experienced by the workers at the Prestolite plant in Sarnia, with which he is familiar, I'm sure, and given that this points out some of the fundamental inadequacies in the pension

legislation in this province, which I will go into if he would ask me—

Mr. Mackenzie: What about portable public pensions? Do you support that? That would resolve it.

Mr. Peterson:—given the fact we have had two or three or four ministers dallying in this subject—

Mr. McClellan: What about portable pensions, David?

Mr. Peterson:—the former Minister of Industry and Tourism, the Minister of Labour and so on—none of whom has revealed any comprehension or concern for the subject—I want to ask the minister very seriously how he views the situation. Is he prepared to bring in legislation to change some of the inadequacies in the legislation or the regulations affecting private pension plans in this province?

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, Mr. Speaker, like the honourable member, I view the matter very seriously. I don't think it's a question of inadequacy—

Mr. McClellan: Sure it is. We don't have totally portable pensions.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I don't think it's a question of inadequacy.

Mr. McClellan: You're wrong.

Hon. Mr. Drea: There have been a great number of changes in the industrial sector that simply weren't there a number of years ago, not the least of which has been the very heavy burden of inflation, particularly when it is a management-funded program.

Mr. Peterson: You've been aware of that for quite a while.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Yes, I have been aware of it. The member wanted to know how I felt about it and I'm trying to answer him. Then we'll come into what he wants—

Mr. Sargent: How do you feel about it?

Hon. Mr. Drea:—and at the end of it he is going to get exactly what he wants.

Hon. W. Newman: Right between the eyes.

Hon. Mr. Drea: No, no. He is quite right. It is a very serious matter. It does give me very deep concern, particularly with the rationalization of industry, the fact that more and more mergers are coming.

Mr. Mackenzie: Rationalization—that means scuttle the workers.

Mr. McClellan: The two of you should keep it to yourselves.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Sometimes the mergers are effected in other jurisdictions. There is quite a rapid rationalization here. Also, in terms

of the private pension industry this has been held out to the average Canadian as a way he can hedge against inflation, whether it is management-funded or whether he makes his own contributions.

I have no doubt that within the next 12 months there will be significant legislation that will bring the private pension industry—its regulations, the administration and so forth—into the general industrial sphere at this time.

As members know, for some time there has been a royal commission into pensions. That commission has been compiling a great deal of data.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It is almost pensionable now.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It has been taking a very serious look, particularly in terms of inflation accounting, inflation contribution.

Mr. McClellan: We hope it's an improvement.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I am looking forward to that report. I think on the basis of that report it is reasonable to assume that very shortly thereafter there will be very significant legislation regarding private pension funding in Ontario.

Mr. Peterson: I welcome the minister's assurances. I can assure him it's the most positive thing I have heard from the ministries.

Mr. McClellan: You don't know what he is going to propose.

Mr. Swart: He backs off.

Mr. Foulds: It's good enough for a Liberal.

Mr. Peterson: But apart from the problem of these massive unfunded liabilities, one of the central problems, as I see it, is that the general level of knowledge is so dismally low in this complicated area. Would he not feel, even before the legislation comes down—

Mr. Foulds: Question.

Mr. Cassidy: Don't worry about that.

Mr. Peterson: Shut up—part of his responsibility would be to bring some kind of public education in this matter? For example, I am referring to forcing disclosure, involving beneficiaries on pension fund management, to allow a much higher degree of knowledge and awareness of some of these fundamental issues. When it comes right down to it, as I'm sure he would agree, many of the choices today are society's choices.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The question has been asked.

Mr. McClellan: He should write a book on the subject.

Hon. Mr. Drea: In reply to the honourable member, first of all, I don't think there is much more need for education in a large sector of private industry—

Mr. McClellan: What we need is decent pensions.

Hon. Mr. Drea:—where the pension program is part of the collective agreement or an appendix to it. Regardless of how the plan is funded, the person, through his labour organization does have professional access and explanation.

One of the difficulties is that some of the pension agreements, even where there is a labour organization, were entered into at a time when there was resistance to the labour organization having participation in, or at least an overview of, the plan. It's in those areas that there is some difficulty.

Secondly, a large body of private industrial pension funding is in industry or commerce where there is no formal collective agreement. It is a matter of some concern to me. I have asked, and I will ask again, in terms of the work of the royal commission if it might not on an interim basis provide suggestions as to what might be proper guidelines or proper disclosure.

What concerns me, and I'm sure the honourable member shares the concern with me, is that one can disclose quite accurately the terms, contents, conditions and so forth of a pension plan. Yet to the ordinary person who is going to be the beneficiary, what may look good may not be good and what doesn't look good is good.

Mr. Conway: Run that one through again.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I would like to try to come up with something that is understandable and that people can base their future upon because that is the real reason they're involved in these things. I will ask the pension commission, perhaps prior to its report, to do some work on this. I would be glad to share that with the members because this is one area that I think is everybody's concern in this House. The only time a person finds out whether there are any deficiencies in the plan is when there is a plant closing or a forced early retirement. By that time it's too late for the individual to plan how to adjust.

Mr. Peterson: But the minister can do something about it.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary: For all of the reasons he's raised, would the minister also take a look at the issue of portability in all private pension plans in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Drea: The question of portability is one of the terms of reference, if I understand it correctly, of the royal commission into pensions. I think there has been considerable work done in that area in the past few months because the commission has been ongoing for some time.

BELL CANADA RATES

Mr. Swart: My question is of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of Bell Canada's net profits increasing by 37 per cent last year over the previous year, from \$288,000,000 to \$395,000,000 and in view of yesterday's report of the consultative committee on the implications of telecommunications for Canadian sovereignty, saying that long-distance rates are too high, will he make application to CRTC to reduce Bell Canada's rates in this province, particularly the long-distance rates?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I have no plans to make such an application to the CRTC. About each year for the last number of years, Bell Canada has been making applications to the CRTC for rate adjustments. When this takes place, we are represented at those hearings. Ontario does intervene to make sure to what degree we can that rates are not approved that are higher than necessary for the financing, expansion and level of service that the people of Ontario require from Bell Canada. I haven't seen the report the member refers to, but I have no plans to make such an intervention at this time.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that Bell Canada received far more revenue last year than it estimated it would on the increase it received in rates? Is he not aware that CRTC itself does not do any investigation. Application has to be made by some other source if rates are going to be reduced.

Is he also not aware that in Florida an order was issued to return \$41,000,000 to the consumers by Bell Telephone because it had made excess profits, when our rates in this province are 50 to 100 per cent higher than they are in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta where the provinces operate the telephone system? Doesn't he think he should use the clout of his ministry to make some effort to reduce rates here and keep down Bell Canada's profit in line with the increase in wages and salaries?

Mr. Warner: Let's have a good answer.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker. I guess that's the only answer I can give him.

Mr. Mackenzie: The profiteering is allowed. Controlled wages, but profiteering is okay.

Mr. Swart: The great protector of the consumers.

ATIKOKAN HYDRO PLANT

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, or Natural Resources and Energy, relating to the Ontario Hydro plant at Atikokan. Since Hydro is going to be making its decision on Monday as to whether to proceed with that plant, can the minister inform the House what procedures will follow its decision? Will that decision then go to the minister and the cabinet for either final approval or change? If the decision of Hydro is not to go ahead with that plant, will the minister and the cabinet have a meeting with the people of Atikokan to discuss the final decision?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In answer to the first part of the honourable member's question, depending on what the board decides there might be no further approval required from the government. If it had to do with additional transmission lines and some of the things which were in the seven alternatives which I believe they showed the select committee, a variety of things would have to happen. There would be environmental assessments and hearings and then final approval by the government.

If they simply proceed with the things which have already received the necessary approval—and all the projects in their program have to one extent or another—then there would be no further action needed from the government. In the event that they decide not to go ahead with Atikokan, certainly the government would be involved again with the community in looking for other things to happen there, but I think statements by some ministers of the government have indicated that the government would be happy to see Hydro go ahead with Atikokan. I'm sure they must have read those statements themselves.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Supplementary: The minister mentioned the transmission line. Is he aware that at a recent meeting, in Sault Ste. Marie I believe, an advisory committee came to the conclusion that if Hydro went ahead with the transmission line between the east and west systems the planning itself, and the environmental assessment and so on, would take until about 1987, and construction another three or four or per-

haps even five years? Is the minister aware, therefore, that we're already underpowered, if I may use that term, in northwestern Ontario and that the alternative of a transmission line between the east and west systems cannot be built in a time frame to assure northwestern Ontario of uninterrupted power?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have indicated to Hydro, and our staff has indicated to Hydro's staff, that processes for new transmission lines could be quite lengthy. I'm sure they are aware of that themselves from their experience to date. Nobody should be banking on the assumption that a new line would be built in any particular time frame.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: Is it not accurate that the cabinet has already considered Hydro's proposals for cancellation and/or stretching out of the construction program of other plants, and if so, has the minister made recommendations to Hydro as to what the cabinet's views are, since they have not only a power generating objective but also, in some areas, a regional development objective?

[11:00]

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I mentioned, statements by the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells) indicated not only to Hydro but to everybody what the government's preferences would be.

Mr. Sargent: I have a supplementary about additional plants. Mr. Mueller, a senior adviser to the Ontario government on energy matters said this morning that Hydro does plan more nuclear plants. Will the minister confirm that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are two additions. In the program discussed by the Hydro board at its last meeting on which I assume a decision will be made at the meeting next week, there was one new plant, Darlington, additions to two existing plants, and a new lignite plant in Atikokan.

Mr. Sargent: Are these nuclear plants?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes. Darlington is a nuclear plant. That is the only totally new plant they are planning of which I am aware.

Last summer they were looking at sites in various places; eastern Ontario, sort of mid-Ontario, was one; and Georgian Bay near Sault Ste. Marie was another general area. They were looking at sites which might be expanded from one to several plants over a period of years. In the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning interim report Dr. Porter recommended, based on his infor-

mation, Hydro should only be looking at three more nuclear plants between now and the year 2000.

As far as I am aware, Hydro has not made any announcements of any plans for those three plants, if in fact, those three plants are needed.

Mr. Wildman: Is it not correct that Hydro is going ahead with site acquisition along the North Channel site at Burton Island and if that is the case, what does this mean? Is this purely landbanking, or are they going ahead with their plans for the new plant?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think the honourable member knows as much about it as I do.

Mr. Foulds: Probably more.

Hon. Mr. Auld: They have indicated they are still looking at landbanking, because of the long time frame involved in acquiring a site and the transmission corridor that will connect that site with the existing network. The size of the site is the question at the moment.

I am not aware when that site will be acquired, or whether it will be optioned, or what will happen, because Hydro, as I am sure all honourable members are aware, have been reviewing their future program.

The same thing applies in eastern Ontario not too far from my own riding. There is a great concern on the part of people there to know what is going to happen in the future. Hydro has indicated they hope to have some definitive answer on those two matters this summer.

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Mr. Foulds: I have a question of urgent public importance. I regret that it must be directed to the Minister of Energy, but here goes.

Does the minister recall the statement his predecessor made on June 5, 1978, when he announced the Canada-Ontario radioactive waste management program? One of the points made in that statement, and I quote from it, was: "The government of Ontario has insisted that it be consulted at each step and that its prior approval be obtained for all activities leading to a site in Ontario."

In view of that statement, is the minister aware of, and has the government of Ontario given approval for, the statement made yesterday by Egon Frech, the public relations director of AECL's Whiteshell program that the Canada-Ontario nuclear fuel waste management co-ordinating committee would be approving a test drilling site in or near

Atikokan next week? Can he confirm or deny that and is the minister now ready to level with this Legislature and tell the public which two to four sites have been decided on for drilling for a possible nuclear waste disposal site in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I hope the honourable member is not implying that I don't level with this House because I do and I am accused of doing it at some length on occasion. I read that announcement and I believe I discussed this question in answer to another question earlier this week about what was happening. I think it was from the member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That's right.

Mr. Foulds: But you didn't answer.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really can't add anything to that. We have approved and all the honourable members who might be affected have been interviewed by the team from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited as to their public participation procedures.

Mr. MacDonald: But has a decision been made?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I believe there have been discussions in Atikokan and as soon as I am personally aware of the approval of the community and if there is to be a test drilling site project there, I imagine that I would approve it because it is a test drilling project, not a test burying of nuclear waste project. I, also, believe that there will be several other sites where they hope to do the same thing providing that they get the approval of the community to do that kind of test drilling.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell us whether or not he knows at this moment which sites have been decided on? Can he reveal those sites to this House? If he cannot, can he explain what lack of communication and breakdown of Ontario's authority has taken place in view of the former Minister of Energy's statement last June and Mr. Frech's statement that they are planning to approve a site in the Atikokan area next week?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I asked that question the other day.

Mr. Foulds: You didn't get an answer on Tuesday either.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The information about the other sites they are looking at I don't have with me but I believe we have it. I will certainly dig it out and report to the House, perhaps on Tuesday.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the minister consider, when he's getting that information, if he

would table in the House the procedures that pertain between AECL, the Ministry of Energy and the government as to what Ontario's responsibility is in these matters so that we can be informed of the input of the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will do that, Mr. Speaker. I believe that my predecessor had indicated that at the time the agreement was made with the federal agency but I'll get it updated.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you know now?

Mr. Foulds: Does the minister not find it disturbing that a public relations spokesman for AECL should make such a definitive statement that indicates clearly a site has been selected for drilling when the minister does not know and is not in a position to inform this House or the public definitively?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am assuming that the community has agreed because I know there have been discussions going on with the community there. I just don't happen to know what the latest status is as far as pieces of paper are concerned in Energy, but I will find out.

Mr. Foulds: But the committee of which you're a member is supposed to approve it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: But let us again remember that we are talking about test drilling, we are not talking about test storage.

Mr. Foulds: I understand that.

Mr. Cassidy: It's more than pieces of paper.

EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Will the minister, at this time or in the near future introduce amendments to the Human Rights Code or accept my bill, Bill 21, an act to amend it, to eliminate discrimination in employment on the basis of a physical handicap where the handicap doesn't preclude the reasonable performance of that particular employment?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well this government's commitment to that very issue he's raised and, as I said in the House last week, it remains my intention to introduce certain amendments to that legislation after they have gone through the regular legislative consideration and the process that always occurs.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: As we are approaching the warm weather months and job opportunities improve, is the minister aware that the big three automotive manufacturers are very reluctant to employ

the handicapped, even though the handicapped may be able to perform the jobs to a reasonable degree of satisfaction?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Yes, I was aware of that.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Could the minister tell us what we are to say to people with certain forms of epilepsy, for instance, whose doctors say that they are not disabled in the sense that they can perform jobs but who continue to be discriminated against in the work place because we don't have that Ontario Human Rights Code amendment? And will the minister undertake to bring forward an amendment to the Human Rights Code, to bring forward a revised code, whatever he likes, but something to get that in there in this session, before we rise for the summer? I know there are touchy issues involved, but let him have the courage to bring it forward.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I try to tell people such as the member has described the very same thing he does—that is, that they should not be discriminated against—and the commitment that I have given the member is the one that I have just given to his colleague and that I have repeated before. That is, it remains my intention, and it has always been the government's intention with regard to the class of disability we have spoken about, to deal with it.

Mrs. Campbell: After 37 years?

MINISTRY OFFICE MOVE

Hon. W. Newman: On a point of order: In the interest of all members of the Legislature, I would just like to point out that starting as of Monday, the Minister of Agriculture and Food's office will be located at 801 Bay Street.

Mr. S. Smith: That is not a point of order. It is a point of disorder.

Mr. Gaunt: We have already been down there, Bill.

Mr. Peterson: Can you imagine Bill Newman on Bay Street?

REPORT

GOLD FUTURES CONTRACTS

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with section 20 of the Securities Act, I am tabling today an order issued by the Ontario Securities Commission authorizing the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange to trade prospectus-free its proposed call options on gold futures contracts. The com-

mission's reason in the matter is set out fully in the order.

If I might just elaborate on that, the commission's order, which is dated January 15 but was released in early March, permits prospectus-free trading of exchange-traded call options on the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange's gold futures contract by securities and commodity brokers who are registered under the Securities Act. The forms of prospectus provided for in the regulations to the act do not lend themselves to these instruments.

Instead, more meaningful disclosure will be provided the investor by the summary disclosures statement that the order requires be provided him, conditions three and four on page two of the order. The order also imposes on brokers conditions as to proficiency standards—conditions two, 5(1), pages two and three—and supervisory procedures, condition five, page three.

The Winnipeg Commodity Futures Exchange expects to commence trading of these options in late April. Before trading is permitted in Ontario, the conditions of the order will have to be satisfied. This may not prove possible until into May.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TOURISM AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moved first reading of Bill 41, An Act to amend the Ministry of Industry and Tourism Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this is a short housekeeping bill which in essence will allow the ministry to employ residents outside Canada or Ontario to work on behalf of the crown. The second section sets out the authority of the minister to enter contracts and agreements as well as authorizing the minister to delegate this authority to his deputy or other designated officers of the ministry.

SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION REPEAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moved first reading of Bill 42, An Act to repeal the Sheridan Park Corporation Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This short bill, which the NDP seems to have some major policy objection to, is a housekeeping measure which—

Mr. Foulds: Abolishes the corporation.

Mr. Warner: Your housekeeping is demolition.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —abolishes the corporation as part of our drive to deregulate and get off the books those items and pieces of legislation which are no longer required.

I would point out to this House that this will dissolve the corporation which has been inactive since March 31, 1971, when all the unsold land at the Sheridan Park Research Centre was acquired by the Ontario Development Corporation. Since that time the Sheridan Park Corporation has not maintained accounts or processed financial transactions. The corporation has no assets or liabilities.

Mr. Foulds: You are not abolishing the research centre?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

[11:15]

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might take this opportunity to table the answer to question 91 and the interim answers to questions 97 and 98 standing on the Notice Paper. (See appendix B, page 828)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to take part in the debate on the reply to the speech from the throne. This is my second opportunity to do so. In looking over the speech from the throne which Her Honour delivered, I find it very difficult to reply to such a vague speech.

In this speech the government has very little in the way of programs that are going to answer some of the things and some of the problems that are the most difficult for the people of Ontario to accept at this time. I guess it is the old saying that if the government doesn't have plans and programs to spend massive amounts of money, the throne speech is naturally very dull. It is that; there is no question about it.

But there is one paragraph of the speech which I would like to read in order to begin my comments on it. It is the first paragraph on page three. It reads: "Some may wish to argue as to whether the primary emphasis of

this session should be directed to improving the economic climate of Ontario or to improving the social services available to our people. In truth, extensive attention must be given to both."

I say the attention that is required to both of these topics mentioned in that paragraph has not been addressed in the speech from the throne. There is no imaginative program for improving the economic climate in Ontario, the one point that is made in this paragraph. And, instead of improving the social services available to our people, they are being eroded under our very eyes.

I don't know how the government can expect to enjoy, or indeed should have, the attention and the support of the people of Ontario in that kind of vague statement that is not founded in fact. I guess they are trying to fool the people that all is well, but I do not believe they are fooling some of the people. I would suggest the senior citizens of Ontario are not being fooled by that vague statement. The chronically ill in Ontario certainly must be wondering about that, as must be the handicapped people of Ontario. Families with children with various disabilities, particularly children with mental health problems, must also be wondering about those statements.

Let us back up and look at some of the problems I have just mentioned. In our society today we have an increasing percentage each year of people in the over-65 group, and we are surely expected to have programs that are going to be of benefit to these people in order to help them live out their remaining years, one would hope in the community and at least in decent circumstances.

The Ministry of Health has said it is not cutting back or reducing costs in the health service; it is emphasizing different priorities. I wonder what we would hear from those people who are lying in hospital beds that are for people who come in for emergency treatment; those people are lying there, occupying these beds, and not getting the treatment or the atmosphere they should have in an active-treatment bed. I wonder what those people think of the priorities that are being talked about by the Ministry of Health.

St. Joseph's Hospital in Sarnia has recently renovated its fourth floor, south, as a very proper area for the treatment of chronically ill patients; it is known as the chronically ill ward, and I believe it contains 40 beds. The construction, furnishing and equipping of that ward was completed

three or four months ago. But as of yesterday it had not been opened, because there are not sufficient funds to provide the staffing of the unit.

The fact that these beds are not available is putting great strain on the availability of active-treatment beds, as many people have mentioned in this House, both today and on other days. As a result, the people are having to be cared for in the emergency section of hospitals, awaiting a bed.

The Ministry of Health is not permitting—in most cases, anyway; certainly not in my riding—the issuing of any further permits for nursing home beds. Here we have another problem. The government has said it is looking at new ways of doing this, new priorities and so forth; but, before putting in the alternatives to the existing system, it has started cutting off the advantages of the existing system.

There are people in Ontario who would begin tomorrow to build more nursing home beds. From a conversation I had with a group of people from Bestview Lodges of Ontario I can say that they have been trying to build more nursing home beds but they have been refused, certainly in our area and in most areas of Ontario. They have shipped off about \$4,000,000 to Texas where they are able to enter the field without government interference.

On the other hand, the Ministry of Community and Social Services has refused permission to have any additional homes for the aged beds built in our community. So, it seems to me that in this revision of priorities the elderly people are being shuffled out of the deck.

The minister has said there is going to be much more in the way of day care, more in the way of home care, more in the way of outreach programs. That is a splendid idea which I endorse 100 per cent. This is right; we should be able to try to keep elderly people in their homes as long as possible in the community. This is a good program that is being talked about.

But the problem, of course, is that the funding that has been provided thus far for these programs has been completely inadequate to accomplish anything to a marked degree—not enough to accomplish something that is going to offset the disadvantaged position that I have spoken about in the way of chronic care beds, nursing home beds and homes for the aged beds, which of course, are very expensive initially in terms of capital and in continuing cost also.

However, the day care, home care, and outreach programs could be the answer,

but thus far have not produced any very great assistance to these people.

The \$9.80 co-payment for chronically ill people in hospitals I can see is fair in one respect, since it has been paid by the chronically ill in other institutions such as nursing homes for some time. But when you take that in round figures, say, \$300 a month, out of the income of an elderly couple it almost makes it impossible for the spouse of that chronically ill person to continue to maintain his or her home in the community.

This is really flying in the face of what the government has said: They want to establish day care, home care and so forth to keep the elderly in their homes in the community. I suggest to you that the way this \$9.80 co-payment is being carried out is defeating the purpose of keeping the elderly in their homes. If that much more money has to be allocated on a daily basis for the care of the one spouse, the other spouse is naturally going to have that much less to pay his or her taxes, energy bills, et cetera. This, as I was saying, needs a great deal of thought, and I would ask that this be looked at very carefully.

Then, in reference to that paragraph I read from the speech from the throne, I come down to children's services, where we are experiencing here again the product of what is known as the restraint program. Here in the International Year of the Child, of which everybody seems so proud, we have a letter from the Deputy Minister of Community and Social Services to the chairman of the board of children's mental health centres. If I may, for a moment, just read a line or two from that letter:

"A number of children's mental health centres, along with other parts of the ministry, will be asked to reduce certain services in order to make funds available for the designated priorities of the ministry." This is really an unusual way to celebrate the International Year of the Child.

[11:30]

This is just one area in the case of the children's mental health centres. It has got people in this service throughout Ontario most anxious and concerned about continuing care for these people. This is what is happening in various other services within the Ministry of Community and Social Services, where one after the other there is talk of cutbacks at a time when we need the services even more than we ever needed them before.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that many of the services provided by the Ministry of Community and Social Services for children, particularly the

younger children, are services that would be expected to, and I believe do, head off down the line much greater problems among those children with much greater cost to the people providing the service. I think it is a bit shortsighted to say that certain of these services should be cut.

I think there should be a great deal more emphasis on the prevention of problems among children and early teens. That is only a proper thing to do. But to cut the funding for children's services—In his letter the deputy minister mentions prevention, advocacy, child abuse, foster care, francophone services—the ministry is developing priorities in this area. So members know what that means and I'm afraid the people of Ontario know what that means.

It seems to me this government, which has been in power for so many years in Ontario, has lost its grip on the situations as they affect the people. Back in the late 1950s, the 1960s—the postwar period, generally speaking—and really up until the early 1970s, in this province all systems were go. We had a continually increasing birthrate, we had a continuing amount of immigration into our province, we had increases in the industrial might of the province, and so forth. It seems to me almost anybody could have governed the province and done it well in those days when things were going our way and were building the people and industry and business of this province.

Now, of course, things are different. The birth rate has fallen off markedly; immigration to the province has been reduced considerably. As a matter of fact we are finding an outflow from Ontario to the western provinces, particularly Alberta. There have not been great increases in industry. So all those things that were going for us in the postwar period and right up to the 1970s are not now there. Therefore it takes a lot more to plan wisely and govern wisely for this province.

This government, which has been in power throughout all those years, has lost its grip on the problems that are facing the province. It is not now able to cope with the new problems we find because of the new sets of circumstances in our economy and in our society.

I would also like to speak on the matter of day care. About 50 per cent of women in this province are now working. Many of these women have children. Naturally, in addition to their work—even above their work—they are interested in their children. How can a woman work with a free conscience if she does not know she is able to get adequate and properly supervised day care?

I believe in 1977 there were just under 50,000 licensed child care places in Ontario. It's obvious there are not going to be enough licensed child care places to meet the requirements of the number of mothers who are now working.

The second thing is that it costs a great deal for a woman to provide adequate day care for her children while she is working. This is compounded because the average income for a working woman is in the \$8,000 to \$8,500 bracket. How can she afford to pay the present prices for day care, a day-care system that does not fully supply the needs of the people anyway? This is one area I believe must be looked at this year, since more and more mothers are returning to the work force, in addition to the 50 per cent of women in Ontario who are already working.

I would like to mention one or two matters that pertain more directly to my own constituency. I hope many of these things will be taken seriously by the government.

In Sarnia, as everyone knows, we have a concentration of petrochemical industries. This is now a healthy, vibrant industry. It embraces the whole gamut of all the major companies in these fields: Imperial Oil Limited, Shell Oil, Sun Oil, Dupont, Dow, Union Carbide, Polysar and Petrosar. They are all operating in Sarnia, in an industry that historically has been volatile and one in which there are many hazards.

We speak today of the hazards in the existing and the coming nuclear field. The petrochemical industry has gone through those hazards in their industry, and now is practically accident-free. They have a competent staff, and are mostly manned by members of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' International Union, who are dedicated to their job, who are educated for their job and who are performing in complete safety. Seldom is there an accident in this massive industry in Ontario.

The major pipelines from western Canada all come into Sarnia. This industry is growing well, but I want to point out we have a great challenge to the continuing petrochemical industry in Ontario from the province of Alberta, which of course is a natural situation. I would expect any government of Alberta to continue to try to achieve greater eminence in this field.

I would like to point out the government of Ontario must do its part in watching and guarding the needs, the legislative needs of this great industry in Ontario to ensure it has a healthy, competitive situation and that it will be able to continue to prosper for the people of Ontario generally.

The next matter I would like to touch on is the difficulty that the people of Point Edward and Sarnia have encountered with the closing of the Prestolite plant. Prestolite, a company owned by Eltra Corporation of the United States, had been reducing its staff for some time because of a reduction in business but closed the plant at the end of November, 1978; this threw out of work many people whose sole employment record over the years had been with that company. The problem they now are facing, of course, is finding alternative jobs. I really think this matter is one in which the Ministry of Labour and Manpower should take some part in helping these people find alternative jobs.

One problem that is being faced by those people who have retired, or who have had to retire because of the closing of the plant, is the dreadful pension situation. I do not know how any company could get away with having a pension like the one Prestolite had for its employees.

To give you just one example, Mr. Speaker, I will cite the instance of a couple, a man and wife, both of whom were employees of Prestolite. When they retired at the age of 61 and 62 years, they were in receipt of pensions that, added together, came to about \$790 or \$800 a month. When the plant was closed by Eltra Corporation, and the company fled back to the United States, this couple's combined pension was reduced to \$403. One would not think that such a thing could happen in our society today.

I noted that there were questions today by my colleague from London Centre (Mr. Peterson) of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) regarding pensions. The minister did say that many of the things we were talking about—the portability of pensions and so forth—were being discussed by the royal commission in Ottawa. The minister also said there would be some legislation brought in, perhaps within a year.

I hope the minister will hear what I have said about the poor Prestolite pensioners. This one couple I mentioned—it's an absolute fact; I can give him the details of it—were getting about \$800 and now are getting \$403 together. This is a very important thing for this government to look at, and I hope that, in bringing in the new legislation that the minister mentioned, the government will take recognition of this fact.

No throne speech debate participation by a member from Sarnia riding would be complete unless I talked about the lack of a controlled-access highway from Sarnia to

Highway 401. I will very briefly make some comment on that.

I found an old newspaper dated October 1938, 41 years ago, when the Bluewater Bridge between Sarnia and Port Huron was opened. Governor Murphy of Michigan and Premier Hepburn of Ontario met in the middle of the bridge and shook hands. In the events that went on afterwards, the governor and the Premier at that time said that the bridge was one of the major steps to build a controlled-access highway from Chicago to Montreal. That was 41 years ago. That was a very foresighted position to be taken by these two people, the governor of Michigan and the Premier of Ontario. But that was 41 years ago. Even though 41 years have passed, we do not have anything that was spoken about and envisaged by those two people then.

[11:45]

Mr. Ruston: The Tories came in and messed it up.

Mr. Blundy: Yes, that's exactly what I was going to say. The member must have read my notes.

Mr. Ruston: Great minds think alike.

Mr. Blundy: That was back in 1941 and 1938. During the few years remaining in the Hepburn term of office, there were seven miles of dual controlled-access highway completed from the bridge through Sarnia and Sarnia township. That was within five years of the opening of the bridge, when Hepburn's government was in power.

Mr. Hodgson: Who was that? Who was that Hepburn guy you are talking about?

Mr. Ruston: Remember him? That shows your age.

Mr. Blundy: If you look back, you might see many interesting things about that time.

Mr. Ruston: You have to be over 50 to remember him.

Mr. G. I. Miller: We haven't had a change since then?

Mr. Blundy: In the ensuing 36 years since this government has been in power, we haven't really—well, we have the controlled-access highway now to the middle of Warwick township in the county of Lambton, and there it stops. There is work progressing on it, thank God, and I am told by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) that by 1981 we will be able to drive in relative safety to Highway 401.

I mentioned that this road is completed now to the middle of Warwick township, and

I would like to interject a very sad note. Only two weeks ago the reeve of Warwick township, John Pedden, and his wife Marie were killed when they got off that road onto Highway 7. They were both instantly killed in a head-on collision after they had gone east of the area served by the highway.

When I look back over the years, there have been scores killed on that two-lane road which carries tremendous traffic, particularly truck traffic coming to the petrochemical industry. There have been scores killed, scores maimed. It was a very sad note that John, the reeve of Warwick for a number of years, and his wife should have been killed only two weeks ago on that highway.

I have covered a number of my concerns, particularly in the Community and Social Services field, and one or two items that are really important to the people of my riding. I have enjoyed participating in this debate very much, and I hope some of the things said will not fall completely on deaf ears. With that remark, I will close my comments on the throne speech debate.

Mr. Ziemba: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan cost the taxpayers \$108,000,000 last year. About half of this money went directly into the pockets of the pharmacists. I suppose the Tory members across the way would see nothing wrong with this because they see it as free enterprise.

The Ontario government manages the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan in such a way that pharmacists get three fees instead of one. The government will pay for a six months' supply of free drugs, but most druggists refuse to fill prescriptions for longer than 30 days. They do this in order to collect as many dispensing fees as they can. Much of the \$50,000,000 they pocket in dispensing fees from the plan could be eliminated if druggists would give up their insistence on only giving out prescriptions one month at a time, or if the government ordered them to do so.

Recently, the Premier (Mr. Davis) warned that the province may have to tighten up the plan that provides people over 65 with free prescription drugs because costs are running too high. The Premier said part of the blame lies with doctors who prescribe too much medicine for the elderly. He indicated this results in non-prescription drugs costing much more than if they were simply bought off the pharmacy shelves. However, the abuse is by pharmacists who collect dispensing fees every month by refusing to fill long-term prescriptions.

Many people are on long-term maintenance drugs but still they have to go back to the pharmacy and get their prescriptions renewed every 30 days.

Here is the story of a Toronto woman with a thyroid condition. She takes a drug called eltroxin, two milligrams. The pills cost 1.8 cents each. She used to buy a three-month supply for about \$4. Now that she gets free drugs under the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan, she can get only one month's supply at a time. The result: the druggist gets three dispensing fees instead of one. The government picks up the tab for \$9.42—more than double what the drug cost when she could get a three-month supply.

The 30-day limit on medication was introduced when the plan covered only welfare recipients. In fact this was the Ontario Pharmacists' Association price for opting into the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan. The government did not want to supply drugs for more than 30 days because they felt the recipient might go back to work and pay for his own drugs at that point.

Since January 1, 1976 the plan has been extended to cover 785,000 senior citizens. The Ministry of Health will pay for a six-month supply for seniors at a slightly higher dispensing fee, but druggists prefer the 30-day limit so that they can charge the extra dispensing fee.

The average prescription last year cost \$6.12. Of that amount \$3.30, or about half, was for the drug. The other half, \$2.82, represented the dispensing fee charged by the druggist. Billings have soared from \$69,800,000 in 1976 to \$86,600,000 in 1977, and then to \$108,000,000 in 1978. As I said earlier, nearly half of this money went directly to the pockets of the pharmacists.

Here is a case of an Etobicoke woman who takes a blood pressure medication called hydrochlorothiazide. She takes only two tablets a week so a bottle of 100 lasts her a full year. Before the woman turned 65 she could buy 100 tablets of hydrochlorothiazide for \$3.50, but when she was covered by the plan she could only get one month's supply, nine pills at a time. The cost to the government was \$2.35 a month or \$28.20 a year. As a cash customer she pays \$3.50; under the plan it costs taxpayers \$28.20.

My assistant contacted 19 pharmacies located in Toronto, Burlington, Barrie, Windsor and Thunder Bay and asked for a three-month supply of these hydrochlorothiazide tablets. Only one pharmacy agreed to fill the prescription for three months. Two others said the government would only

pay for a one-month supply at a time and the other 16 flatly refused to dispense for more than 30 days stating that this was government regulation.

Originally pharmacists got a straight fee of \$2.25 for every drug benefit prescription. Last year they could receive \$2.82 dispensing fee per prescription as long as the fee they charged the government was no more than what they were charging the public.

This marketplace system is not working because it seems to have given many pharmacists the green light to charge the public more so that they could get more money out of the government. Everyone pays more because of the marketplace concept of the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan.

Here is a letter from a Toronto man. I will just quote his opening statement: "Several times on a regular repeat prescription where the doctor ordered 60 units, I have been sent 30 units. I went back and made them give me the other 30." Most people aren't that insistent.

I have another letter here from an Arnprior man: "The report of your concern with the abuse of the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan certainly was welcome. I have been fighting this unsavory practice on a personal basis for some time and so far I've succeeded only in having my doctor prescribe for 100 tablets to be taken as directed, whereas prior to the inception of the plan I was able to get Prednisone tablets by the 1,000 from the Vanguard Prescription Drug Service Limited in Toronto. The last order returned was marked, we cannot send prescription drugs through the mail. Even this I don't believe.

"I'm obliged to take three separate drugs daily for the rest of my life and this refusal by the druggists to dispense more than a month's supply could leave me with an obligatory visit to the drug store monthly for 20 years.

"Letters have been sent by me to the Honourable William Davis, Honourable Frank Drea, Honourable D. Timbrell, Paul Yakabuski and Mike Cassidy, asking all of them to please put a stop to this costly, wasteful and inconvenient practice, which seems to make it as difficult for those over age 65 as possible.

"Thank you for your efforts, keep up the good work. Who knows, we may be successful."

Here's a letter from Pembroke, Ontario:

"Re Ontario Drug Benefit Plan for our senior citizens and druggists who refuse to fill more than one month's supply.

"This is exactly what goes on in Pembroke. I would suggest that all doctors in Ontario be asked to prescribe more than one month where advisable and druggists demanded to fill the requirements as given.

"We appreciate the assistance of the taxpayers for our help, but deplore the get rich quick methods of a Pembroke outfit exploiting the good intentions of the government through the taxpayers."

Here's a letter I received from a Weston, Ontario, man:

"Perhaps you will be interested to know that I wrote to Mr. E. N. Thompson of the drugs and therapeutic pricing department early this week, pointing out the various increases in the price of the drug I have been taking for the last five years.

"I cannot go back to the entire period, but in May of 1977, I paid \$7.11 for 300 tablets of novophenytoin; in October 1977, the price for a mixture of dilatin and novophenytoin tablets—there was not enough of the one at the time to fill the order—was \$10.18.

"I questioned the 43 per cent increase in the price, and took the case to the Ontario pharmacy college, which, after investigation, ordered a refund of \$3.

"In July 1978, I came under the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan and as you've said was limited to 68 tablets per prescription. The excuse given was that the druggist was not allowed to dispense more at a time—probably by rules and regulations set up by themselves.

"The first 68 tablets given under the plan was in November of last year. The cost to the government, and therefore to the taxpayers, was \$4. In January of this year, it was \$4.13. On a basis of 300 tablets this would amount to a cool \$18.22, an increase of some 260 per cent over the price of \$7.11 paid in May 1977." This was when he was a cash customer.

A ministry official assured me that since January 1, 1976, they look at one month's supply as the minimum quantity, but many pharmacists look at it as the maximum quantity. He says: "Pharmacists have it ingrained in their mind," and these are his exact words, "that they can only dispense one month's supply."

Now I'm going to quote from the Windsor Star, February 10, 1979. "Essex County Pharmacists' Association president . . . says the monthly fees are not a ripoff. They cut down on drug abuse and allow doctors to re-evaluate the results of medication." These are her exact words: "It's actually a very wise way to do things and has been followed

with all other drug plans." Why isn't it "wise" for cash-paying customers?

[12:00]

Here's how another pharmacist put it:

"Dear sir: As a third-generation pharmacist, I resent very much your accusation that the pharmacists are ripping off the drug benefit plan. (Toronto Star, February 1.) The government of Ontario agreed to the 34-day supply at the time Parcost was introduced and seems to prefer that the pharmacists submit their accounts once a month." Now listen to this: "The up-to-date thinking re health care for the elderly is that loneliness is the biggest problem. Therefore, if they visit the pharmacy once a month they have at least one social contact.

"For example, long before the drug benefit plan was thought of, I had a customer who telephoned me twice a month for half of her prescription. The reason was that I would visit her after hours, twice a month, instead of once a month." I wonder if he collected his dispensing fee for those half prescriptions as well.

Here's how the pharmacists feel about it. On February 15, they wrote into the Toronto Sun: "The abuse of health-care professionals has been rampant in the media of late. February 1, a report of the remarks made by Ed Ziemba, MPP, on pharmacists and prescriptions appeared. Mr. Ziemba is either unaware of the facts or distorts them to gain cheap publicity.

"If he is so anxious to release statistics, perhaps he should state those factors which influence the data. For example, he states that billings to the plan have increased, but neglects to say that the number of people eligible for coverage may have increased." They are wrong. They haven't increased. Good try.

"Mr. Ziemba charges pharmacists with refusing to issue more than a 30-day supply of drugs under the drug benefit plan as a practice instituted by them to gain the dispensing fee. In fact, this is one of the fundamental rules of the program imposed by the government, and any diversion from this path is subject to approval by the Ministry of Health. We would hope that Mr. Ziemba's remarks were misinterpreted and that he will be anxious to clearly articulate his view. Signed, R. Halliday, BSc, Pharm, and 10 others."

The Sun, in its usual fashion, has a little snarky postscript: "We suspect that his mind is made up."

Mr. Conway: Now, now, Ed, take it easy on the press, particularly the Newcastle Trombone.

Mr. Cureatz: It's the Newcastle Reporter.

Mr. Ziemba: A ministry official was quoted in the Ottawa Citizen: "Earl Coulson, director of the drug benefit plan, denied that it is government policy to allow only a month's supply to be dispensed at one time." Here are his words as quoted from the Ottawa Citizen on February 1: "There is no way that it is, and they are misrepresenting the contents of our drug benefit plan." Coulson said the terms of the government's agreement with the Ontario Pharmaceutical Association allows druggists to dispense anywhere from one to six months' supply of a prescribed drug. Druggists who insist on dispensing only a month's supply of drugs do so because they stand to gain financially, Coulson admitted."

Here again, Mr. Coulson was quoted in the Windsor Star: "Earl Coulson, co-ordinator of pharmacy services for the Ministry of Health, said in an interview that subject to some qualifications, Ziemba is right. Coulson said the drug plan allows for drugs to be prescribed for a maximum of six months and a minimum of one month. He agreed that many pharmacists insist on only giving enough medicine for one month but said any druggist is incorrect who says the one-month period is required by government regulation.

"Despite the abuse in dispensing fees by some pharmacists, he said, there are some arguments in favour of maintaining the status quo. He said he knows from experience that it is 'probably right' that most druggists insist on 30-day limits. But Coulson said there are some arguments in favour of not forcing druggists to issue long-term prescriptions. He said the plan was negotiated with the Ontario Pharmaceutical Association and if any changes were made to the agreement it could end up costing the government more." What are they going to do, blackmail him?

I tried to contact Mr. Coulson the very next day after he made that statement, but he had been transferred to another department, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that physicians do not appreciate having pharmacists alter their prescription quantity, especially on long-term maintenance drugs. I don't see why the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan prescriptions have to be treated any differently from any other prescriptions, prescriptions that people walk in and purchase, cash and carry. The Ontario Drug Benefit Plan is being mismanaged by this government. The time has come to get tough with druggists who are milking the plan; the ministry should send out a directive tomorrow

stating that the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan prescription quantity is not to be altered by the pharmacist.

The Ontario Pharmacists' Association, which represents 1,600 pharmacies, insisted on this 30-day dispensing fee as their price for co-operating with the drug benefit plan and they shouldn't have been allowed to get away with it. We would not have to be cutting back on hospital beds and punishing the weak and the powerless in our communities if the government would manage plans like the Ontario Drug Benefit Plan properly.

Mr. Cureatz: It is my pleasure to rise to debate the motion before the House, Mr. Speaker.

In my remarks this afternoon I would like to reiterate one or two of the points touched on in the throne speech. Because of the intensity of the debates nowadays surrounding the control of government spending, and because I think this is a period of readjustment for all governments at all levels in Canada, I would like to discuss what I feel is a growing paradox in politics, the so-called constraints that we are facing today.

The conflicting demands of present government policy are obvious, I think, to all of us. On the one hand, there is a growing mood among both the public and the business sector to have the government reduce its role as a regulatory agency, to control its spending in order to keep taxes down and to provide capital for the private sector. On the other hand, in our present economic climate there is added pressure being placed on governments to assume increased responsibility for the well-being of the people of this province. There is, of course, no simple solution to balancing the fine line between government meeting its responsibility to those in need and maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Conway: Sure there is; read the charter.

Mr. McClellan: You are not supposed to read your speech.

Mr. Cureatz: In part the problem stems from the expectations that society has imposed on government; namely, access to high standards in education, health and social services.

Mr. Samis: From the heart.

Mr. Turner: But he is doing it well.

Mr. Cureatz: With each new generation this expectation has grown stronger. In 1945, the Ontario budget was \$183,000,000, with some \$20,000,000 or 9.8 per cent being spent on health care.

Mr. Conway: I remember it well.

Mr. Cureatz: Today, the Ministry of Health alone has a budget of \$3,900,000,000, accounting for 20 per cent of the province's budget.

Since 1946 we have witnessed the emergence of what I think is one of the best systems of social care in the world. The growth of the system went hand in hand with the building of a burgeoning economy.

In 1946, Ontarians, tired of depression and war, turned their attention to building a strong growth-orientated and prosperous society. Prosperity brought with it a willingness to invest in social services and improve the quality of life in Ontario.

Mr. Conway: From the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Cureatz: In a sense, public concern in Ontario merged with the willingness and empathy on the part of the government to form a common bond of expanded and improved services in the education, health and welfare fields. Few people would argue that we are not a better society for it.

In recent years, however, we have come to realize that social services can be costly, and if economic growth and revenues do not keep pace, government can be placed in a precarious position.

The experience in California with the passage of Proposition 13 is of great significance, because it is a clear indication that taxpayers are fed up. Not only are taxpayers in North America feeling the sting which accompanies the large bite that governments take from taxable incomes, but they are also beginning to rebel against levies on their capital acquisitions through property taxes. The people of California obviously reacted to a distrust of government; and, while their actions may ultimately lead to unforeseen and perhaps even dire consequences, I think all governments which increased spending through massive social planning in the 1960s must read the California message.

Even Michael Pitfield, the most powerful of federal civil servants, has asked the fundamental question: "How long can the public sector take on functions and manpower from the private sector before the latter loses its vitality and not only our system of government but the whole structure of society is irrevocably changed?"

The question is answered simply, for as long as governments lack conviction and courage we will not have restraint. But spending must be stopped unless deficits increase enormously or the taxpayer is prepared to cough up a whole lot more than he is already doing. The challenge of gov-

ernment today is to serve the public more effectively while at the same time adhering to principles of restraint.

Mr. Lawlor: You don't believe that malarkey, do you?

Mr. Cureatz: Often the only way to reduce the burden of taxation is a painful one which will involve cutbacks.

Mr. Lawlor: All your planning is lining the pockets of the rich.

Mr. Cureatz: I am buying the member's book, and he is complaining. I don't think I will be buying his book now.

Unfortunately, if government is serious in its efforts to control spending, it must take a long, hard look at three areas in particular; these are, because of their costs, the areas of education, health and welfare. The area of education provides a good deal of insight into the new equilibrium between service and cost that this government is attempting to achieve. It also provides insight into the criticism that the opposition parties are currently engaging in.

Mr. Conway: Very valid criticism.

Mr. Cureatz: Here we go. This is the meat of this speech.

Let me turn briefly to the question of education. I think it is time that we and the opposition both recognize what effects demographic changes are going to have in our educational institutions. A most obvious instance is the university situation, which is currently having to prepare for declining enrolment. How can the members opposite criticize funding for universities when they know that increases really amount to spending larger sums of money on programs serving fewer members of our population?

I think it is high time that the members on the opposite side of the House came to the realization that universality, that magical word born of a feeling that government can be all things to all people, is more and more open to question as we preach restraint. Universal programs, rather than meeting the needs of a special group in society for which they are intended, often produce large bureaucracies which are insensitive to individuals. Often the so-called universal application of one particular program costs enormous amounts of money.

For example, just because all children are subject to a particular learning program in the school system does not mean that we have accomplished the means by which we can effectively recognize remedial or compensatory needs in a few children who truly need individual help. If government is going

to be as generous as people continue to want it to be, this means we are going to have to maximize the use of existing resources by carefully assessing needs in the light of the individual who cannot care for himself. We are going to have to question the concept of universality.

Just as one has to question universality in education, I think one has to question institutionalization in our health and care programs. The shift away from strong, central control over health services towards local community organizations is simply an outgrowth of our awareness that community-based preventive services are both more desirable and cost-effective.

It is essential that the reorganization in the delivery of health services be viewed as a system, and, as such, isolating single aspects of the changes is misleading. For example, it is misleading to discuss a 4.5 per cent increase in 1979 funding for active beds and ignore a 5.3 per cent increase to chronic-care and rehabilitation units within active-treatment hospitals.

The point I am making is that human nature is often reluctant to accept change. I suppose many would prefer to maintain the status quo. However, once again, demographic shifts will in a few years alter greatly the demands on the health-care system. An ageing population will require a mix of health services different from our current ones.

[12:15]

Therefore, unless we want a largely institutionalized elderly population, which we cannot afford, we must ensure we have a healthy population and alternative services which provide care, yet allow people a large measure of independence and flexibility.

I mentioned welfare when I began to speak, but perhaps I can best sum up my thoughts by saying that I sense, as most of us do, a growth in our awareness of the relationship between welfare programming, or any of the social services for that matter, and the revenue resources that fund these services. I think we all realize we cannot afford to divorce social planning and economic goals from each other. We recognize the strong balance in what we do economically and what we can do in the social services.

Mr. Conway: What are you going to do about too many lawyers?

Mr. Cureatz: In order to maintain a healthy balance, we in Ontario have committed ourselves to encouraging industrial strength as best we can. We are focusing more and more attention on those industries and resources that have long-term potential.

This will require a greater emphasis on research and development. In some instances it has meant providing incentives that will assist these industries to provide long-term employment and to improve our competitive position locally and internationally.

Mr. Lawlor: You are doing no such thing. You are blundering around in utter darkness. What industries are you putting so much money into apart from automobiles?

Mr. Cureatz: By way of example, the down-sizing of automobiles for energy efficiency has opened up a whole new avenue of investment potential in the last few years. It is important that we attract some of those investment dollars for Ontario. The automobile assembly and automobile parts manufacturing industries are the largest dollar-producing sectors in the Ontario economy. Only through the tapping of this investment market, created by the production of smaller cars, can we retain economic health in our automobile industry.

That is why our government is proud of the fact that our \$26,000,000 incentive to Ford brought a \$500,000,000 V-6 engine plant and over 7,000 jobs to the Windsor area. It is worth mentioning, also, that Ford has further decided to locate a \$150,000,000 aluminum casting plant there as well at no cost to the government of Ontario. This achievement is a direct result of an aggressive attitude on the part of the government to make Ontario as attractive as possible for new investment.

The results of these are obvious, especially to the people of Windsor.

Mr. Lawlor: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: How is it possible to heckle a member properly if he reads his speech? If he is speaking off the cuff, then you can get yourself in. But if they go on a blue streak, having it all set out in front of them, they obviously have an advantage. This is being utilized by this government too extensively. I wish you would bring an end to it.

Mr. Turner: You might consult the member for High Park-Swansea.

Mr. Eaton: The last speaker read all his speech. He even read a letter.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Lakeshore will have to use his own authority.

Mr. Cureatz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the points I am trying to get across to the House are so important I want to make sure they are concise and that the record is able to establish the exact train of thought.

Mr. Conway: Would you mind repeating that?

Mr. McClellan: You have some hack writing your speech for you because you are incapable of thought.

Mr. Cureatz: Pulp and paper manufacturing is another example of an industry which has in the past and continues at present to make strong contributions to the Ontario economy. The government has offered the industry about \$100,000,000 in incentives to upgrade environmental protection equipment and to effect process modernization which will result in increased productivity and a cleaner environment.

Mr. Samis: Look at their profits last year.

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you just table the speech? File the speech with the clerk.

Mr. Cureatz: It is through the provision of these incentives at a time in the pulp and paper cycle—

Mr. Lawlor: Now we have to pay them to make money. It is a disgrace.

Mr. Cureatz: —when the companies are realizing profits that we can ensure this industry does not lose its competitive edge in the world market.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a complete betrayal of the free enterprise theory.

Mr. McClellan: This man is a regular reading machine.

Mr. Cureatz: In Ontario, we are prepared to address changing realities. The aggressive attitude taken by this government to attract new investment and its program to assist those sectors of our economy which demonstrate an ability to compete in the new world market are two of the large number of major initiatives which we are undertaking to ensure that Ontario's economy remains competitive.

Mr. Lawlor: It's a complete reversal of anything Herbert Hoover could put up with.

Mr. McClellan: Go back to the sacred text of Herbert Hoover.

Mr. Cureatz: If we are to be successful in attracting new industries to Ontario or in encouraging those already in Ontario to expand, we must be able to assure them that they can expect a reasonable return for taking risks and innovative measures. We must also be in a position from which we can ensure an adequate supply of energy, which is both secure and competitively priced. Ontario's Hydro nuclear program, viewed within the reality of OPEC policy and an uncertain Iranian situation, places us in an enviable position. I think we can easily deal with our surplus energy—and no one denies that we have one—by selling it to industry.

The Darlington nuclear generating plant becomes a very reasonable proposition, when we look at it as part of the government's "go east" strategy and as a cornerstone of an overall plan to stimulate the economic growth towards the other side of the Metropolitan Toronto area. Darlington 2 will be a key element in our growing nuclear energy industry.

From the local perspective, the station with its 3,000-megawatt capacity will employ 600 people at present and approximately 3,700 people during its peak construction period. From a global perspective I think it is becoming clear that Candu nuclear technology is superior to much of the technology being developed elsewhere and this success is important to maintain as we look to exporting the products of this technology abroad.

If we are going to give business a successful boost I think one of the most important things we can recognize is that healthy economic growth cannot take place when governments are overly interfering and blindly going ahead creating red tape. The government of Ontario is fully committed to the principle of regulatory reform in the broadest sense in order to reduce, as far as possible, the complexity of statutes, regulations, directives and administrative practices.

Particular attention is being given to those areas where simplification of government requirements can assist in reducing the cost of compliance both in financial and human terms, although I must confess to the member for Lakeshore I often wonder who created all the red tape in the first place. Deregulation is a further insurance that we will remain competitive in the world marketplace.

Mr. Lawlor: Why don't you want to subsidize the red-tape industry?

Mr. Cureatz: We are committed to creating an environment that will be attractive to investors and will demonstrate we have a system of government regulation both stable and fair. The element of fairness, of course, must apply equally to the investor and consumer of his product. That is why we are examining all the past legislation and programs to discover whether there are areas of overlap, overregulation or unnecessary regulation.

Furthermore, any new legislation being considered should be examined to ensure it is efficient in terms of its administrative cost and time to government as well as to the group affected.

Another area in which the government recently has been moving to establish

greater equality and fairness is that of tax assessment. Just prior to last Christmas, the Municipal Assessment Amendment Act was introduced. The bill is aimed at allowing municipalities to realize the full potential of their existing tax base under the present property tax-assessment system. Municipalities may request implementation of section 86 of the Assessment Act to calculate the new equalization factors for their municipality. This will remove the freeze on mill rates that has been in place since 1970 and will be the new basis for the distribution of government grants to municipalities and school boards in Ontario. This program is attempting to eliminate serious discrepancies in the current allocation of municipal grants for 1979.

The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck) is attempting to correct serious assessment inequalities with the implementation of section 86. When a resolution is filed by a municipal council, it will allow assessors to amend assessments in order to equalize assessment values and similar real property in the vicinity. There will be no property tax shifts from one class of property to another—for example, from industrial to residential.

The revised mill rates will become the basis for the 1980 education resources equalization grants to municipalities based on the 1978 market value. No municipality or school board will receive less grants in 1980 due to the introduction of new factors. To date, 13 municipalities have applied for the implementation of section 86 in 1979, and more than 50 municipalities have applied for assessment equalization in 1980.

The two-year time factor involved before implementation of the new mill rates will allow municipal and school representatives to review the factors and, if necessary, appeal the change. Provisions will also be made to allow for phasing in of drastic changes in mill rates.

In my riding of Durham East, the town of Newcastle, which encompasses the old township of Clarke, the township of Darlington, the village of Newcastle and the town of Bowmanville, is undergoing this initiative for change. Any initiative for change is usually accompanied by some confusion and uncertainty. The town of Newcastle is no exception. However, I think council made the right decision in requisitioning such action.

While section 86 should bring fairness among properties within a given class—residential, commercial or industrial—it also protects against tax shifts from one property

class on to another, such as from commercial on to residential. In other words, each property class will bear the same proportion of the total municipal tax burden following the section 86 assessment as it did before. The objective is solely to achieve equality within each property class.

Certain property owners within a class that has been paying more than its fair tax share will have both their assessment and their property taxes reduced. I think this confusion comes in where others who have been underassessed will face tax increases. For those people, however, who may think their assessment is incorrect, the regional assessment office may be contacted. Of course, there may be the occasion where a person is still dissatisfied with a decision. In this case, he or she has the resources of the right to appeal to the assessment review court. It is also my understanding that under the Municipal Act, sections 505 or 636 might be used by residents to approach their local council to seek some relief where there has been a very sharp rise in taxes. The local councillors for the individual wards should be approached in this regard.

Another matter that very much affects my own riding and relates indirectly to the topic of deregulation is that of decentralization of government services. A great deal of progress, for example, has been made in the past year in the Ministry of Revenue's preparations for the relocation of its head office to Oshawa. A site was purchased on the southeast corner of King and Centre streets in downtown Oshawa, and the building's preliminary design stage is nearing completion. Construction is scheduled to begin in May 1980 and continue for two years.

Mr. Haggerty: That's a depressed area.

Mr. Cureatz: By May 1982 the ministry expects to begin transferring employees to the new facility, which should be fully staffed with 1,300 employees and in operation by October of the same year. Although Revenue officials expect many of the present employees to remain in their jobs, a significant proportion of the positions will, over time, become available to local people.

As well as the economic benefits from the original construction employment factors, the area's economy will further benefit from the spending and housing requirements of the new families moving into the area and also from the supply and service demands of the ministry itself.

These are a few of the initiatives the government has taken recently to make both

Ontario and the Durham region a more attractive investment location. When discussing the broad topic of restraint in social services spending, however, it is not enough to talk about deregulation or decentralization by themselves; nor is it enough to mention our commitment to free enterprise as a means to ensure a stable revenue source to support services. We in Ontario must continue to recognize the human aspect of free enterprise, or of freedom and enterprise, if you will. We must continue to realize that in today's context we still have a social responsibility, a responsibility to those disadvantaged by change, not choice.

Perhaps, given the current emphasis that is being placed on restraining the growth of government spending and the pressure that is being placed upon us to review each new initiative carefully, we should be returning, as the government House leader said in a speech he delivered not long ago, to the spirit of volunteerism that once permeated our society.

In recent years, with government assuming an ever-larger role in the delivery of social services, this principle has been somewhat eroded. Government should, of course, continue to meet its responsibility in the social field. What I am saying, however, is that this role must go hand in hand with individual involvement and community initiative. A government can only do so much alone. We need the family institution. We need a social commitment to one another, and I think we are entering a time when decentralization of our social services is the only sane, rational policy to follow.

Finally, we need a commitment to improving these social services but giving at the same time the highest priority to our economic circumstances, for it is only in a vibrant and growing economy that we can provide for individual needs.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to rise this morning and make a few points on the speech from the throne of last March 6. But first of all I would like to recognize the new members who have been elected to the House and haven't had the opportunity to participate in the debate from the floor.

I'd like to recognize the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. Watson), the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Ramsay), and the two new members, Colin Isaacs, Hamilton-Wentworth, and Richard Johnston, Scarborough West, and welcome them to the Legislature of Ontario so that they can participate in making this province work more efficiently.

I would also like to point out that I've had the opportunity in the last few weeks to participate in the campaign in Hamilton-Wentworth and had the opportunity of working with some good young people, such as young Peter Tice, the Liberal candidate, and of course, we've known Gordon Dean, the Conservative candidate, for many years. They've all contributed to our democratic system.

[12:30]

I was very interested in the results because I think the people spoke; they perhaps do not want an election at this time. They have also indicated a real concern for the waste disposal site planned to be located in Glanbrook township. It was obvious by their votes that they do not want it there; they are concerned for their environment, and it should be a real concern to this Legislature.

I welcome the opportunity to respond to some of the points raised in the speech from the throne on March 6, and to share with you some personal concerns I have on a number of issues in my riding of Haldimand-Norfolk. When I speak on behalf of those, I think I am perhaps speaking also on behalf of Ontario.

I have become particularly annoyed and frustrated over the past 18 months when I see more and more elderly people wanting to move into senior citizens' apartments but discovering they cannot do so as they do not fit into the point system formulated by the Ministry of Housing. This has been another concern.

We had two projects, one in Cayuga and one in Port Rowan. They were researched five years ago, indicating there was a need there. But the point system that has been established has ruled out many from taking advantage of the need. The reason given by the ministry is that we have to provide housing for low-income families. The ministry does not take into consideration whether you have any money; but if you own a home, even though you are not in a position to look after that home, it does not qualify you to utilize the apartment, because when you sell your home you would have too much funding.

That may well be so in larger urban centres such as Toronto, where there is plenty of apartment accommodation, but in our rural municipalities it does not work that way. There is not a demand for apartments, but there certainly is a need for senior citizens' accommodation. I know many old people who would take advantage of it, and perhaps would pay more than the

required funding now, if they had the opportunity of utilizing senior citizens' accommodation.

For example, two senior citizens' projects in Haldimand-Norfolk have been rejected; they have been denied government assistance on the grounds of insufficient need. According to the ministry, there are not enough seniors in this particular community who would move into the units on the present point system. I know there are many old people living in isolated areas who would love to move into such homes if they could. They currently live in ostensibly poor-quality homes requiring a great deal of upkeep and, in winter particularly, they are cut off from the main towns, as the only mode of transportation is the automobile. They are unable to do the day-to-day chores that they could do a few years back.

I would also like to mention the fact that on Monday of last week we had the pleasure of the government House leader's coming down to open 43 new units in Dunnville, making a total of 84. Dunnville is a community that has plenty of accommodation at the present time; but Cayuga, which is 20 miles away, does not. It is our responsibility to keep our people in the communities where they have grown up and lived their lives.

Because these seniors do not fall into the point system set up by the Ministry of Housing, owing to the fact that they have a so-called roof over their heads and live on a scanty pension, they are denied adequate housing. These are old people who find life very hard and, for one reason or another, I believe they deserve better treatment for the hard years of work they have contributed to the province.

What I would like to see is greater flexibility in the point system. Naturally, individuals in dire need must be given first priority. However, if a unit becomes vacant, I would like to see the opportunity being given to those seniors who wish to move, and who can afford a modest rent, to accept it. I feel they deserve the right to spend their last years in decent, well-heated homes, without maintenance headaches forever hanging over their heads.

In 1977, the government requested children's aid societies to cut back as much as possible. This is in the area of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. This has been done to such an extent that the fat has been trimmed right to the bone—so much so that these agencies are now operating a second-rate service.

The Family and Children's Services of Haldimand county is a case in point. Inade-

quate funding and staffing are resulting in an inferior level of service at a time when the caseload is increasing dramatically. Haldimand-Norfolk is now drawing a more urban type of newcomer who is bringing his urban problems with him. Child abuse has increased substantially, marriages are more unstable and the extra burden placed on the caseworkers makes it almost impossible to meet these challenges. Inadequate funding is preventing adequate family counselling and the society can only respond with Band-Aid plans.

I draw this to your attention because I find it rather ironic that the children's services bureau of the Ministry of Community and Social Services was set up in June 1977 to look into the future needs of our children. More money is being spent on research, more civil servants are being paid hefty salaries to look into the needs of our kids over the next 10 years, while in the Year of the Child, 1979, many children are being denied adequate help because government funding has been slashed in their communities.

I would just like to read to you, and put on record, the report of the president of the Family and Children's Services of Haldimand. This was presented at their annual meeting, March 15, 1979. I'll just quote a portion of it to make the point and express their views to the Legislature and to the minister.

"Since the advent of regionalization and the beginning of industrialization, the composition of this county has been changing. We are losing our rural nature and becoming more urban. There has been an influx of new families, many of them from other urban centres. We are losing our close-knit, family ties that existed for generations. Family disruptions are increasing. Child abuse, or at least the identification of child abuse, is increasing. The number of families needing counselling to prevent breakdowns is on the rise. Consequently the needs of the children are changing. Cases are becoming increasingly complex and the demand on the time of our limited social-work staff is steadily increasing. Legal complexities involved in providing for children at risk are becoming increasingly complicated and time-consuming.

"As you can see, these changes are placing great demands on your society. We have been given a mandate under the Child Welfare Act, but we have not been given the necessities to carry it out. This board, acting on your behalf, has budgeted, we feel, realistically and conscientiously to provide for the needs of the community. We had, somewhat naively in retrospect, supposed that this concern and conscious

planning that we felt was necessary to carry out our obligatory mandate would be respected by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. However, we are plagued with inadequate financing, social work and support staff cutbacks. The ministry makes decisions based on provincial averages—theoretically, caseloads and supposed needs—all of which are far removed from the reality of our situation.

"As I have said, we have been given a mandate in law but we are finding it increasingly difficult to carry it out. The demands on our social-work staff are becoming unbearable. These dedicated people put in many hours of uncompensated overtime per week and, if it were not for their dedication, this society would collapse tomorrow. We are in a crisis situation. We are fast reaching a point where we will be unable to carry out our responsibilities and, because of this, there will be some tragic consequences.

"Ladies and gentlemen, unless matters change, I feel we will have to choose one of two options: First, continue as is and provide, at best, a second-rate service, an option I find really distasteful. I feel our community deserves better than second-rate. As a second option, recognizing the futility of continuing under these impossible circumstances, we can close our doors."

This was signed by Dr. Tony A. A. Lyon, MD, who happens to be the chairman of the board of the Family and Children's Services of Haldimand county.

These people are responsible and are giving their time freely to provide a service, yet they are not being provided the funding by this government to do an adequate job. That is the point I would like to make on behalf of not only that society, but many societies in Ontario.

As a farmer myself, of course, my primary concern for the future of farming is in my riding and in Ontario. I have great hopes that agriculture will remain an important and integral part of the future of Haldimand-Norfolk and also of Ontario.

As we look over statistics for Canada, 40 per cent of our labour force is utilized in agriculture or agriculture related work. Again speaking of my own riding, I like to see the landscapes broken by barns and silos, rather than industrial stacks. I would like to point out that no doubt we are going to have to work together. I think that is possible because industry is in need of agriculture and an active farm uses many of the steel products that will be made at the industrial park in Nanticoke by Stelco. I

hate to see our corn and grain fields turned entirely to asphalt and highrises.

It is interesting to note that according to Minister of Agriculture Eugene Whelan, during the period 1966-71 some 71,503 acres of high-capacity agricultural land in Ontario was converted to urban uses. Land is lost through other reasons as well, including neglect and mismanagement. Again, I think the policies brought forth by the Minister of Agriculture have to encourage our young people to get back to the land.

I had the opportunity to have dinner with a group of junior farmers in Ancaster the other evening. We used to have 30 per cent of young people returning after taking college and university degrees and I think the percentage has now increased to 60 per cent. There is a desire on behalf of young people to return to the farm, to take over where the elders have left off. I think this should be encouraged. Farming must be made economically interesting to encourage our young people to stay on the land to produce the food necessary for the nation.

I can't blame anyone for hesitating to get involved in the commitment a farm requires in this day and age when returns are so doubtful. On the other hand, do we use the best methods at our disposal to ensure the best returns? Maybe a fresh approach has to be taken in some areas of marketing and production.

Going back to December 5, I suggested to the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) that the DREE program be expanded to take in not only areas where I admit it is needed, in eastern and northern Ontario, but also special areas where this funding could be used to improve other depreciated areas or areas where the drainage needs improving. I think a good example of that, again, is in my county of Haldimand and in the areas of the Niagara Peninsula. They could be much more productive if proper drainage were provided and the incentive could well be from the DREE program.

Another area where there is a need for job and financial assistance is that of small processors. We had a good example of that in Norfolk county last year where, because of imports coming onstream at the same time as our fresh products, there was no place to market or process the strawberry crop. Funding in this area and for tomatoes and peaches would be of great assistance in providing job opportunities that are so drastically needed now for our young people.

[12:45]

Whether or not the urban community is aware, it is very dependent on the farmer. In Canada the average farmer produces enough food from the farm to feed 55 people. By the year 2000 that figure is expected to rise to between 200 and 250. This is in comparison with some underprivileged countries and Third World countries that produce enough food to feed one person off the farm where in a country like France the figure is 12.

Canada's agricultural production is important, and for this reason I feel there is real hope for the Canadian farmer. If we have agricultural produce we are in a position to barter, considering the energy shortage appearing on the horizon, and with the countries around the Mediterranean in a position where they can't produce. They have the oil, they have the money and I think if we have the food we can barter. I also think the future of agriculture and the using of our agricultural products as a bartering point can only be to the advantage of us all.

While there is considerable hope there are also some needs right here at home. One of the ones I see is the need for processors. These are limited in number and control so much of our production at the present time that growers find it difficult to market their crops.

Imports too at certain times of the year create marketing problems. An example of this is Norfolk strawberry producers, as I indicated a few minutes ago, who lost thousands of plots of berries because the supermarkets came in with imports. We stand to lose our Norfolk production without markets and these are controlled by the large chain stores who contract for imported berries to secure winter produce, a form of blackmail that is hurting the Ontario market.

I am pleased to see in the throne speech the province-wide campaign to assist consumers on ways to reduce their food costs by using Ontario-grown produce. It can only be hoped that eventually the consumer will take to heart the slogan "Buy Canadian" where possible and force the distributors to deal at home. I think it is to the advantage of the supermarkets that we buy Canadian- and Ontario-grown produce. It keeps the money here and it stimulates the economy, so it has to be to the advantage of supermarkets, consumers and producers.

Wages are another factor in high production costs as farmers find it difficult to hire responsible workers at the wages they can afford to pay in comparison with the

increasing wages of industry. Again, the farmer has to have a fair return so that he can compete. There's no reason someone who works on the farm shouldn't have the right to have the same living standard as anyone else in the work force.

If one were to make a snap judgement, it might be thought that in order to make farming a viable industry, large co-operative farms are the answer. In the long run, however, I believe the best stewards of our land are the family farm units. They produce not for the profit of the moment, but with a view to keeping that land productive for generations to come. They ask only for a fair return on their investment and I believe it is their right to expect to receive it. Certainly, there have been good years when corn and grain brought top dollars for the bushel, but there have been other years when the story was not so great and the temptation to look for another field of endeavour faced us all.

I like to think that we in opposition have, since 1975, made some contribution to the legislation which has been helpful in improving returns to the agricultural industry. At the present time we have many options: the St. Lawrence Grain Company established a new elevator in southwestern Ontario in the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk; the federal government was putting up for sale to private enterprise the facilities at Port Colborne, and hopefully they can be maintained by Ontario or Canadian haulers to provide a service to the producers here.

As an example, last year they shipped out a boatload of corn to Cuba. The boat came into Port Colborne, and it would have made 10 cents a bushel difference in price, but they were able to load only 400,000 bushels. They had to put the remainder on the St. Lawrence. Consequently, I think this facility should be improved. It provides a service for the agricultural industry in southern Ontario and it should be kept in Ontario or Canadian hands to best serve the interests of all producers.

Ontario has begun to recognize the need to take measures to preserve farm land in the province. The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) introduced in 1977 and 1978, food land guidelines as a planning policy for agricultural land use. However, this is not official legislation and there is no assurance that it will be followed. Even in the face of the guidelines, the government continues to allow withdrawal of farm land through annexation, such as has

happened recently in Hanover and Barrie. I would indicate too that we are hopeful that the regional planning department will implement these agricultural guidelines. I hope they are used to the best advantage of the agricultural industry, because with only four per cent of our population in the agricultural production field they have to have strong support, not only from the rural element, but from the urban and especially from the Legislature at Queen's Park.

Mr. Riddell: It will be interesting to see what the cabinet does on the agrominium development in West Gwillimbury township.

Mr. Ashe: That's just a peanut gallery after your conference.

Mr. Riddell: We'll see if they are going to overrule the decision of the OMB.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Haldimand-Norfolk has the floor.

Mr. G. I. Miller: When guidelines and controls on land use are put into effect through planning, it is generally good for the preservation of the land. However, in individual cases it can also create problems, such as that of the family farm where the parents remain in the home farmhouse and perhaps two married sons want to continue the operation and require homes of their own, thus creating a zoning bylaw and planning department nightmare. Again, this is a real concern and has to be dealt with at the local level.

In my particular case, I had an opportunity to speak to a group from Master Feeds and the Royal Bank of Canada at a symposium in Jarvis yesterday, pointing out the future of agriculture in our area. An instance came up where our area is accepting these homes, on behalf of the farming community, where they are needed and necessary, and they are being dealt with more readily. These are just a few of my concerns about farming in this province, and I won't speak any longer on this subject.

The Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett) has announced plans for the first stage of development in the province's new community of Townsend in my region of Haldimand-Norfolk. I would like to point out at this time that I do not disagree with the concept of Townsend. However, as far as I am concerned, the timing of the project is most important to my area and individual municipalities. They are wrestling with that problem at the present time. My concern is that the existing municipalities should be given the opportunity to come up with the potential growth.

If Townsend is allowed to grow, it should be integrated with the town of Jarvis or the other municipalities, because to make a strong community I think we have to blend the new people coming in with the old so that they can all contribute to the welfare, rather than isolating them and having a separate identity.

I believe there is nothing to substantiate the need for this site at the present time. If Stelco meets its agreement to hire 800 of its 1,200 workers from the region, this leaves theoretically 400 families to be secured from outside. Some of these families will be transferred from the Stelco plant at Hamilton and it is conceivable that a large portion will remain in the city and commute as is presently done, since Hamilton is less than an hour's drive from the site.

Regional assessment population figures indicate a slight decrease in numbers in the past year. The forecast, going back to 1973 when regional government was established, was that there would be tremendous growth. This hasn't come about, and as is indicated with the finalizing of construction at Texaco, which is on stream now, and the Hydro plant is nearing completion, they only have their work force; the construction force has deteriorated and consequently our population went down by 174 from 1977 to 1978.

A recent survey by the regional planning department shows that in 11 urban centres in the riding there are 1,190 existing vacant lots. The town of Simcoe, the largest centre in the region, has a maximum growth potential of 22,000 and a present population of just over 14,000. There are 260 vacant lots at present available, with proposals for 1,411 units.

Port Dover and Waterford and the city of Nanticoke have new areas under development with economical housing. Other centres with growth potential include Jarvis, Cayuga, Caledonia and Dunnville. I can see a need for the Townsend site, where it could be utilized to the best interest of the province, and I am one who wants to assure our young people of the housing opportunities they deserve.

It clearly indicates that the land that is owned at the present time should be put on the market at competitive prices; otherwise, the Townsend site may be needed to make the competition effective.

Again, as we had the opportunity of doing a little bit of campaigning on behalf of Peter Tice in the riding of Wentworth, we felt that the town of Saltfleet was still not being utilized. There are bridges there at

the present time—including a four-lane bridge that has been there for several years—not being utilized. The lots are selling for around \$23,900. There is no indication that they are going to be more economical. If the areas are sold to subdividers I think they are going to come up with a price similar to the existing prices of subdivisions which are being put on the market now. For example, in Port Dover a house can be bought for \$43,000 and I don't think there is anywhere that you can get them any cheaper, even if you provide the land. My concern is that the existing areas get the potential they deserve, because there are plenty of vacant lots.

The Norfolk Board of Education has closed, or is in the process of closing, some five or six elementary schools and a number of classrooms in the area high schools. The separate school board is also noting a decline in enrolment. Newspaper reports of the first phase for Townsend indicate the building of two public elementary and one separate school in the plan. The children presently living on the Townsend site are primarily students of existing Townsend area schools.

One of these schools, Townsend Central Senior, is being closed through lack of enrolment. This is a relatively new school, only 14 years old approximately, and it is located adjacent to the Townsend site and Waterford. It is equipped with gymnasium, auditorium, library, home economics and shop facilities. Waterford High School, which presently serves the students living on the site, has a number of empty classrooms and I am wondering if these factors were involved in the planning of educational needs of the site.

It is the general consensus that at the present time there are many more pressing needs in Haldimand-Norfolk. These include more adequate transportation facilities, better transportation corridors into the industrial sites from centres such as Hamilton and Port Colborne, and better water facilities for Jarvis, Hagersville and Cayuga. Possibly the most important is that sufficient time be given for all existing municipalities to adjust and reach their growth potential, or almost so, before Townsend becomes a reality.

The land on the site is excellent agricultural land, and once again I would urge the government that it be kept in production until such time as an absolute need can be shown for the development of the Townsend town site.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have taken part in the debate. I was may-

be rushed a little bit at times. I wanted to put these facts on record. I am concerned for the future of not only my riding, but for Ontario, and concerned for the future of our young people, that they have job opportunities and a home of their own, and I think that is perhaps the main concern for this

particular Legislature, that we make plans for that very purpose.

Thank you for the opportunity of taking part in the debate.

On motion by Mr. Renwick, the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. W. G. Davis, Premier and President of the Council; Hon. R. Welch, Provincial Secretary for Justice and Deputy Premier; Hon. J. A. C. Auld, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister of Energy; Hon. R. Brunelle, Provincial Secretary for Resources Development; Hon. T. L. Wells, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs; Hon. L. Bernier, Minister of Northern Affairs; Hon. J. W. Snow, Minister of Transportation and Communications; Hon. M. Birch, Provincial Secretary for Social Development; Hon. C. Bennett, Minister of Housing; Hon. W. Newman, Minister of Agriculture and Food; Hon. F. S. Miller, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics; Hon. D. R. Timbrell, Minister of Health; Hon. H. C. Parrott, Minister of the

Environment; Hon. B. M. Stephenson, Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities; Hon. R. McMurtry, Attorney General and Solicitor General; Hon. L. C. Henderson, Minister of Government Services and Chairman of Cabinet; Hon. K. C. Norton, Minister of Community and Social Services; Hon. F. Drea, Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations; Hon. L. Grossman, Minister of Industry and Tourism; Hon. G. McCague, Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet; Hon. L. Maeck, Minister of Revenue; Hon. R. C. Baetz, Minister of Culture and Recreation; Hon. D. J. Wiseman, Minister without Portfolio; Hon. R. Elgie, Minister of Labour and Manpower; Hon. G. Walker, Minister of Correctional Services.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATURE

Procedural Affairs: Chairman, Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP); Vice-Chairman, Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP); Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP), Haggerty, R. (Erie L), Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC), Rowe, R. D. (Northumberland PC), Ruston, R. (Essex North L), Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC); Clerk, G. White.

General Government: Chairman, McCafrey, B. (Armourdale PC); Vice-Chairman, Hodgson, W. (York North PC); Ashe, G. (Durham West PC), Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP), Duksza, J. (Parkdale NDP), Epp, H. (Waterloo North L), Handleman, S. B. (Carleton PC), Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC), Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP), Mancini, R. (Essex South L), McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L), McGuigan, J. (Kent-Elgin L), Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP), Scrivener, M. (St. David PC), Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC), Turner, J. (Peterborough PC); Clerk, Mrs. F. Nokes.

Resources Development: Chairman, Vileeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC); Vice-Chairman, Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC); Bolan, M. (Nipissing L), Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP), di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP), Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC), Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP), Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC), Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC), Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC), McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC), Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L), Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L), Van Horne, R. (London North L), Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP), Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC); Clerk, A. Richardson.

Administration of Justice: Chairman, Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP); Vice-Chairman, Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP); Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L), Campbell, M. (St. George L), Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC), Kerr, G. A. (Burlington South PC), Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP), Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC), Roy, A. (Ottawa East L), Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC), Stong, A. (York Centre L), Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP), Taylor, G. (Simcoe Centre PC), Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC), Williams, J. (Orillia PC), Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP), Clerk, S. Forsyth.

Social Development: Chairman, Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L); Vice-Chairman, Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L); Belanger, J. A. (Prescott and Russell PC), Blundy, P. (Sarnia L), Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP), Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP), Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP), Jones T. (Mississauga North PC), Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC), Leluk, N. G. (York West PC), McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP), O'Neil, H. (Quinte L), Pope, A. (Cochrane South PC), Ramsay, R. H. (Sault Ste. Marie PC), Rowe, R. D. (Northumberland PC), Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L); Clerk, D. Arnott.

Public Accounts: Chairman, Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L); Vice-Chairman, Hall, R. (Lincoln L); Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP), Handleman, S. B. (Carleton PC), Leluk, N. G. (York West PC), Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP), Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP), Peterson, D. (London Centre L), Pope, A.

(Cochrane South PC), Ramsay, R. H. (Sault Ste. Marie PC), Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L), Taylor, G. (Simcoe Centre PC); Clerk, A. Richardson.

Statutory Instruments: Chairman, Williams, J. (Oriole PC); Vice-Chairman, Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC); Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP), Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L), McCaffrey, B. (Armourdale PC), McKessock, R. (Grey L), Rollins, C. T. (Hastings-

Peterborough PC), Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP); Clerk, S. Forsyth.

Members' Services: Chairman, Campbell, M. (St. George L); Vice-Chairman, Conway, S. (Renfrew North L); Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP), Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC), Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L), Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC), Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC), Young, F. (Yorkview NDP); Clerk, A. Arnott.

SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATURE

Hydro affairs: Chairman, MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP); Ashe, G. (Durham West PC), Belanger, J. A. (Prescott and Russell PC), di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP), Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP), Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP), Haggerty, R. (Erie L), Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC), Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L), Leluk, N. C. (York West PC), McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC), Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L), Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L), Williams, J. (Oriole PC); Clerk, A. Richardson.

Company law: Chairman, Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L); Blundy, P. (Sarnia L), Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L), Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC), Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP), Hodgson, W. (York North PC), Laugh-

ren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP), MacBeth, J. P. (Humber PC), Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L), Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP), Rotenberg, D. (Wilson Heights PC), Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC), Van Horne, R. (London North L), Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC); Clerk, Mrs. F. Nokes.

Ombudsman: Chairman, Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP); Campbell, M. (St. George L), Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L), Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP), Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC), Lane, J. (Algoma-Manitoulin PC), McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP), Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L), Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC), Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC); Clerk, A. McFedries.

APPENDIX B

(See page 809)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

UTDC TENDERS

91. Mr. Philip: Will the ministry provide details of all tenders for which UTDC has successfully bid. Will the ministry also provide details of all tenders for which UTDC has unsuccessfully bid. In all cases, will the ministry provide the total value of the contract and details of what was or is to be developed or built as a result of the contract. In cases where UTDC was unsuccessful, will the ministry provide all details of the successful tender. [Tabled March 13, 1979. Interim answer March 27, 1979. Approximate date information available April 10, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Snow: The response to the member's question is as follows: Part A, tenders for which UTDC has successfully bid, and proposals still outstanding; Part B, tenders for which UTDC has unsuccessfully bid.

A. Delivery and sales contracts in operation (showing contract subject and base contract price): Canadian light rail vehicle, \$72,793,000; intermediate capacity, Phase I and II, \$6,100,000; Phase III, \$55,500,000; flywheel energy storage system \$86,000; diesel flywheel hybrid bus system \$1,110,000; com-

posite flywheel program \$36,000; articulated light rail vehicle prototype \$3,700,000; Trans European Express train (TEE) \$5,000,000; TEE train spare parts \$389,000; Sao Paulo, Brazil, Phase I, \$50,000; Phase II, \$56,000; San Francisco Municipal Railway \$300,000; Brazil "Four Cities" program, Phase I, \$237,000; Glenayre signal system \$50,141; AC propulsion evaluation \$35,000; small bus program \$1,750,000; seat design licence \$80,000; rotary-powered steerable truck program \$250,000; CLRV spare parts contract \$2,161,587; miscellaneous planning studies \$110,000; total \$149,783,728.

Proposals currently outstanding (all prices confidential until after program has been awarded): Korean subway program; USA Department of Transportation truck program; Guadalajara Transit planning program; Washington "Metro" truck program; rotary-powered steerable truck, Phase III.

B. Tender submitted in which UTDC was not awarded the contract: (a) Philadelphia, streetcar procurement; (b) Cleveland, streetcar procurement.

Tender results are as follows:

(a) Philadelphia, Septa* bid results

Country	Bidding Entry	Base Bid	Mandatory Options	Total Bid
Japan**	Trading Company Nissho-Iwai	\$39,357,800	\$18,381,350	\$57,739,150
Canada	UTDC	41,039,836	20,459,300	61,499,136
Italy	Trading Company	45,496,000	22,965,100	68,461,100
	BREDA	43,263,000	21,518,200	64,781,200
Canada	Hawker Siddeley	52,687,940	24,681,814	77,369,754
Belgium	Car Builder			
	Burgeoise and	55,407,360	25,853,953	81,261,313
	Nivellos	53,702,355	24,244,916	77,947,271
USA	Budd Company	56,289,510	27,758,490	84,048,000

*South Eastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority

**Successful bidder

(b) Cleveland

Carbuilder	Total Cost	Cost Per Car	No. of Cars
UTDC, Canada	\$28,810,000	\$430,000	67
Breda, Italy****	30,960,000	645,000	48
CleveTran, USA***	32,465,733	612,561	53
Mass Transit System, Duwag, Germany	32,935,500	731,900	45
Pullman Standard, USA	34,353,989	582,271	59
Nissho-Iwai, Japan	34,452,810	546,870	63
CleveTran, USA***	34,740,026	588,814	59
Nissho-Iwai, Japan	35,278,320	629,970	56
Burgeoise et Nivelles, Belgium	36,228,000	754,750	48
Nissho-Iwai, Japan	36,458,720	544,160	67
Burgeoise et Nivelles, Belgium	36,580,000	620,000	59
Hawker Siddeley, Canada	37,265,088	665,448	56
Burgeoise et Nivelles, Belgium	37,580,400	782,925	48
Burgeoise et Nivelles, Belgium	37,744,210	639,732	59
Hawker Siddeley, Canada	39,105,613	662,807	59
Boeing Vertol, USA	44,309,000	751,000	59
MLW Bombardier, Duwag, Germany	45,013,760	818,432	55
Boeing Vertol, USA	46,551,000	789,000	59
Boeing Vertol, USA	51,330,000	870,000	59

***CleveTran was a joint venture of UTDC/Budd Company/Swiss Industrial Co.

****Successful bidder

Further to B: Tender on which UTDC was part of a Canadian consortium in Caracas bidding on a turn-key subway project, showing car builder and total cost in Canadian dollars: SGTE, France, \$236,600,000; ITOH, Japan, \$250,800,000; Siemens, Germany, \$267,600,000; Franco Belge, France, \$306,000,000; Pullman, USA, \$314,600,000; Westinghouse, Brazil, \$316,800,000; Metro Canada, Canada, \$386,900,000; GE, Britain, \$625,200,000.

Proposals submitted by UTDC for study contracts: (a) Bangkok, (b) Aspen, (c) Norfolk, (d) Miami, (e) Havana; UTDC was not

selected to negotiate these contracts, programs awarded to other consultants.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES REPORTS

97. Mr. Blundy: Would the Ministry of Community and Social Services produce a listing by title and author of all reports, studies, consultation papers, evaluations, assessments, inventories, policy papers and other such studies prepared for the children's services division of the ministry for the years 1977 and 1978. Would the ministry further list those reports that were prepared by contract

or non-permanent ministry employees and by paid consultants. What is the cost of each of the above reports produced by non-ministry staff. [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

CHILDREN'S SERVICES STUDIES

98. **Mr. Blundy:** Would the Ministry of Community and Social Services enumerate all the task forces, study groups, interministerial committees, demonstration projects, pilot pro-

grams, et cetera, that were in existence in 1977 or were struck subsequently in the year 1978 and 1979 under the auspices of the children's services division of the ministry. [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: In order to provide a complete answer to the two questions presented, a period of one month will be required. An answer will be forthcoming on or about April 30, 1979.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 6, 1979

Financial management by government, statement by Mr. McCague	795
National Steel Corporation, statement by Mr. Elgie	795
Welcoming new members, Mr. Davis, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. S. Smith	796
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Sargent	797
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy	798
Physicians opting out of OHIP, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Conway, Mr. Swart	799
Home insulation program, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Peterson	801
Human rights cases, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. McGuigan	802
GO Transit service contract, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Mackenzie	802
Pension funds, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. Peterson, Mr. Mackenzie	803
Bell Canada rates, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Swart	805
Atikokan Hydro plant, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Wildman	805
Disposal of hazardous wastes, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds, Mr. T. P. Reid	806
Employment of handicapped, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. S. Smith	807
Point of order re ministry office move, Mr. W. Newman	808
Report, gold futures contracts, Mr. Drea	808
Ministry of Industry and Tourism Amendment Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading	808
Sheridan Park Corporation Repeal Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading	808
Tabling answers to questions 91, 97 and 98 on notice paper, Mr. Grossman	809
Throne speech debate, continued: Mr. Blundy, Mr. Ziemba, Mr. Cureatz, Mr. G. I. Miller	809
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Renwick, agreed to	826
Adjournment	826
Appendix A: Members of executive council and committees	827
Appendix B: answers to questions on notice paper	828
UTDC tenders, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Philip	828
Children's services reports, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy	829
Children's services studies, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy	830

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McGuigan, J. (Kent-Elgin L)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 19

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Monday, April 9, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the results of the 1978 United Way campaign organized by the public servants of this province. The final tabulation shows that the Ontario public service raised \$405,000 in Metropolitan Toronto and \$274,000 in 30 other communities in Ontario, for a total of \$679,000. This is a 6.6 per cent increase over the 1977 campaign.

This success is a credit to the generosity of the employees and the effectiveness of the fund-raising structure that has been set up. Our organization is unique in charitable fund-raising in Ontario.

As members know, we are in the middle of a cancer and heart fund campaign now, hoping to raise \$105,000 before the closing date, this Thursday, April 12. I am confident that we will meet this objective.

It should also be mentioned that the Red Cross blood donor clinics received 3,083 donations of blood from government employees in Metropolitan Toronto during 1978.

I hope the members will join with me in expressing our thanks to the staff who have made this worthy project so successful.

COMFORT ALLOWANCES

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to announce an increase in the comfort allowance for 45,000 residents of our long-term care institutions.

As the honourable members know, co-payment levels in the major long-term care programs are designed to ensure that residents maintain discretionary income to meet their personal needs.

In homes for the aged, the first \$45 of monthly income is currently exempt from charges for maintenance. In nursing homes and chronic-care facilities, the co-payment is set so that an aged person at the guaranteed income level is left with \$45 in discretionary income. Non-aged residents of

such facilities are often eligible for family benefits allowance, which includes the same comfort allowance.

The basic needs of food, shelter and personal care are met by the facility, and the comfort allowance is to provide for such items as tobacco, refreshments, telephone, clothing, dry cleaning, toiletries, personal travel and confectionary.

In recognition of the increase in the cost of many of these items since the last adjustment in May 1977, the government has decided to increase the comfort allowance to \$51, effective May 1.

Consequently, the co-payment level administered by my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) will remain at its current level of \$9.80 per day for the 22,500 residents in nursing homes and the 13,000 residents on extended care in homes for the aged.

The charging policies of the homes for the aged, administered by my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), will be adjusted to ensure that the other 7,800 residents in these homes who are entitled will receive the same \$51 in discretionary income.

The same increase in comfort allowances will apply to the 2,000 adult residents in facilities under the Homes for Retarded Persons Act.

This adjustment amounts to a 13.3 per cent increase and maintains Ontario's position of having one of the highest comfort allowances in Canada.

Mr. Cassidy: It's 2.5 per cent a year.

Mr. McClellan: Who plays Bob Cratchit to your Scrooge?

ORAL QUESTIONS

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED; COMFORT ALLOWANCES

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. How can she come before us with a generous, in quotation marks, \$6 per month increase for these people, when people in wheelchairs alone—certainly in the city of

Hamilton—can't even go downtown, in most circumstances, for less than \$50?

How can people, confined to wheelchairs yet still able to be reasonably active in society, possibly live on your generous \$51 per month income when it will cost them almost all that amount just to get around? Remember, they must have more than one ticket if they want to go and see a movie or something like that and then need someone to help them.

Surely she can show a little more humanity than this?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition has been for the last couple of years. We introduced a program of transportation for the disabled. The onus is on the communities to provide that, but it is subsidized very heavily by the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Laughren: You don't think it is a restraint package?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The fare for such services is 50 cents per trip. I don't see any relationship between what I am announcing today and the transportation available to handicapped people across this province if the communities in which they live will become involved and set up the services.

The ministry is providing the subsidy and Hamilton is already involved in it, so I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition was when all this was going on.

Mr. S. Smith: A supplementary: Perhaps the minister would like to join me at Chedoke Hospital and talk to the people confined to wheelchairs there. Under the new co-payment arrangement her colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) takes away what meagre allowance they may have had from alimony or from pensions or insurance. It leaves them each with a grand total of \$45, now \$51. With that each is supposed to buy clothing, pay for entertainment and have somebody handle his or her wheelchair from time to time.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Eighty-one dollars a month.

Mr. S. Smith: Let me invite the minister to visit the people at Chedoke Hospital and tell them about the generous increase from \$45 to \$51.

Hon. Mr. Norton: There you go, off half-cocked again.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The honourable Leader of the Opposition forgets that those same people are entitled to tax credits, which makes the total income—

Mr. S. Smith: Tax credits?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Tax credits, yes.

Mr. S. Smith: They are low income.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition has been for several years, but he doesn't understand. They get a tax credit which brings their monthly allowance to about \$81.

Mr. S. Smith: That is unbelievable.

Mr. McClellan: Leaving aside the incredible cheapness of this announcement, may I ask the minister, since she referred to tax credits, whatever happened to the promise in last year's budget to enrich the tax credit for senior citizens, or is that as phoney as this increase in front of us today?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This is almost beyond explanation.

Mr. Wildman: You are.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Three million dollars are being contributed to make this possible for those people, who through no fault of their own are in institutions across this province. Their basic necessities are provided for, they are provided with tax credits, and in addition they are each provided with a disposable income, now at \$51 a month, to help with those basic requirements.

Mr. Warner: You probably send them a \$6 bill. Mail them out two \$3 bills.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I really feel, regardless of what the opposition members are saying, that for those people who will be the recipients of what may seem like a small amount to members opposite, this money will be very helpful and will be very well received across this province.

Mr. McClellan: Answer the question; what about the promise of enriched tax credits?

Mrs. Campbell: I wonder if the minister would care to elaborate? Does this disposable income formula apply in those cases where people are in their own homes, and hopefully in receipt of some home-help service; or are they still precluded because all the funding has been cut off by OHC and they cannot afford to pay for home-help service themselves out of \$45?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think that question relates to the announcement I made today, which was about an increase in the comfort allowance to those people who are in institutions.

Mrs. Campbell: And nobody else?

Mr. McClellan: What about your promises on the tax credit?

Mr. Swart: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister would table in this

House the average amount paid out in tax credits to people in those institutions for the last four years. In view of the fact that the tax credit formula has not been increased and that they are getting less because of the slight increases in remuneration, would she not think that they're worse off in the tax credit than they were four years ago?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That information is all public knowledge; I'm sure if the honourable member is interested in receiving it he can find it quite easily.

Mr. Warner: Yes, send a letter to Darcy McKeough.

TORONTO CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question of the Minister of Government Services. Since the city of Toronto has been prepared for the last three and a half years to develop the southern two thirds of the east of Bay site, the housing portion alone of which would produce about 700 jobs for one and a half years, which is 1,000 man-years of work, why is the government continuing to drag its heels on this project? Why is it not going ahead and doing something there after three and a half years of waiting.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, the government has not dragged its heels.

Mrs. Campbell: You have so.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The government has looked at several projects for this site. The site is being used at the moment. As the member knows, the Toronto Humane Society is there. There are several other people there. The province owns the site, but it has not decided yet as to whether it will be used by the province or the city of Toronto. At this time I have informed the mayor of Toronto that we are still looking at the site and we will get back to him.

Mrs. Campbell: How many years have you been dragging your feet?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We haven't been dragging our feet one year.

Mr. Nixon: What's dragging then?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We have responded fully to the city at all times.

Mr. S. Smith: There's something dragging; I don't know if it's their feet.

By way of supplementary, will the minister make it clear who speaks for the government on this issue? Is it the minister himself? When he answers that, would the minister also explain why it has taken three and a half years for the province itself to decide what it wants

to have as its portion of the development on that site and why it won't let Toronto get ahead with the planning for at least the southern two thirds of the site? Since that could create much needed jobs, 1,000 man-years of construction work, why doesn't he at least let the city get on with it while he's sitting around making up his mind?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Nobody's sitting around making up his mind. The province of Ontario owns this property, not the mayor of the city of Toronto.

Mr. Cassidy: Well give it to him.

Mrs. Campbell: That's right. Give it to him.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The mayor of the city of Toronto has put forth a proposal—

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are millions of dollars' worth of real estate there and members opposite say give it away.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: —that is not acceptable at this moment to the province. The province is studying the proposal, and I have so informed the city.

An hon. member: Sell Minaki.

Mr. S. Smith: What about Minaki?

Hon. Mr. Davis: To the city of Toronto?

Mr. S. Smith: Sure, why not?

SUBURBAN SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, arising out of the findings in the report of the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto on Metro suburbs, which was published today and which confirmed what we have known for a very long time, that is that social services in Metropolitan Toronto suburbs are simply not adequate to meet the needs of disadvantaged groups, like the elderly, single-parent families, immigrants and working women with families—

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Mr. Cassidy: —who now make up a social majority in the suburbs. My question is that since we have known for a long time that planning in the suburbs of Toronto and other major cities has catered to physical but not to social needs, and since the social planning council's report confirms the desperate state of those in need of social services—

Mr. Speaker: Get to the point of the question.

Mr. Cassidy: —does the government have any plans to meet the social needs of these suburban residents; and what are those plans?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, since I haven't had the benefit of looking at that re-

port I'm very loath to make any comments. But coming from one of those suburbs which the member suggests does not have those social services, I take exception. I have a riding office and I am available, and very rarely do I ever have any complaints about the lack of social services to senior citizens, to new immigrants or to anyone else. I would like to have the opportunity to look at that report myself.

[2:15]

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the Provincial Secretary for Social Development is saying in the first place that in her tenure in the ministry she has never been aware of the problems of people living in these suburban areas; since she has only just discovered them now that the social planning council has brought them to her attention; and since four years of operating her riding office have not brought her into contact with the problems of groups such as women in the labour force, pre-school children whose mothers are in the labour force or who need group care—

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a supplementary question?

Mr. Cassidy: —immigrants and other people like that, can the minister explain how the government intends to provide the needed social services in the suburbs which are not now in place, in view of the cutbacks which this government is imposing on social services across Ontario?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the honourable member is referring to Scarborough in particular. That is of course the one suburb with which I am very familiar. But I am assured that social services, as provided through Metropolitan Toronto, look after the needs of the suburbs very well, and I am not aware of any gap in the services.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that, with the new immigration law, immigrants in this country are not assisted by the federal government after three years and, therefore, many of the immigrant aid societies are closing down services for immigrants; and is she aware that the Ministry of Community and Social Services does not have enough staff to assist people, especially in the west end of Toronto, which is the part of the city I represent? What is the minister planning to do if she is aware of these problems; and if she is not aware of them, where has she been in the last three years?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I will have a look at the report when it comes across my desk; obviously the Leader of the Opposition

received it far in advance of the rest of us. But I am sure that the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) is very well aware of the programs under his jurisdiction; and, as far as I am concerned, a great deal of money flows into those particular immigrant services through many of the ethnic services that are available within this city.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has the Provincial Secretary for Social Development ever taken the time to go to the Jane-Finch area, for example, to see the way in which the nonprofit housing, having all been crushed into one area and having been sort of ghettoized in that way, has led to enormous problems for the people there? Has she gone into suburban areas to see the way in which various kinds of facilities have been resisted in suburban areas, or put into a corner somewhere, and to see for herself the problems that are created that way?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, yes, I have taken time to do many of those things; and I am very much aware of many of the things of which he obviously has not been aware, such as transportation for the disabled and tax credits amongst other things. Yes, there are problems in those particular areas; and yes, there is money being funnelled into those services that provide additional help to those Ontario Housing units where they do have problems. We are well aware of that. Programs are available.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Even though the minister is not particularly concerned about the report, and even though she does not realize the reality of social problems in Scarborough, probably because most of those problems from her area end up in my office—

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Warner: I would like to know a precise date when the minister intends to respond in detail to this serious report, which was made known today.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my honourable colleague from Scarborough that I was involved in social planning long before he ever thought of being concerned about social problems. Serving as I did for 10 years on the social planning councils of Scarborough and Metropolitan Toronto, yes, I think I know some of the problems.

Mr. Warner: So the minister does not intend to respond to the report.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I did not say that.

Mr. Warner: That was the question.

Mr. Philip: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that in suburbs like Etobicoke valuable services such as the new Welfare Action Centre are closing their doors on this very day because of lack of government funding; and would the minister, when she brings in her comments, also look at the statement made in the report, that not only are there current problems, but current population statistics suggest the suburbs will increasingly become the homes of increasing numbers of aged and disadvantaged; would she advise the House what her government intends to do, not only to meet the present inadequacies but also to meet the future projected inadequacies of the system?

Mr. Warner: She won't even respond to the report.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to look at the report.

CO-PAYMENT FEES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health arising out of a case which came to the attention of my riding office this week. I would like to bring to the minister's attention the case of Mrs. May Brown, pensioner, aged 83, with an income of \$350 a month, who was transferred to a chronic-care bed in the Pembroke General Hospital last month.

Mrs. Brown has received a bill for \$298 for the month of April, payable in advance, as a result of the minister's new co-payment charge for chronic-care beds.

Mr. Speaker: Are you asking the minister if he is aware of this case?

Mr. Cassidy: I'm going further than that, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister condone this practice of billing a chronic-care patient in advance and does this particular case mean the ministry has eliminated this 60-day grace period he announced would be an integral part of the program?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That, I think, is a critical point. If, in fact, Mrs. or Miss Brown was just admitted last month, it doesn't sound to me as though she should be even considered at this point, and I would have thought the member's riding office might have drawn it to the attention of the administration or the sisters at the hospital, depending which hospital she is in. I will make sure that is drawn to their attention and her situation is checked into.

Mr. Martel: What is the government's response in all this?

Mr. Cassidy: I thank the minister for suggesting people in my riding office should do his government's work in terms of ensuring people aren't victimized by this co-payment charge.

Mr. Havrot: What have you got a riding office for?

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister act in order to ensure chronic-care patients are not billed in advance for this co-payment charge? Can the minister assure the House that if a patient is transferred to a chronic-care bed from a nursing home there will also be a 60-day grace period in the future?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As I think any reasonable person would expect with the implementation of this program, as recommended by the three parties in this House among other sources, there are bound to be some start-up problems. That sounds like a start-up problem; I will make sure it is clarified for the benefit of the administration of that particular hospital—

Mr. Swart: Especially when you say go get him.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and that as far as the advance collection is concerned that is straightened out. That is not what is anticipated or expected in the administration of this program.

Mr. Wildman: Supplementary: Can the minister explain why a married couple earning less than \$15,000 a year is exempt from the co-payment plan, but if they are married and pensioners over 65, receiving old-age pensions they are not exempt? Isn't that a bit of discrimination?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker. I think I have pointed out to the honourable member once before that having received all the recommendations to institute the co-payment, we looked at how it is administered in other provinces. There are three other provinces which have the system, if I remember correctly. In Quebec, they start to charge it from the day the person is diagnosed as being a chronic care patient, no matter where they are in the system. My recollection is that in all three cases the charge applies to everyone, regardless of means, from day one, and if you are without the means, you end up going on welfare.

That kind of system is unacceptable to me—

Mr. McClellan: You are all heart.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and so in devising the scheme, we set it up in such a way as to be uniform with the nursing home system. However, there are cases where the bread-

winner in a family situation, with young dependents, is confined for reasons of strokes, or various debilitating diseases and it was felt those exemptions had to be built in, unlike in the other provinces.

I think on examination the member will see it does meet the two criteria. First of all, it is uniform with the nursing home system, inasmuch as in the nursing home system we are dealing basically with the extremely long-term stay patient. The average length of stay in a nursing home is measured in years.

It meets the other concern identified by various bodies such as the Senior Citizens' Advisory Council that moneys provided for the maintenance of an individual by way of an individual pension are being used, in fact, for their support, albeit in the institution in which they have become resident, rather than in the community where they were resident.

An hon. member: How do they keep their homes?

Mr. Cassidy: A final supplementary: In view of the discrimination between pensioners and people aged under 65; in view of the very real anguish this co-payment charge is creating for such people as the multiple sclerosis patients of the Chedoke Hospital in Hamilton, whom I visited three weeks ago; in view of the limited revenues now coming in for this co-payment charge because of the exemptions built into it; and in view of the difficulties this co-payment charge is creating because hospitals must apply a means test, will the minister and the government not simply eliminate all those problems by eliminating this unreasonable charge completely?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will first of all reply, and I hope not in a pejorative way, that it really amazes me how little backbone exists in that party. Having signed a recommendation about six months ago, they scurry for cover all the time—

Mr. Warner: Not for this kind of punishment. No one signed for this nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —when somebody picks up on a recommendation they supported.

Mr. Cassidy: You get the facilities available in the community. You give people a choice.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think, with respect, we have gone to great lengths to ensure that the co-payment plan is brought about in the fairest possible way.

Mr. Cassidy: It is institutionalized misery.

Mr. Havrot: You thrive on that.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are monitoring it very closely because we know there will be various problems to do with the administration of the co-payment plan, and various problems to do with the way the forms have been designed. We will do everything possible to ensure it is brought about smoothly.

There is one point in particular I do want to refute: The member said a means test is being applied. In point of fact, there is a statutory declaration of income and income only.

An hon. member: How do they keep their homes?

Mr. Cassidy: It sounds like a means test to me.

Mr. Warner: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health claims I signed a report authorizing the course of action which the government has taken. In no way did I sign for the kind of distortion which we are now getting in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Squirm a little more. Where is your integrity?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You are in trouble, David.

Mr. Nixon: Let him make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is no point of privilege, so there is no need to respond to it. There is a legitimate difference of opinion between two members in the House. Let's leave it at that.

TOURISM

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism: In 1977-78, the Ontario Development Corporation approved a total of 398 loans; of these, only 52 were tourism oriented. Will the minister introduce a more effective program to encourage the people in the tourism industry?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must say our support to tourism has, by the member's own figures, been rather substantial. I think our support through the Ontario Development Corporation to the tourism industry has outstripped our support to any other single industry. That is particularly the case in eastern Ontario and northern Ontario where we have specific preferential rates available to the tourist industry.

We are at the present time considering the ways in which the tourism industry may be even more substantially assisted through the new employment development fund. As the member will be aware, I have already indicated the tourism industry will be one of those industries particularly favoured by

the new employment development fund and one of our priority sectors.

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary: Only 52 loans out of 398 certainly does not reflect that the minister is giving very great priority to the tourism industry. Will he introduce a program which will help the people in the tourism industry upgrade their facilities in order to make them four-season oriented? Fifty-two out of 398 is not a very high score.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I must repeat for the honourable member, I don't have the analysis with me but I suspect he would not be surprised to learn that tourism still is the industry which has received more loans than any other single industry out of the Ontario Development Corporation.

Mr. Eakins: Fifty-two out of 398?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It far exceeds the support we are giving any other single industry through the development corporation. I have already indicated we are looking for new programs through the employment development fund to give further help to the tourist industry.

I must say to my friend, before sitting down, that I was interested to note a document unveiled by his leader this morning which talks about seven priority areas for Liberal Party industrial strategy. Although I have already indicated that one of our priorities for industrial strategy is the tourism industry, there wasn't a single word in terms of the priorities of the Ontario Liberal Party in industrial strategy referring to tourism. It wasn't there.

[2:30]

Mr. Van Horne: Here we go again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How did you let that happen, John? How did you let that happen? Such a high priority and you left it out.

Mr. S. Smith: Why don't you read it? You might learn something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You've been reading my speeches; that's where you wrote it from. You read well, though.

Mr. Van Horne: How's your expert in bankruptcy doing over in Istanbul?

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: Doesn't the minister think what he is doing to boost the tourist industry in Canada is totally contradictory, when last January he withdrew the presence of this province with the other Canadian provinces from the tourist world fair in Berlin, which will provide 30,000,000 Deutschmarks out of which \$150,000,000 was coming to Canada? Is he aware that most of the Canadian operators were forced to use private travel agency booths,

as well as American booths, to promote tourism in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I regret that because of the reaction to some previous statements I missed most of the initial part of that question. Perhaps the member might either repeat it or drop me a note on it, and I can get that for him.

Mr. di Santo: I would rather repeat the question. Doesn't the minister think it is contradictory to try to help the industry in Canada while we missed perhaps the most important occasion this province had by not participating in the world fair in West Berlin last January, forcing our operators to use private travel agents' booths as well as American booths, because the Canadian government didn't participate in the fair, thus losing most of the 30,000,000,000 Deutschmarks that are going out for tourism, \$150,000,000 of it coming to Canada?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I regret that the Canadian government chose not to participate in that fashion. We have already had communications with them, urging them to reconsider for the next time that fair is held. From what I hear, it is quite likely that they will once again participate.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I want to advise all honourable members of the House and all our guests in the galleries to vacate the chamber in a very orderly fashion and to go down to the main lobby of the building. We will recess for 15 or 20 minutes for that purpose.

Would you do that now, please?

The House recessed at 2:33 p.m. and resumed at 3:15 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. Speaker: I thank all honourable members and our guests for their co-operation. Because a message I received gave me concern for the safety of those in the House, the security service searched the House and its precincts. I am satisfied that we can now proceed with the question period for which we have 32 minutes left.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, having discussed this matter with representatives of the security force, the Ontario Provincial Police and the Metropolitan Toronto police department—who all had a hand in the search—it is fair to say we are satisfied that the call received by the central switchboard can be characterized as a crank call. But it was the recommendation of the Ontario Provincial Police that in the circumstances the utmost precautions be taken.

As you have already mentioned, Mr. Speaker, we are satisfied that our security

precautions, which have been in place for some time, are quite adequate. However, I might respectfully suggest to the members and, particularly, to our friends in the press gallery, that a high degree of discretion be utilized in talking about or reporting this interruption in our proceedings, inasmuch as we don't want to encourage other individuals to disrupt the proceedings of the House in the same manner.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, because of the interruption and the amount of time involved, and knowing what we had planned for today, I didn't know whether or not the House might want to make some adjustment with respect to the time allocation in order that we could get to the windup of item one. It is really a matter for the unanimous consent of the House. There are still 32 minutes left for the question period before we get into other matters of routine proceedings and orders of the day. I would like to raise that now before we get started, because I do know certain preparations have been made for the windup today. This will eat into that time.

We could either deem the question period to be completed and carry on, or we could have some adjustment of time. I have no fixed approach, except to say that this is the time to discuss it.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we are prepared to do that. I think most of my colleagues would prefer that we go beyond six o'clock to make up the time we lost. That would take us to about 6:30 or 6:45.

Mr. Peterson: What about your lunch? You usually get quite upset when you miss dinner?

Mr. Martel: I only do it on special occasions.

Mr. Nixon: If I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated that about 30 minutes remain in question period. How about having a good compromise—continue the question period to 3:30 and then carry on with the business otherwise unchanged?

Mr. Peterson: The Liberal Party always has the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have unanimous agreement for that proposition?

Mr. Martel: Which one are you talking about?

Mr. Speaker: It has been suggested that the question period terminate at 3:30.

Mr. Martel: I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that you won't get unanimous consent. I would ask the House to consider going until 6:30 p.m.

It is only half an hour more and we could carry on until then, with unanimous consent. Or the minister could move a motion to that effect.

Mr. Speaker: The proposition was that the question period be deemed to have ended at 3:30. We do not have unanimous consent for that. I have no alternative but to abide by the rules of the House that provide for one hour for question period.

I want also to remind honourable members that standing orders indicate that a vote will be taken if there is an amendment to the motion for acceptance of the speech from the throne; and that that vote will be taken at 5:45 the night before the budget is brought down. That's tonight. I just want all honourable members to understand that the debate on the throne speech will terminate at 5:45 p.m.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, we have done it in the past. Just in the last session, to finalize the estimates of the Treasurer, we sat on the Monday evening until seven to accommodate the House, so those estimates could be finished and so we could get on to Bill 70. I would ask the House leader to put a motion forward so that the House goes to 6:30 this evening, to accommodate the orderly completion of this debate.

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed with the question period.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

Mr. Laughren: My question is to the Treasurer. In view of the fact that for the year 1978 straight figures show that foreign ownership continues to be an enormous drain on our economy and that our deficit on interest and dividends alone is \$5,400,000,000, up in the fourth quarter 72 per cent over the third quarter and more than 50 per cent over the fourth quarter a year earlier, will the Treasurer assure us, and I understand that he cannot provide us with precise details at this time, that his budget statement tomorrow night will address itself to that particular problem?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The last time I was caught in a position of attack such as I am now, I was saying to the honourable member in between, a fire intervened to save me. This time I have to say it was perhaps a little more frightening.

Mr. Nixon: Disaster accompanies you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, you were with me that night, you may recall, at St. Lawrence Centre.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The third one will be tomorrow night.

Mr. Nixon: That was one of your better evenings.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's right, it was certainly a hot show.

Much as I would like to indulge in speculation about what is in the budget, unfortunately I know that I obviously can't answer the member's question today.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that in 1978, as in other years, his government gave approval to approximately 95 per cent of all takeover applications that went to the Foreign Investment Review Agency, and that in 1978, out of 310 foreign takeovers, 91 per cent were approved, and that for new businesses established in this province, 96 per cent were approved? Will the minister table the criteria by which he and his close personal friend, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman), approve takeovers in their submission when FIRA asks them for their opinion on takeover applications for Canadian industry?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The Foreign Investment Review Agency certainly does perform a useful role, although in many countries it is seen as a definite deterrent to investment in Canada.

Mr. Laughren: I am asking for your criteria.

Mr. Wildman: They approved 95 per cent.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can only say to the member that while we want very much to encourage Canadian investment in Canada, an exclusively Canadian investment posture would obviously do away with many opportunities for employment for Canadian people, because by their very nature many industries have become multinational. There is absolutely no use trying to pretend that we have a Canadian automobile manufacturing industry per se. Our job, of course, is to maximize the Canadian content of the production in this country. I have to agree with the honourable member that if we could have Canadian ownership I would be delighted, and I want to encourage Canadian ownership either through the purchase of shares or the creation of companies that become big.

Mr. T. P. Reid: As the minister is so concerned about encouraging people to participate share-wise, will he also encourage these companies perhaps by way of legislation that requires them to dedicate part of their dividends or profits—and I leave the

percentage to the minister, but I would say 50 per cent minimum at least—to research and development and reinvestment in Ontario or Canada?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am sure the honourable member has heard the Minister of Industry and Tourism, the Premier (Mr. Davis), me and others talk about our stated objective to improve the percentage of R and D done in Canada. It is something we take every opportunity to encourage. The last federal government's budget, we were glad to see, had certain measures in it to encourage that. In the past, Ontario's has too, and we intend to keep on trying to get more R and D in Canada.

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that despite what the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Industry and Tourism and this minister have been saying, not one iota has changed, and last year we had a trade deficit of \$317,000,000 in the auto pact, most of it in the area of research and development, because it costs Canada \$230,000,000 a year, what is the Treasurer going to do specifically and what has happened to his ministerial fair-share document released last year?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Research and development I think has to be encouraged rather than legislated. The member may feel it can be legislated; I don't think it can.

Mr. di Santo: I didn't say you have to legislate.

Mr. Cassidy: You will never stand up to the multinationals.

Mr. Warner: You didn't answer the question.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In my absence on Friday the Premier was asked a question concerning Queensway General Hospital.

The ministry received a letter from Queensway in July 1977 requesting an 80-bed chronic-care unit to be built adjacent to the hospital. That request was forwarded to the Hospital Council of Metropolitan Toronto and to the Peel District Health Council for consideration as part of the broad process of setting priorities.

The hospital subsequently withdrew its request for chronic-care facilities and substituted expansion of its radiology department as a first priority. This was agreed to by HCMT and approved by the ministry.

The next correspondence was a year later, in July 1978, saying the beds were needed for 16 patients who were occupying tem-

porary accommodation in the emergency department. Since, at that time, we were already making definitive plans to expand chronic care accommodation in Metro, the Queensway situation was included in consideration of the overall plan.

Last Friday, ministry personnel visited Queensway to learn that the hospital doesn't want more money. It doesn't want more chronic-care beds. It wants to be relieved of the chronic-care patients it has.

Our Metro-wide plans for chronic-care facilities are already bearing evidence. Last September the new Queen Elizabeth Hospital branch opened on University Avenue.

Mrs. Campbell: Bearing evidence of what?

Mr. S. Smith: The minister's lack of policy.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think you were there. Maybe you don't remember.

To repeat, last September the new Queen Elizabeth Hospital branch opened on University Avenue, providing 300 new chronic-care beds. The conversion of Salvation Army Grace Hospital in Toronto will provide 116 more chronic-care beds, of which 61 are already in use.

Next month about 300 chronic-care patients at the old Queen Elizabeth Hospital on Dunn Avenue will be transferred to the new building, and by August an additional 154 chronic-care beds will be available when construction is finished at the West Park chronic-care hospital.

Prior to the opening of West Park, about 40 of the West Park beds will be opened in the early part of May, using the old surgical building at West Park, as a means of phasing in their expanded program, and in this way, will relieve pressure on chronic-care facilities in the west end.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister explain how these plans are going to solve the problems, when more than 1,200 beds are to be cut in active-treatment hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto over the course of the next two and a half years, but only 509 chronic-care beds are mentioned as being provided under the plans announced here today?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I've already identified, we have asked for, and are funding, a study, under the auspices of the Hospital Council of Metropolitan Toronto, to identify the need in Metropolitan Toronto for both chronic-care beds over and above what I've already indicated—

Mrs. Campbell: Why don't you do that before you cut beds?

Mr. Grande: Five years from now.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and extended-care beds over and above what I've already indicated.

Mr. Warner: Great system.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As in all parts of the province, we are trying to make sure that as we, in the spirit of the philosophy of health care that has abounded in this country in the five or six years—

Mr. S. Smith: First you cut it and then you study it.

Mr. McClellan: Why didn't you do the study before you cut the beds?

Mr. Warner: You begin the destruction and then you study it. Great system.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As we are de-emphasizing acute institutional care, in the process we are identifying the needs for chronic and extended care and meeting those needs.

Mr. S. Smith: Is that the only way of identifying it—when patients are in the emergency room?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. We've been working on it. That's the point I was making.

Mr. Foulds: Talk about hyperbole.

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Health, concerning Metropolitan General Hospital. As Metropolitan General Hospital in Windsor provides two area services, that is, cancer treatment and burn care, which require a large number of active-treatment beds, thus leaving fewer beds for obstetrics, paediatrics, medical and surgical services, is the minister not concerned that the lack of active-treatment beds there means there will be inadequate health-care services provided by Metropolitan General Hospital? [3:30]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: With the establishment at Grace Hospital of a centre of excellence in obstetrics and with the establishment at Hotel Dieu of St. Joseph Hospital of a centre of excellence in paediatrics, it seems to me that the obstetrical and paediatric needs, in addition to those of the much smaller units that remain at the Metropolitan General Hospital in Windsor, will be extremely well met.

In the statement I made in February regarding hospital services in the Windsor area, part of it concerned approval of the expansion of the cancer clinic at Metropolitan General Hospital, as recommended by the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation. Given the overall picture in Windsor, the services will continue to be very well met.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Is the minister not concerned that Metropolitan

General Hospital has already stated that after April 1 it will not be able to assure the public it serves of backup beds required by the emergency department or admission to a hospital when necessary for active treatment?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am aware that in all the planning in Windsor there has been an odd man out every time.

Mr. Wildman: You.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It's always been the same odd man.

Mr. Wildman: You.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am confident, given the support of all but one of the hospitals in Essex county to make sure the rationalization works and the level of service is maintained, that any problems will be kept to a minimum.

As I said, with the establishment of centres of excellence in obstetrics and paediatrics, as well as neurosurgery, inasmuch as a CAT scanner will be going to the Hotel Dieu hospital as well, and with the expansion of chronic-care units in various of the hospitals, I am confident, based on the advice of the local health council but also involving the hospitals who are signatories to that rationalization agreement, that the level of service will not only be maintained but improved, particularly through these centres of excellence that are being introduced into that community.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I have raised this issue in the Legislature on several occasions over the last few weeks. I would like to ask the Minister of Health whether he has bothered to check out the fact that since January of this year, on an average night at three hospitals in Windsor—Grace, Met and Hotel Dieu—people are stacked up in emergency rooms and hallways because of a lack of active-treatment beds? Did he bother to check that out when he was in Essex county last week?

Mr. Mackenzie: He hasn't got around to it yet.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have discussed it with staff on various occasions. I am satisfied it would appear this is again a situation where, with the expansion of chronic-care services and even with a reduction in active treatment, this will assist a great deal in relieving these kinds of pressures.

Mr. Foulds: Well, expand them. Expand them ahead of time.

Mr. Swart: Before, you said it wasn't true. Remember? It's a different story today.

Mr. Cassidy: Where is your plan for chronic care across the province?

Mr. Mackenzie: He is too arrogant to have a plan.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ashe: A bunch of rowdies over there.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I know it upsets people in that party—

Mr. Mackenzie: It's upsetting people; that's what it's doing.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —that for one of the first times anywhere in the province the local health council, with the active involvement and support of the hospitals in the community, came up with a plan not only to rationalize existing services but to provide very valuable new services to that community.

Mr. Cooke: You told them what to do.

Mr. M. Davidson: You didn't give them any alternative.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I know it bothers them that local people can plan—

Mr. Cooke: You made the decisions.

Mr. Mackenzie: They can't make the decisions. You are pulling the strings.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I know it bothers them that we aren't accepting their policy. I know it bothers them that we aren't wiping out all the hospital boards as per their green paper and centralizing all the bureaucracy.

Mr. Warner: It bothers us that you allow the health-care system to be destroyed.

Mr. Mackenzie: Come off your arrogant horse and start dealing with people.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I know that bothers them, but local planning can work and is working in Essex county.

Mr. Mackenzie: How long are you going to fool around with people's lives? Arrogant.

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Can I have his attention? In view of the fact that last Thursday the editorial in the Toronto Sun, and the adjacent cartoon, reinforced the stereotype that organized crime is the exclusive product of the Italian community, and in the aftermath of the CBC program *Connections*, doesn't the minister think it is time for an inquiry so that it can be made clear what is the extent of the operation of organized crime, and what control over the situation the government has so that the public will have a clear perception of the phenomenon, since this is the way to contribute to clearing the atmosphere of the suspicion and mis-

understanding surrounding the entire Italian community?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have said on a number of occasions in recent years that any conception in the minds of any of our citizens to the effect that the Italian community is any less law-abiding than any other community in this province would be entirely mistaken. The fact of the matter is the Italian community, which, as we know, has made an immense contribution to the development of this province, is as law-abiding as any other community in Ontario. I repeat that once again.

In so far as a public inquiry into the problems related to organized crime is concerned, I am still not persuaded that this would be in the public interest. I say that, having met on a regular basis with senior officers of the major police departments in Ontario, who are all of the view that the fight against organized crime can more effectively be carried on by traditional police methods, namely, the gathering of evidence that is admissible in court, upon which to secure convictions.

I rather regret that those responsible for the production of *Connections II* did not make note of the fact that several individuals who were featured in that series had been successfully prosecuted. Notwithstanding that, I think I should also state that in the past year and a half, according to figures available to me, some 250 individuals who are believed to have some connection with organized crime have been arrested in this province and have either been tried or are at present awaiting trial.

The advice I have received from senior police officials is that a public inquiry would probably interfere significantly with ongoing investigations and, furthermore, would interfere significantly with the cases before the court. For that reason, at this time I am of the view that it would not be in the public interest to have such an inquiry.

Mr. Warner: If they wore hockey skates, you'd get them. You wouldn't hesitate.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: Since I don't doubt for a moment that law-enforcement officers have control of the situation, short of an inquiry, could the minister at least undertake to make a public statement delineating the limit and extent of organized crime operations so that the public has a clear perception of what is going on? I don't think it is good enough for him to issue a disclaimer, as the editorial in the *Sun* demonstrated on Friday. Can he make a public statement at least?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I will take under advisement whether or not the honourable member's suggestion might be carried forward into a public statement. I will certainly consider that and advise the honourable member as to my decision in that respect.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Supplementary: In view of the minister's response in regard to the number of charges laid and the number of convictions, and in view of the fact that organized crime does seem to be on the increase in Ontario, is the minister still of the opinion the police forces in the province and the RCMP have all the tools they require to deal with this growing problem?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we do not have evidence to suggest that organized crime is on the increase. It is a significant problem, it has been for some period of time and I am afraid it probably will be for the foreseeable future. But I am of the view that, while police forces would always like additional resources, they currently do have the tools with which to carry on very effectively their law enforcement activities in this area.

Mr. Lupusella: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In spite of the minister's opinion that a public inquiry would not serve the public interest; and in spite of the recommendation that was made by my colleague the member for Downsview that public statements should be made by the Solicitor General in the Legislature in relation to organized crime to sensitize the public—an idea that was suggested several years ago—can the minister explain the statement made by Commissioner Harold Graham of the Ontario Provincial Police, who told the annual Ontario police chiefs' conference on June 28 that there is no Mafia in Ontario, they are just organized criminals, and that, in his opinion, he thinks of the phenomenon as no more of a problem than burglary? Can he explain that?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think I heard the honourable member's statement, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the term "Mafia" is not a very helpful term. It is rather a meaningless term in the ranks of law-enforcement officers. It is a term that is not used by experienced police officers who are involved in the fight against organized crime; it just is not a very useful noun and it is just not a very useful term. I do not know how one adequately defines what is meant when one uses the term "Mafia."

Mr. Lawlor: You're the first Attorney General to admit that organized crime exists in this province.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I did not hear the commissioner make his remarks to the annual conference to which the honourable member referred. Without having the benefit of the text of his remarks, I do not think I can add anything further that is useful at this time.

HEALTH QUESTIONNAIRE

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 3, the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breagh) asked me about a questionnaire of the ministry and its use by certain health-service organizations, and I replied that I would respond more fully at a later date.

Today, I am tabling my response to the member rather than taking the time of the House to read the answer in full; it is fairly lengthy and detailed.

In essence, my reply indicates that a questionnaire was used by the ministry as part of a pre-test in four HSOs. Legal counsel has indicated that neither the survey nor its application, which was on a purely voluntary basis, was in violation of the Ontario Human Rights Code or the Health Disciplines Act. The questionnaire and its results will be discussed by ministry officials and the HSOs concerned, at a meeting on April 16.

I should also like to say that I know the honourable member will agree with every effort made by the ministry to ensure that consumers are provided with satisfaction where it involves the expenditure of tax dollars.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have a further answer. On Thursday last, the member for London North asked me some questions about students employed as ambulance attendants during the summer months. I am tabling today a letter that explains the matter fully to the member. Again, it is a very lengthy answer, too long to go over here.

In brief, I am satisfied that the requirements for summer part-time employment in ambulance services across the province are such that excellence of care is protected. Summer students are always required to work in company with senior ambulance officers anywhere in the province.

[3:45]

Mr. Van Horne: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The allegations that were made in my opinion were serious, and in spite of the assurance the minister has given I would like to know that students as poorly trained as this would not be employed in any way, shape or form either this year or in years to come.

Has the minister spoken directly with the executive of the London Ambulance Association and has he looked into the specific instances wherein they claim that students who were not qualified did work in London and Windsor in the summers of 1977 and 1978?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have not spoken with them. I believe staff of the ambulance services branch, either at district office or in Toronto, have. I am advised by a member of the media in that community that at a press conference last Friday the representatives of the association were asked to give specific instances and for some reason were reticent about it.

I would hope that if they have any specific incidents about which they have concern they would report them either to the district office in London or to the head of the ambulance services branch, directly or through solicitors, however they want. I can show them they should have no concern about any legal problems for themselves. If there are specific incidents they are aware of, we want to know about them. The member will see in the letter I have tabled, the original of which will come to him, that our policies are very clear in that regard.

FAMILY BENEFITS

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Is he prepared to table in the House the study that four senior civil servants in his ministry reportedly embarked on into the issue of removing unfair sexual biases in the welfare legislation and the family benefits act?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to withhold the information as obviously it is available merely by looking at the legislation. There is nothing secretive about identifying those areas within the legislation where there are apparently biases based upon gender. All the report consists of is identifying those areas within the legislation. It's not an original comprehensive report of information that's not already available. I will see whether we can make it available to him. That's no problem.

Mr. Peterson: Given that the minister has made this piercing insight into the self-evident and the obvious, is he now prepared—because he now admits it and everyone else who looks at this admits it—to work with the other members of the House to change these sexual biases in the legislation? Or is his only answer against it the one he gave in an interview in the *Globe and Mail*—I believe about November 1977—when he said it would cost \$26,-

000,000? Is that the only reason he has for changing this? My supplementary to my supplementary is: On what basis does he say \$27,000,000 will be the cost to change this unfair legislation?

Hon. Mr. Norton: The basis upon which I used that figure was the work done by the analysts within the ministry as to the total cost implications. I would say that is not the only reason but I would say it is a significant reason. If the member can identify where we can come up with \$27,000,00 in this fiscal year—

Mrs. Campbell: That's the only reason you gave.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —to eliminate those biases, then it seems to me you have accomplished something I haven't been able to in the time I have been in the ministry. I would also point out that another and very significant reason is that in view of the fact—I recognize it and so do my colleagues—there are traditional biases within existing legislation and we would like to eliminate them—

Mr. McClellan: How about an income security review?

Hon. Mr. Norton: —I would like to see that done in the context of a major reorganization of our approach to income maintenance, for example. I had, in view of the desire to do that, made very specific proposals to the other provinces back in September and got the support of the other provinces. In November I made the request—

Mr. Warner: Blame it on someone else.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —to the Honourable Monique Bégin at the federal-provincial conference for co-operation on the part of the federal government to make the necessary changes to the regulations under the Canada Assistance Plan. At that time it was indicated to me, along with the other provincial ministers, that they would sit down and seriously discuss changes under the Canada Assistance Plan. I must say that I am terribly disappointed to tell the House that I have now in my possession—

Mr. S. Smith: How about the pensions?

Hon. Mr. Norton: —it has now been received by our ministry, a letter, to which I intend to be responding to the Honourable Monique Bégin very shortly, indicating that no, the federal government is not prepared, after all the effort that has gone into it and support from the other provinces, to sit down and seriously make changes in the regulations that would allow us the necessary flexibility.

In the face of that, I obviously will have to discuss with my colleagues whether Ontario is in a position once again, as we have been repeatedly in the past, to go ahead independent of the federal government to make changes that we feel are necessary, with no cost sharing at all.

PETITION

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from over 200 parents in one school area petitioning the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) regarding the reduction of funding for the heritage language program. The petition reads:

"We were shocked and dismayed by your recent proposals to reduce funding for the heritage language program. This program was instituted after long years of struggle on the part of several community groups and has become a valid and important part of our children's education. Therefore, we most vigorously protest the proposed budget cuts for this program and strongly urge you to consider and rescind them."

This petition is the first in a long list of petitions from people who are extremely upset about the retrograde decision to destroy the heritage language program.

MOTIONS

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 12, it stand adjourned until 2 o'clock, Tuesday, April 17.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing administration of justice committee be authorized to travel to Milton and Guelph to visit the Maplehurst complex and the Guelph Correctional Centre on Wednesday, April 11, 1979, and that two and a half hours be credited against the time allotted for the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services, and that the provisions of section 66 of the Legislative Assembly Act be not applicable.

Motion agreed to.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Welch moved resolution 2.

Reading dispensed with. (See Votes and Proceedings.)

Resolution concurred in.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the interim answers to questions 100, 101, 102 and 103 standing on the Order Paper. (See appendix, page 874)

ORDERS OF THE DAY THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (concluded)

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset I am tremendously disappointed at the government House leader in not moving that we sit until 6:30, because we on this side of the House on more than one occasion have seen fit to do so to accommodate the order of business which had been planned. I draw your attention to the Monday when the House adjourned for the Christmas break and we sat until 7 to get the Treasurer's estimates finished so that we could do Bill 70 on Thursday and Friday, and I feel that the minister—

An hon. member: Stop crying and get on with it.

Mr. Hodgson: You weren't interested in reducing the question period by half an hour.

Mr. Martel: When the order of business is established and something interferes with that order, there is nothing to say that we cannot change the rules, by motion, to accommodate the orderly carrying out of the business planned for that day.

Mr. Foulds: We certainly did not plan for the adjournment of half an hour.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in reading the throne speech it contained, I think, something for everyone—mind you in small doses. It reminded me of the Brylcreem ad, "A little dab'll do ya." That is what everyone is getting, a little dab. It amounts to very little.

In fact, the throne speech contained a lot of reruns that the government has tried to pass off as things that are going to be done. Let's look at a few of them.

How long have we been talking about apprenticeships; how long? Forever, it seems; and we really haven't reached first base. The committee to promote employment opportunities for women; we established such a committee in the civil service a number of

years ago and it has not accomplished a great deal.

Mr. Laughren: Bob Welch, remember that.

Mr. Martel: The fight against inflation; members will recall that this government—

Mr. Hodgson: Get on with your speech, Elie.

Mr. Martel: —supported the federal Liberals on that fight against inflation on the backs of the workers of Ontario, as well as on the backs of the Canadian people. There is a little blurb in there that says we are going to look at profits this time, but for the last three and a half years the workers have paid the price of fighting inflation.

Risk capital; those of us who served on a select committee from 1971 to 1974 advocated action, there is a whole report on risk capital. We have been talking about helping small business for years and not much has materialized.

They also ran this one by us, senior citizen drug plan retained. That's nothing new; it just goes to show how they just threw a little bit in here, a little bit there to make a throne speech which appeared to be doing something and which virtually was not going to change a heck of a lot in this province.

Family planning; we have been talking about that for years. I was surprised to learn, a couple of years ago, that we had a clinic in Sudbury which was open every Wednesday afternoon. The only problem was that the people of Sudbury did not know it was there. I did not know it was there.

An advisory council on multiculturalism; we had one, our friend from Sudbury was on the multicultural committee but it was allowed to die. I think my colleague from Brantford put his finger right on the pulse when he said, "This government has as much commitment to multiculturalism as an alley cat has to morality."

My colleague today brought in a petition from people who are trying to establish a heritage program. It indicated their dismay at government withdrawal from that whole sphere, withdrawing the funds necessary to proceed. Now we are going to establish another committee. I ask the government: what in God's name is it doing?

I have cited just seven items. All of them have been repeated over and over in this House, but we really have not advanced very far with them. A couple were good. I appreciate the fact that we are going to do something for people who are handicapped, at long last. This is something I started advocating as the critic for this party in 1971; that we do what Saskatchewan was

doing then and put 50 per cent permanent funding in place for those municipalities which in fact were providing transit systems for the handicapped. We are going to do it in 1979.

The other one, interestingly enough, was a motion I moved in this House, and which the government and the Liberals voted against, when we created the Ministry of Northern Affairs. I advocated a community council. The government is not going to call it that; it is going to call it a local services board; but in fact it is going to do exactly what I suggested, which was to get people voted onto a committee through which in fact necessary funding would be obtained. This was impossible in the unorganized communities.

The throne speech really did not have much new. It is not going to do much to overcome the problems facing Ontario. It deals, I think, primarily with the economy. I want to look at the economy as it affects my area, and then broaden it out to the province. In my own area, I want to examine this throne speech against the background of a document, prepared for the region a couple of years ago and called *A Profile in Failure*. So members won't think it's just those people in the New Democratic Party, listen to what the chamber of commerce said in respect to the planning of the northeastern Ontario regional strategy, called NORS:

[4:00]

"The NORS is devoid of any strategy of development physical, economic or social. It represents the pinnacle of intellectual bankruptcy of the southern establishment in even analysing the problems of the north, let alone dealing with them effectively.

"The only way to deal with NORS is to let it terminate as an expensive receptacle of dust, until it glides, gracefully or otherwise, into oblivion."

Mr. Laughren: Who said this?

Mr. Martel: The chamber of commerce. "The fundamental problem with NORS can be summed up as the troika of noes: no strategy, no analysis and no programs; therefore, no use."

That's the business community in Sudbury indicating what they see as the problems in the Sudbury area. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we've got problems, the beginning of the problems in the Sudbury basin started with this government: I well recall in 1974, the day the House adjourned, as I motored home I listened to the announcement by the government that they were shutting down Burwash. They eliminated 250 jobs with the stroke of a pen.

Interestingly enough, they opened up a new institution in Milton.

Mr. Laughren: The Davis years have been bad for the Sudbury basin.

Mr. Martel: That was part of the decline of the economic base in the Sudbury basin. They wiped out, with the stroke of a pen, the fourth largest employer, after having spent in the previous two years anywhere from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000. They put in a new gym, new quarters for single custodial officers, remodelled all of the homes, and then they wiped it all out overnight.

We argued to try to get the government to change its mind. We argued on the economic basis that they were wiping out economic diversification and leaving us simply to the resource-based industries. It didn't matter.

We argued that they would have to then take the prisoners from the Sudbury basin and put them somewhere else where their loved ones couldn't see them. That was the excuse for closing Burwash: there were too many visitors from the south who had difficulty getting to the Sudbury basin and, therefore, they would have to alter it. Do you know where the prisoners go now from Sudbury? They go to Monteith, about 250 miles away, and they go to the institution in Thunder Bay, about 450 to 500 miles away. It didn't matter about people from the Sudbury basin.

I remind members that Burwash is less than 200 miles from Toronto. It was good, and they wiped it out. I remember raising it in the House. Know what Dr. Potter said to us? He said: "I am running a correctional services institution, not an employment agency." They wiped out some diversification, and they haven't put it back. It was mothballed.

The Minister of Government Services, then the Honourable Margaret Scrivener, followed and she was going to sell it. She, in fact, got one offer of \$1,000,000. The chamber of commerce, the labour council and the local members met with the Premier and prevailed upon him not to sell it and, in fact, to establish a committee that would look into the multiple-use concept for Burwash. We suggested, first, that there should be jobs involved in this multiple-use idea and that it should offer services which were not available in the north.

A year and a half later, that committee reported. Listen to what that committee said: "This proposed use is as follows: It provides for an integrated use of the entire site. It will effectively utilize the arable land

and institutional facilities, including Camp Bison, which the federal government previously purchased for \$1,800,000. It will provide jobs for local residents."

Unfortunately, by the time the report was tabled, the federal government had withdrawn its offer.

Mr. Nixon: That's not like them.

Mr. Martel: It was no longer going to build a federal institution in Sudbury, utilizing the facility that was already there. So there went the jobs. I wrote to the Premier and I said to him: "The Dillon report could have been prepared by a six-year old after a cursory walk around the property."

Mr. Nixon: Is that the Mr. Dillon you are talking about?

Mr. Martel: I'm talking about Mr. Dillon.

Mr. Nixon: Is that the guy who used to be chairman of the John Robarts election committee?

Mr. Martel: I believe he is the same one.

Mr. Nixon: That is the fellow who is on the board of Hydro.

Mr. Martel: I wrote: "The multiple-use concept made more sense than the proposal by Dillon, particularly when one realizes that Camp Bison, which the federal authorities purchased, has not received ministerial approval to proceed with the necessary renovations. I can almost envision the expression of the federal minister, the Honourable Jean-Jacques Blais, when he learns there is another authority telling the federal ministry what it should be doing with the property."

I went on further and indicated it makes more sense to provide a number of services under the provincial jurisdiction which are not now available in the Sudbury area, such as a rehabilitation centre for injured workers, promised by the Premier the Tuesday night before the 1975 election in Sudbury.

Mr. Nixon: That's going to Hamilton.

Mr. Martel: Well, that's gone. The use of some of the homes in the village as group homes for the retarded was recommended by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. That's gone.

The Ministry of Natural Resources wanted in, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food wanted in, Laurentian University wanted part of the facility, Cambrian College wanted part of the facility, and so did the labour council. We get a report after all of that which says, "We'll make it into a federal institution."

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, for gall this government demonstrates it all.

Interestingly enough, the chamber of commerce responded very recently to the Premier.

The chamber of commerce says in their letter to the Premier.

"To the Honourable William Davis.

"Dear Sir:

"We are sorry to have to pursue further the matter of Burwash land use study which upon serious examination we find to be a disservice to yourself, your government and the people of Ontario. This is a sad conclusion regretfully arrived at and which we suspect that you may already share, having regard to what we understood to have been a very substantial cost to the taxpayers of the province, to produce a document of 223 pages which is permeated with bias, contradictions and imbalance of emphasis both in the selection of study areas, conformity to the accepted terms of reference and failure of terms of reference to reflect both in spirit and action the commitment which we felt to be morally binding between us.

"The steering committee formed by your authority was to address itself to the concerns originally identified by the Sudbury Burwash committee, formed around local citizens and groups which met on a chamber of commerce premise to effectively document their collective concern and which we felt would ensure us of effective ongoing direct input and liaison with the steering committee. In reality we were exorcised from further involvement by the procedure of holding meetings alternatively in Sudbury and in Toronto which effectively ensured the non-participation of the chamber volunteers and others, both through cost and subsequent failure to invite meaningful participation.

"This point was brought more precisely into focus by independent and voluntary appearance of the chamber of commerce members at public information gatherings and meetings held by M. M. Dillon Limited, during which no specific recognition was accorded to the visitors, no special courtesies extended, no notes were made or tapes recorded, so that it is bemusing in the ultimate to encounter the outright gall evidenced within the chamber report when it stated that interviews were held in Sudbury with the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce on page 93. This statement was so lacking in substance as to bring into question the quality of the other purported contacts and which leads to the following observation."

I am not going to go into those observations, but what in effect we have happening at Burwash and in the M. M. Dillon report is really a continuation of the status quo.

Mr. Foulds: Was that the chamber of commerce again?

Mr. Martel: Yes, that was the chamber of commerce again. We believe the government advised M. M. Dillon not to come up with a multi-use concept which would provide the services and the jobs which are so badly needed. Instead of spending \$10,000,000 on Minaki Lodge, they could spend a heck of a lot less and in fact, provide some alternative employment in the Sudbury basin.

The only recommendations which are meaningful in the backup to what we asked for were the adoption of those services or those things already on the Burwash property. For example, they went along and said, "What we need or should go along with is the camp that is already there for kids." Well, that was built by the Ukrainian community, I believe. That's already there.

They suggested we go along and have a part of the facility for training dogs.

They went along and said they would put a weigh scale on the Burwash property.

It went on and on in this vein, not creating one new thing. Not one cent of commitment came forth from the government to establish a multi-use concept, although they had spent \$4,500,000 to \$5,000,000 when they shut it down and they're spending roughly \$500,000 a year now to keep it in mothballs. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that's commitment.

I want to leave Burwash to move to another part of my riding, and it deals with a multinational. You haven't come to grips with the multinational situation in this province yet either.

We have a mine in my community, which is located about 14 miles away. There are 250 jobs at the mine—by the way, they only made \$6,000,000 profit last year. It's called National Steel.

I want to thank the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie) and the Premier for trying to keep that facility open. But it comes to the nub of the problem when dealing with multinationals that we in Ontario are held to ransom by those corporations.

Let me document it briefly, and I make the following observation before I start. Multinationals, not only in this country, but in other countries, have no concern for the host country. Recently I listened to an economist indicate that southern Ontario looks to northern Ontario as a supplier of raw materials—and I remind you of the Thoman report. Do you, Mr. Speaker, remember that famous report which said that northern Ontario would continue to be the source of raw materials for the megalopolis from Chicago, to Toronto, to New York? That was the Tory government's response to our problem, called the Toronto-centred

region plan. The multinationals look on all of Ontario and all of Canada in the same vein; as merely a place from which you draw natural resources.

This company, lo and behold, has an excess of pellets. Iron ore pellets. They've got an excess in the United States. Shades of excess of nickel. Here we go again.

National Steel, which is managed by Hanna Mining, was going to close a mine called Pilot Knob in Missouri, which produced approximately the same amount as is produced in Capreol, my hometown, about 500 tons or 600 tons a year.

Pilot Knob is a losing proposition. It's underground mining for iron ore, and that's usually a losing proposition. They have a three-year life expectancy. The American government decided: "We shouldn't close this operation. We want you to mine it out. We'll pay the shot. You mine it out, and we'll pay you \$28,000,000 a year to mine it out so that we can store oil."

National Steel and Hanna Mining decided they could close the mine in Capreol, throw 250 people out of work, despite the fact that the company made \$6,000,000 in Capreol last year.

One wonders why they can't gear down somewhere else. Hanna Mining, which manages this operation, produces about 18,000,000 tons a year in Canada. They produced about 20,000,000 tons in Brazil, and they produced about 15,000,000 tons in the United States. It's a drop in the bucket to produce 500 tons in Sudbury. They could gear down one notch somewhere and not destroy that community.

Let me tell you what will happen. Two hundred and fifty men will be out of a job as of May 15, unless we can get something to change that. They're going to close for two or three years, and then they're going to come back when the pellet glut is over. But, where do workers from the Sudbury area go, with Inco having laid off 2,000, losing another 2,000 which they would have had to lay off had there not been a strike; Falconbridge laying off about 750? Where do the 250 men and their families go from Capreol?

But, this company is going to come back. Two or three years from now it will say to the town council, "We need another subdivision. We want you to put that in and we want you to put sewers and water in, and we want you to put in an addition to the high school because we're coming back." Hopefully in two or three years those homes which will have been put up for sale

will have been sold, and other people will have come in.

What does it do to that community? What does it do to those workers? What about the tax loss to a small municipality, with about 4,100 people? Right now there are 84 homes for sale in that community.

[4:15]

If Hanna Mining is grinding out 35,000,000 tons a year, and it's just the operator for National Steel, and if from Labrador alone National Steel itself is extracting about 10,000,000 tons, I can't understand how we allow a small community to be hammered in that fashion. This leads me to ask a question of the government.

When we had the Inco layoffs, the Premier established a cabinet committee under the jurisdiction of the then Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. F. S. Miller) which was going to do a cabinet study and come up with a policy pertaining to resource communities. I suspect that committee hasn't even met because if it has, I'm still waiting for the report on what policies it is going to adopt to prevent multinationals, or even nationals, from acting in such a high-handed fashion that they would destroy a community and see workers lose their homes.

After 35 years, this government has not come in with a policy with respect to the resource sector. Its track record leaves a good deal to be desired. That leads me to want to deal with the whole mining industry. I'm glad the minister responsible for the resource sector is here because I want to indicate to him what bothers me about that sector.

Aside from a legacy of abandoned communities, I'm not sure what we have in northern Ontario in terms of secondary industry. I might indicate that if we wait for secondary industry, as espoused by the former Treasurer when he said there would be no secondary industry in northeastern Ontario for 20 more years, if that's the position of the government of Ontario, northeastern Ontario is in trouble.

The mining industry produces fewer than 50,000 jobs a year, and yet the boast of this government is that the resource sector is the basis of our economy and that it is very proud of that. What does it do with the 50,000 jobs, if you include pits, quarries, mining or you name it? If one looks at employment in metal mining and the amount that is produced, one will notice that in 1966 with 27,147 people involved in metallic mining the industry managed to churn out 43,000,000 tons. In 1976 notice the great difference. With 27,380 workers, about 230 more workers, they managed to grind out

60,000,000 tons. In other words, they increased their production by 39 per cent with 230 more workers.

That doesn't bode well for us in the north. It doesn't bode well for Ontario in terms of jobs for young people. If one looks at where our unemployment is, the heaviest area is among young people. Look at revenue. The government talks about this being the cornerstone of our economy. In 1968-69, we got \$19,000,000 in revenue in Ontario. Isn't that a magnificent sum?

Mr. Foulds: What are those figures again?

Mr. Nixon: For the whole mining industry?

Mr. Martel: For the whole mining industry, we got \$19,616,000. Up until 1972, it had got all the way to \$16,344,000. If we include it with income tax, starting with 1973-74 as a base year, we got \$59,000,000. Then we had a boom year. We got \$191,000,000 in 1974, if we include mining tax and corporate income tax.

Mr. Nixon: That's when John White adjusted it.

Mr. Martel: That's right. Then the slide started.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Reform.

Mr. Martel: In 1975-76, we got \$82,000,000. In 1976-77, we got \$59,000,000. In 1977-78, we got \$31,000,000.

Mr. Nixon: Gee, that John White was a great Treasurer.

Mr. Foulds: Scandalous.

Mr. Martel: The total in federal income tax and in mining tax was \$31,500,000.

Mr. Nixon: They have been trying to clean up their act after John White ever since.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, if you want to look at it in another way, based on production, let me tell you the value of production in 1977. The value of mineral production in 1977 in Ontario was \$2,699,400,000. Our total take was \$39,000,000 or about 1.4 per cent of production.

Mr. Foulds: Awful, just awful!

Mr. Martel: Tell me how we will build an economy in Ontario with that kind of return. Let me tell you, if you try taxing them, Mr. Speaker, they will just high grade, so you can't win the game on taxation.

Let me tell you what the Saskatchewan government did in 1978. Let me read their return.

Mr. Nixon: It sounds like a political pamphlet you are reading.

Mr. Martel: In 1978 they got \$349,000,000 from gas and oil. In natural gas they got

\$500,000. In potash they got \$108,000,000; in uranium, \$2,356,000; and there are a couple of other smaller ones for a total revenue from the resource sector of \$461,923,000. Compare that to Ontario where from a value of mineral production of almost \$3,000,000,000, we got \$39,000,000.

Mr. Laughren: What a disgrace.

Mr. Nixon: Inco says they pay it all to workers.

Mr. Martel: Oh, I can give you Inco's figures too. I have broken them down. Inco's total profits in 1976 were \$197,000,000; their total tax—federal, provincial and provincial mining—was \$79,000,000.

Mr. Nixon: That is corporation tax—everything?

Mr. Martel: The whole business, the whole business. It is not only bad enough that we don't have jobs and we don't have tax revenue, but we got into the game of exemptions. We have about 30 exemptions which allow them to take our resources from here and refine them somewhere else.

Inco alone delivered 111,000,000 pounds of nickel—contained in nickel oxide sinter—to Wales in 1971. It was 109,000,000 pounds in 1972; 75,000,000 pounds in 1973 and in 1974; 100,000,000 pounds in 1975; and 82,000,000 pounds in 1976. That comes to a total of about 20 per cent of their total production.

If one looks at the refining capacity in Port Colborne, they refine about 90,000,000 pounds a year and this accounts for about 1,411 jobs. When one realizes that Inco sends that much out annually to Wales, we see we lose those 1,411 jobs. If you extrapolate and consider the effect in terms of other jobs in Ontario, it is about double.

It isn't bad enough that we give the exemptions and allow them to send it out of the country, we even allow them to take their money out and explore somewhere else, and we even allow them to write off their taxes against profits earned in Ontario. We are generous. We are generous to the extreme. In fact, they don't even reinvest in Canada any more.

Mr. Foulds: We are giving them away.

Mr. Martel: Let's just look at Inco for a moment. They reinvested about \$250,000,000 abroad in ESB Incorporated. They invested \$235,000,000 in Exmibal in South America. They invested \$30,000,000 in Inco United States Incorporated, International Metals Reclamation Company Incorporated in Ellwood City, Pennsylvania—I didn't even know that existed. They invested \$850,000,000 in PT International Nickel, Indonesia. All of that

money was earned in the Sudbury basin and they haven't invested a cent for secondary industry in Ontario—none. They have a plant which may start up eventually. They have taken that kind of money and invested it somewhere else.

Before someone says, "Ah, but what about their investment?" As of November 16, 1977, Inco's profits for the previous 10 years amounted to \$1,700,000,000, or a 14 per cent return on investment. That is not bad, when you take all that investment, you plough it in somewhere else, and you do not create a job in Ontario. In fact, the only place Inco has invested in Ontario is in the extractive end so that it can get it out of the ground faster.

Inco ploughs it in somewhere else, and we get nothing. We get nothing in tax; we get nothing in research and development; we get nothing in jobs for our young people. I want to say that goes right across our resource sector. If one looks at Falconbridge, Falconbridge is the same; Falconbridge invests in Norway.

Let me tell you just how bad it is, Mr. Speaker. Inco is taking some \$50,000,000 of its earnings this year and putting it into ESB-Ray-O-Vac to upgrade those plants in the United States. But they cannot even put an offer on the table to the workers in the Sudbury basin who have created all the wealth for them. All the Tories do is give them more privileges and more benefits, and after seven months they still have not put a decent offer on the table.

I want to tell the government that its track record in the resource sector leaves a good deal to be desired and, when government party members say it is the cornerstone of our economy, I think they are all nuts. There is nothing left to be the cornerstone.

If one takes it one step further, to where the exploration is going on, even the mining companies to whom we have been so generous do not reinvest that money here. In Ontario in 1977, \$28,000,000 was spent in looking for new metals. In 1972, the amount spent in looking for new metals was \$14,000,000; then it got to \$16,000,000, and in 1977 it was \$13,000,000.

Do you know what they are spending in Saskatchewan this year? Eighty million dollars. And that province is one seventh the size of this jurisdiction in terms of population. Thirty-five million dollars is coming from the Saskatchewan mining development corporation, but \$45,000,000 is coming from the private sector. This government can say socialism scares off the private sector, but we are not getting

\$45,000,000 looking for new wealth. In fact, the last new mine discovered in Ontario was Land Lake Mine in 1971, and the last new mine to come into production was Sturgeon Lake in 1975.

Where is this government's policy? Where is its policy that will ensure that we have more jobs, more tax, and a greater percentage of reinvestment of earnings held here in Ontario? Where is its policy to guarantee that a certain amount of that resource will be put into the manufacturing sector? Why are we allowing them to invest abroad and then to write that off against the profits earned in this jurisdiction? It's nuts. Surely, even for a Tory government, it is time to put it all together and take a look at it. It's a disgrace.

If one looks at forestry, the government's track record is a little bit better. I guess it was Frost who said, way back, "You have to produce more in this country."

I am trying to go as quickly as I can, but there are some things that cannot be overlooked.

First of all, we are turning back to the private sector the reforestation of this province. We took it away from them in 1963 because they did a lousy job. Now, in the speech from the throne, we are putting it back in their hands. What has convinced this government that they are going to do any better now than they did prior to 1963?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Because the government did a lousy job itself.

Mr. Martel: I was just going to say that. Armson in his report indicated the government did a lousy job. Here's this industry in Ontario which in the first nine months of 1978 made \$540,000,000 in profits, and we're going to give them \$100,000,000. The federal government is going to give them \$230,000,000—not all in this province. This is happening at a time when we have Domtar in 1978 acquiring a gypsum business in California for \$34,500,000, and when we have Abitibi Paper going to invest some \$22,000,000 in an expansion at Roaring River, North Carolina. Why do we have to provide \$100,000,000, without equity and without a return? Does the government even look where those companies are reinvesting the money we are giving them? It might not be the dollars we are giving them, but they are taking other dollars and investing in North Carolina and in South Carolina. They are investing abroad, yet out of the public treasury we are going to give them \$100,000,000 this year and we don't have an equity. Government members are lousy

businessmen. I don't know any other country that is so generous.

[4:30]

It was interesting when the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism visited England, the vice-president of ICI, which is the parent of CIL, said to the select committee, and there are seven members sitting over there: "The second you start giving money away you are in trouble. The companies that locate in Canada or in any jurisdiction go because the infrastructure is there and the government is fairly stable; but if a government starts playing giveaway, we want our share too, even if we don't need it."

Mr. Laughren: It's unstable government.

Mr. Martel: The government wants to play Las Vegas with these corporations. I want to know if the government has any policy, outside of giveaway, to enhance the economy of this province; I think not.

Yet there are areas where this can occur. I was able to serve on the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism for about four years. In that four years we tabled, I think, 21 reports dealing with the mining industry and with a whole variety of things. One of the conclusions we came to was that somewhere along the line we are going to have to grapple with multinationals. Seven government members signed those reports, by the way; most of them are in the cabinet today too.

Mr. Wildman: And now they don't even know who is responsible for replying to questions on the subject.

Mr. Martel: One looks at what multinationals do. There are not only multinationals like National Steel putting it to us in the Capreol area, but if one looks at Hamilton, one sees that Westinghouse wants to close and move somewhere else. One looks at Columbus McKinnon in St. Catharines; they closed and moved to Buffalo, after 102 years, I guess, in Ontario. One looks at Budd Automotive who are at the trough looking for a handout. One looks at the Hoover Company. One looks at Kennametal who have moved to Toronto. Remington Rand have closed; Wagstaffe bought out Delmonte and closed the operation down.

The government just can't go on with handouts in this area. The select committee, we thought, was established by the Premier to look into that problem, yet most of the recommendations have been ignored.

On the one report dealing with natural resources it says, "The policy shift should involve not a discouragement of resource development but an encouragement of manufacturing and processing in Canada." The second recommendation was, "One important goal of both provincial and federal resource policies should be the achievement of a strong and visible Canadian-controlled presence in the non-renewable resource sector." We haven't done that.

I won't even read it, but the government member of the committee suggested in that report, and signed it, as did the two Liberal members, that we should take up to 50 per cent ownership in the resource sector.

Mr. Nixon: Donald Deacon was a Liberal member.

Mr. Martel: Donald Deacon, and my good friend the late Dick Smith wanted that. And the government members over there signed that document.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Donald Deacon signed it?

Mr. Nixon: Donald Deacon signed that.

Mr. Martel: That's right. But the government hasn't moved. They paddle around this province saying, "Oh, it is only the socialists who want that." The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) signed it. The member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman) signed it; and the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Walker); as well as the former Speaker (Mr. Rowe). It really is amazing.

But that select committee also said something else. It said we should look to areas where there are weaknesses and then move in. When one sees what our trade deficit is it indicates to me there are certain weaknesses. The trade deficit in Ottawa, \$1,100,000,000; auto pact machinery, \$3,100,000,000; electronics, \$1,000,000,000; textiles, \$1,900,000,000.

That select committee had recommendations on mining equipment. I want to speak about manufacturing. Members would be interested to know that at the present time there is a smaller percentage of our population in the work force engaged in manufacturing than in all other western countries except Ireland, Turkey and Greece.

Mr. Laughren: You guys should be ashamed of yourselves.

Mr. Martel: Can you imagine that; Ireland, Turkey and Greece? There are fewer Canadians and Ontarians involved in manufacturing than in all those countries. Isn't that something? The emphasis on giveaways—

Mr. Foulds: What are those countries again?

Mr. Martel: Ireland, Turkey and Greece.

The select committee said one of the places we should be moving into was our mining equipment sector. I just want to put a few facts on the record.

Canada is the third largest mining country in the world; Canada is also the second largest consumer of mining machinery. Canada has the dubious honour of being the largest importer of mining machinery in the world. For mining machinery, narrowly defined, our imports amounted to \$376,000,000 in 1978, up 340 per cent from 1968. The trade deficit in mining machinery was \$255,000,000 in 1978, up 140 per cent from five years earlier.

The percentage of market captured by imports is truly astounding and getting worse. For mining machinery, the figure was 91 per cent in 1978, up from 73 per cent in 1975 and up from 59 per cent in 1965. Mining machinery has about the worst trade performance of any of the machinery sub-sectors.

In terms of jobs lost, the imports represent a conservative estimate of 6,000 jobs, based on the formula relating value of shipment to number of employees in the overall machinery business. Other formulas suggest that the spin-off would amount to double that. In other words, mining machinery imports represent a total of about 18,000 potential jobs, if we got serious about it.

The argument is always advanced that Canadian industry can't get established because of a small domestic market. Well, in this field, that's crazy. In the mining field this argument just doesn't hold water. The Canadian market for mining machinery—and this does not include oil and gas or extractive machinery—was \$416,000,000 in 1978, double that of five years earlier.

According to Stats-Can, the capital expenditure on new machinery or equipment for all Canada amounted to about \$1,163,000,000, or \$649,000,000 excluding oil and gas. If equipment for smelting and refining is included the total expenditure rises to \$1,692,000,000. Capital expenditure on machinery and equipment for iron ore alone was \$233,000,000.

It is an interesting fact that Canada produces a value of metals almost equal to that of the United States, yet the United States maintains a trade surplus and we continue to be the largest importer of mining equipment. Canada also produces more minerals than England, Sweden, Germany and Fin-

land, yet all these countries have established a strong domestic base.

Just one interesting fact: you cannot, for instance, buy a Canadian-made diesel engine in Canada of any size, of any size.

Mr. Foulds: Scandalous.

Mr. Martel: Isn't it interesting to note that the select committee, in 1974, made the following recommendations: "There is a scope for the development of a significant Canadian control presence in the mining machinery and equipment industry. The committee recommends that the government actively encourage the development of Canadian-controlled firms in the mining machinery and equipment industry through the provisions of loans and research assistance and through purchase policies. The committee recommends that policies be developed to include the performance of mining machinery and equipment firms in terms of export, research and development and increasing Canadian value added.

"The committee is of the view," I go on further, "that if the private sector does not respond to policies designed to encourage the development of the mining machinery and equipment industry, it may be appropriate for the government to become involved in the area directly."

That was signed by at least four cabinet ministers.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but do you believe that any Minister of Industry and Tourism or any Premier ever read that or ever paid the slightest attention to it?

Mr. Martel: Well maybe they didn't, but maybe they should have.

Mr. Nixon: You, me and your mother are the only ones who read it.

Mr. Martel: My understanding is that the member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman) was put in charge of going through those reports and indicating to the government what policies might, in fact, be enacted. Interestingly enough, it was not just that select committee, it was the select committee that looked into Inco last year. They too, made a recommendation. Let me read that recommendation. Finally, the final report of the select committee of the Ontario Legislature on Inco and Falconbridge layoffs made a recommendation:

"That all levels of government investigate and develop a program of industrial diversification in the Sudbury area." Two of the specific areas to be examined and encouraged were an expanded mining research and development program at Laurentian University

and a mining equipment manufacturing industry in the Sudbury area.

"While acknowledging that the Sudbury area is primarily involved in the production of nickel and copper, the committee notes that most of the heavy equipment used in the mining industry throughout Ontario is manufactured outside of Canada. Within a relatively few miles of the Sudbury area, uranium, gold, silver and other precious metals are mined throughout the year."

It was interesting that the people who opposed the establishment of that sort of development were the mining companies. Edwin Carter said at those hearings: "That is a cyclical industry and therefore we should not get involved in it." It is interesting that the one large producer of underground mining equipment in North Bay—

Mr. Nixon: Canadian Tire?

Mr. Martel:—hardly—Jarvis Clark, recommended that we move to that field. He is the only successful producer of equipment. Mr. Clark said he would leave the market system intact but has specific proposals for government effort to foster its development. One of his favourite themes is that Ontario should form an Ontario mining group modelled on the Swedish and Finnish group. Its members would be the manufacturers, government agencies, mining companies, contractors and consultants. The Ontario mining group would have a commercial role, informing its members of all the international commercial opportunities, arranging joint ventures as well as participating in trade missions.

That was just one of the recommendations from the select committee. Significantly, though, they indicated in the report probably seven or eight other areas of real weaknesses, and the select committee recommended that Ontario should look to those weaknesses and then get involved.

Mining equipment is a natural. Because we are the third largest producers in mineral wealth, we should in fact move to the field of production of mining equipment. We have not done so and it is a disgrace, because not only could we capture the internal market, we could give tax preferences and so on, tax credits, we could also get involved in research and development and we could also start to export.

The market is there. If the private sector does not want to do it, rather than give away to Ford \$68,000,000, rather than give away to other industries large sums of money, maybe we should be ploughing our money into something that is going to give us jobs, that is

going to give us research and development, that is going to give us offshoots, and that is going to allow us to get into the export market.

That is just one-area. Those reports indicate a variety of areas.

I am trying to go as quickly as I can. I am just going to deal briefly with the health issue. I wanted to talk about children, but I won't.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Before the honourable member goes on to the final issue, I think the record should show that there was a general understanding by which the House is not bound, and I appreciate that, that the time allotted for this debate prior to 5:45 would be divided equally among the three parties. Notwithstanding a matter that I am going to talk about in a minute for just a minute, that would have been 35 minutes per speaker. The honourable member started at five minutes to four so he had an extra five minutes on that, which no one is going to question, which meant he would have 40 and the other two parties would have 35. Before even the disruption of this afternoon he assured us he had a 45-minute speech; he has now gone 50. All the time he takes now is taking away from the other two, which is not in the spirit of the understanding.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, I started after four o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You started at five minutes to four.

Mr. Martel: That is quite impossible. I would ask the Speaker if he would check that figure out.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You started at five minutes to four.

Mr. Martel: You might say that. I do not agree. My timetable does not indicate that. The other thing is, before you get too hooty with me, we offered a solution—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Why don't you go to six o'clock then?

Mr. Martel: —and in your usual lovely fashion you ignored it. We have sat on this side of the House on a number of occasions to accommodate the government House leader beyond six o'clock. I asked the minister why he couldn't move to go an extra 30 or 35 minutes.

[4:45]

Hon. Mr. Welch: You never agreed to anything that wasn't convenient to yourself.

Mr. Martel: If it isn't convenient to the House leader it doesn't hold water either, does it?

Mr. Cassidy: You sat there, inert.

Interjections.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the honourable member continue?

Hon. Mr. Welch: You've proved your point. You just take it away from the other side.

Mr. Martel: We're prepared to sit until 6:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You've proved your point.

Mr. Martel: You did that on the emergency debate. You proved your point. And you proved your point last Tuesday night when we went into bills that weren't scheduled. So, don't come around here telling me about proving points.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now, wait a minute. We had an understanding.

Mr. Martel: We had it out, yes. My office checked with your office on that occasion, my friend.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has already been raised. I can't wait to hear what the honourable member has to say about medicare; and I hope we all understand that whatever happens now, the light will have to go on after this marvellous debate concludes. So, let's get on with it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I only want to spend about five minutes on this.

Mr. Laughren: I'll testify to that.

Mr. Martel: I am interested, from this point of view, at the accusations being made.

Mr. Nixon: Come on, come on.

Mr. Martel: It is interesting to note that 18 per cent of the doctors have opted out, that we are down to a formula of four beds in the north and 3.5 in the south. It is interesting to hear the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) try to blame the opposition parties for the dilemma we are in. He didn't get such a hot reception at Wellesley Hospital last week, according to the reports in the paper. As for the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane), who totally blamed the NDP the other night for the attack on doctors, I'm amazed; I really am amazed.

Mr. Laughren: He had to apologize to his constituents.

Mr. Martel: Before we are all said and done, if he has not already done so, I suspect the member for Algoma-Manitoulin has already gone to the Minister of Health to talk about the cut in the Little Current hospital, which is going to see itself with about a one per cent increase this year and a bed cut. I suspect if he hasn't already visited with the minister, he will be doing so in the very near future.

Mr. Foulds: If he hasn't gone, he should.

Mr. Martel: The other problem with medicare, of course, is that this government has never been committed to it. I recall when it came in—I happened to be here—John Robarts called it a machiavellian scheme. I remember it well, the great reluctance with which they went into OHIP. I recall that debate well.

Interjection.

Mr. Martel: The minister wasn't here, so she needn't tell me about it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I do read.

Mr. Martel: She should read the record some day.

The government didn't want to go into it. If the government were sincere about trying to iron out some of the problems—but it is not usually; this government has a great capacity for putting a middleman between the government and the electorate. It does that with school boards and municipal councils, and now it is doing it with doctors. It makes them the goat in the piece.

If the government wanted to resolve it, it would have appointed a mediator, as Saskatchewan has just done, to try to iron it out—someone with the eminence of Chief Justice Hall, then it would get a mediator in there to try to resolve the solution. It might look at a couple of other things in discussions with doctors. There is no other profession I know where one starts at the full buck, where one starts from square one. If one is a teacher, he has to work his way up the totem pole. If one is a lawyer, he works his way up the totem pole. Not doctors; they start at the top. No other profession does that. Maybe the government should start to look at that.

They might also look at the maldistribution of income within certain groups. They will find there are certain specialists in certain sectors at the top—a very small group—who cream off the milk. This is what the specialists tell me. Maybe the government could look at it.

The other thing it might look at is the mess within OHIP. In the Saskatchewan system, 82 per cent of the claims are paid within 30 days. I know a doctor in Sudbury who is still waiting for his \$3,000 cheque for January. Does the government wonder why they are upset? It is convenient to have the minister try to blame the opposition parties.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you support Saskatchewan's balanced billing?

Mr. Martel: There is less than three per cent in there. They are so far ahead of us it is not even funny, Larry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you support their system?

Mr. Warner: You will never catch up.

Mr. Martel: I was amazed to read in the last couple of weeks a letter from Dr. Vail. I thought he was just blaming the NDP. I thought, "Here's a Tory," but I learned lo and behold, the other night that Dr. Vail is a Liberal. I couldn't understand why he was just kicking the hell out of us. I thought he was a Tory and, like most doctors, kicked the hell out of us, but I found out he was a Liberal.

I want to ask if any one in this House recalls this statement being made: "If the marketplace, to which the Premier refers, is insufficient to overcome this 30 per cent differential in the two fee schedules, and it seems as though that will be approximately what the difference is, would the minister consider making the marketplace truly effective by either eliminating the opting-out provision or more importantly, by including the non-reimbursement by OHIP of those patients who chose to go to opted-out physicians?" Do members know who asked that question?

Mr. Laughren: Who said that?

Mr. Martel: That was in the House.

Mr. Laughren: Tell us who said it.

Mr. Martel: It was the Leader of the Opposition. It is in Hansard, April 14, 1978.

Mr. Cassidy: What a flip-flop.

Mr. Martel: We have Dr. Vail sending letters to everyone in the province saying: "Look at the NDP; they're after you," while there's the Leader of the Opposition saying, "You can't opt out or, if you do opt out you'll have to collect all your money yourself."

Mr. Laughren: He is still saying that.

Mr. Martel: Isn't that an interesting question? Maybe somebody would send a copy of that to Dr. Vail and to all the doctors in the province.

Mr. Laughren: Is he still saying that?

Mr. Martel: No, of course not. The other thing I wanted to mention is the \$50,000,-000 budget cut that was recommended from that side last year.

Mr. Laughren: The Liberal side, that is.

Mr. Martel: The Liberal side. Last year they were going to save the province \$50,000,000 in the health budget. Nobody ever asked them where they were going to

cut. If they were going to cut \$50,000,000 last year, that wouldn't be in this year's budget and, with a four or five per cent increase where would we be this year, if that party had got its way?

When all of these people go around wagging their finger and saying it's the NDP, I want to tell them we're trying to save the universality of this plan.

Mr. Nixon: Goodbye socialism.

Mr. Martel: That's what you said before Thursday's by-election.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Right, and you dropped 20 per cent.

Mr. Martel: Those two seats will be filled by New Democrats.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about Chatham? There was a landslide there.

Mr. Martel: What happened in Chatham? Where was the landslide there? You slid all right, you slid in the mud.

I want to tell the honourable members that for sheer hypocrisy that group has got it all. They wanted a \$50,000,000 cut in the budget, though they didn't say where. That would have given a further shortfall this year, if we had gone that route. They wanted the opting-out clause totally removed or not to allow doctors to bill OHIP. That's just unacceptable. I wish somebody would send a copy, as I said earlier, to Dr. Vail to let him know the Liberal position.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't you send it? You're always sending out letters.

Mr. Martel: I don't send anything out. If the member wants to give me Dr. Vail's address, I'll send him the letter and Hansard.

I've heard many speakers in the last week on this side of the House say that they're tired of this government. If they want an opportunity to get rid of it, I urge them to join us in the vote today.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think we can probably divide the time remaining. I will be cutting short some of my comments as did the member for Sudbury East, and perhaps the Premier will be able to cut his short as well. I notice he hasn't been in since the bomb scare. No doubt he and his platoon of writers are feverishly trying to work out some defence of the indefensible, which he will bring in hot off the mimeograph machine when he has it completed.

I am of the opinion that the irrelevancy of this debate is pretty much apparent to everyone anyway, and I say that with a very heavy feeling in my heart and mind. As a matter of fact, for most of the hour that the member for Sudbury East was speaking we

did not have a quorum. Keeping careful count, there were at one stage only four NDP members present and only about three in the government benches, without a cabinet minister except our good friend formerly from Cochrane, who in that respect doesn't really count—except as a gentleman, when he will always count.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And two Liberals.

Mr. Foulds: And two Liberals.

Mr. Nixon: So the idea that what is presented in this debate if of some momentous importance really is something that disappeared, if not this year, maybe several years ago.

Mr. Foulds: Probably because the Premier never attends.

Mr. Nixon: I think it should be a tremendous responsibility on all of us, including the House leaders—I say to the member for Sudbury East, and the House leader for the government (Mr. Welch), who has now departed—that we can surely organize ourselves so that this debate returns to being one of the more important ones the legislative session would have.

I would suggest as follows: On the completion of Her Honour's speech, we set aside the first day immediately for the leaders of the three parties, including the leader of the government. There's no reason why we couldn't do this. It's not necessary for an elaborate presentation, since the leaders have the responsibility to put forward in broad terms the alternatives they and their parties are offering to the electorate and the taxpayers.

We could devise a time and maybe could have an agreement sealed in blood so that no one is going to take advantage of the other. The honourable members could be sure we would see there would be no committee meetings, and heaven help the private member who would not be interested enough to attend and listen. We would hope some of the press people would be hanging on the gallery—let's say hanging on the railings of the galleries; we will hang them another way some other time. It can be made an event.

I would further suggest we could limit the speeches of private members, such as myself and the honourable member who has just completed, perhaps to 20 minutes. Once again, we could arrange the work in the Legislature so there is no reason for the members not to be in attendance.

If we have to rely on our whips to see the men and women who are elected are here

to listen to the views expressed by the honourable members in a limited debate, we can certainly do so. This ought to be an occasion where, in general terms, we not only put the party alternatives but listen to the problems that have been brought forward and will be brought forward by private members.

There are not many members of this House who know anything, or give a damn, about the mining tax. Whatever members think about the speech from the member for Sudbury East—

Mr. Foulds: A fine speech.

Mr. Nixon: —he did give us a good deal of information in that connection. When one looks at all those blue seats opposite, and the member for Sudbury East wonders why they don't take any action, the answer is clear: They don't know anything about it and they don't care anything about it.

When the honourable member bleeds a little bit that Conservatives and Liberals and NDPs signed some report of some select committee, really he is being a little naive. I hope I'm not being unduly cynical when I would suggest that although a good deal of work goes into those reports, the ministers concerned simply hand the report to some person employed and say, "What do you think of that?" Probably the person employed, if he/she does get around to reading it, will say, "Actually we're on top of this and our policies cover it."

A lot of the select committee work is practically meaningless.

Mr. Foulds: No. Let the record show that some honourable member said "no."

Mr. Nixon: I regret that very much. It's an opportunity when the House is in a minority situation when we can really impose the responsibility on the government to react to these matters.

The honourable member even referred to the famous select committee dealing with the Sudbury situation. In many respects I would say to him that was largely window dressing. Frankly, it was window dressing for more parties than the government party.

Mr. Foulds: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Nixon: I would include the NDP in that regard. There seemed to be nothing that could be done. The damage having to do with government policy was already a fait accompli and unfortunately it continues in the benighted policies that are doing little or nothing for the development of Sudbury.

But the thing that bothers me is when the honourable member, in the dying moments of his address—somebody wrote me a note and

said there was a bomb in here after all, but that's another matter—couldn't understand why we Liberals were not going to support their no-confidence motion. It occurred to me that when we had the NDP no-confidence motion last week—goodness knows what we're going to have next week, more of the same, no doubt—but last week, when it was the greatest thing in the world that we had to have an election, we had to vote no confidence because of a five cent increase in the subway fare in Toronto.

[5.00]

I wonder what the member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) is telling his people back home.

Mr. Martel: Sudbury East.

Mr. Nixon: The other Sudbury member isn't even here. Is that a big issue in Sudbury? Should we, as the Liberals, have turned to the NDP and supported it on this fatuous, no-confidence motion?

Mr. Warner: You supported the government; a coalition government.

Mr. Nixon: Really, they seem to have lost any understanding of what can be done effectively in this Legislature in a minority situation.

Mr. Foulds: When are you going to sign the form for coalition? When are you going to sign the coalition agreement?

Mr. Nixon: I would ask them to simply look to see what my colleague, the leader of the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith), has been able to accomplish in here in this minority situation.

Mr. Foulds: I'll tell you what the initials are: SWF.

Mr. Nixon: It was his leadership that reversed the 38 per cent increase in OHIP premiums. It was his leadership that got the Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett) to back down from his Olympian position and cancel that great big, huge, elite hotel that was going to be built on the Niagara Escarpment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So much for tourism.

Mr. Nixon: It was his leadership that got the royal commission on food appointed.

Mr. Foulds: Talk about hyperbole.

Mr. Nixon: Whatever you think about its work, this is the way knowledgeable and sensitive leadership, supported by a cohesive and hardworking party, can, in fact, improve the work of this Legislature.

Mr. Foulds: How can a son of Harry Nixon be saying these things?

Mr. Nixon: I know the Premier (Mr. Davis) will be anxious to have his share of time. Dr. what's-his-name, his chief—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Smith.

Mr. Nixon: No, no; not his chief psychiatrist.

They are just dashing off a few pearls they are going to cast before the members of the Legislature. I regret that. It's a shame we cannot have the kind of debate in this House where the Premier and at least some of the more effectual cabinet ministers were present—

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Thanks a lot.

Mr. Foulds: Go ahead and leave, Larry.

Mr. Nixon: —in order to hear not only what the opposition officially thinks about them but what individual members want to bring before this House.

We forget the tremendous power that resides in this chamber, or in the membership of this chamber through its vote. There are many reasons for us to believe we are rather powerless, simply because no one seems to respond to what happens here and the vote is everything; you know, Mr. Speaker, that in a minority House the vote can in fact dismiss the government.

Mr. Foulds: Except when, under the great leadership of Stuart Smith, we telegraph the punches.

Mr. Nixon: I'm getting so convinced by my own oratory I'm going to be led, perhaps, to recommend to my colleagues it is time for such a dismissal, but not on the basis of the ineffectual and crying no-confidence motion that is before us, that's certain.

Mr. Warner: No; coalition is better, coalition government is better.

Mr. Turner: Thank God for that.

Mr. Warner: No, you support the destruction of the health-care system.

Mr. Foulds: Nothing wrong with the hospital system, eh?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I was giving you my recipe for an improvement in the quality of the debate, and one of the things was to truncate some of the longer speeches. My own is approaching that time limit I don't want to go over—

Mr. Turner: Yes, it is.

Mr. Foulds: Go on.

Mr. Nixon: —but there are many areas for the development of an effective parliament that we must bring ourselves to consider. We have to do something so the debates here are effective, so that they influence government policy and we, as elected members from our own communities,

feel we have some effective and useful role to play in these deliberations.

I want to speak about two or three specific things very briefly. The first has to do with the deliberations of the select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs. The matter in Harrisburg, the atomic accident just finished a week ago, in my view makes it imperative that that select committee, standing in for private citizens across this province, review the safety features in our own atomic reactors and make a recommendation to the House and to the government in that connection.

One of the things that concerned me during the height of the incident, or accident, was attempts by some of the media, —and I think particularly of the CBC—to bring together qualified scientists to more or less discuss it. If one scientist was from the anti-nuclear camp, and another for example was from Ontario Hydro, it was appallingly apparent that there was no meeting of minds whatsoever. The one group from Hydro was prepared to say it's safe and it must go forward, and the other was prepared to say it's the end of mankind and civilization as we know it.

Any reasonable person listening to this would have that chill feeling in his heart that perhaps some review of this was not only timely but seriously overdue.

It is true the select committee is going to undertake that this summer, but the proposal put forward by my leader, which would have involved Dr. Porter in the deliberations of the select committee, was an excellent one. I hope it is not going to continue to be dismissed. Any time it is raised the honourable member for Carleton East (Ms. Gigantes) says, "You haven't the guts to make the decision yourself." That has to be so fatuous, it just has to be unbelievably inappropriate under these circumstances. If anybody thinks there is any politics in this, then really it is pretty scary.

This is an instance where the select committee under the chairmanship of the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—and I believe there is universal confidence in his chairmanship—would have a chance to hear the people from Hydro and the people from the anti-nuclear lobby who are extremely well versed and highly academically trained. So we should have somebody there in whom we have confidence, who can listen to these arguments and more or less weigh them, one against the other.

What is going to happen is that public consciousness of the situation in Harrisburg

is going to fade. In fact, it is already fading very quickly. We are going to be back to business as usual believing it can't happen here and that it was probably something designed to increase the sales of tickets to some movie. People are already more or less forgetting about it. Yet it was perhaps a chance in a lifetime for us to focus on the situation involving the safety of the atomic alternative, which is so important to this province.

There is no doubt in my mind if that alternative is rejected, or significantly rejected, it is going to mean a tremendous change in the quality of life in this province for the foreseeable future. If we are not going to have access to atomic energy, then the decision must be taken very deliberately indeed, and after only the most careful review, which I believe should have already been entered into.

Secondly, I want to deal with another matter which came out of the review of the Hydro committee when we were dealing with the atrocious bad judgement of the government in allowing the expansion of Hydro to go forward at its rate over the past decade. I will be referring to that again, hopefully when the Premier is here because I want to refer to it in his presence.

One of the things I found very interesting, when we were talking about the population which must be provided for in the future, up to the year 2000 and beyond, is that the distribution of that population is going to dictate quite dramatic changes in the policy of the government, now and in the future. It is common knowledge that with the number of citizens, probably including most of ourselves, who will be retired in the late 1990s and by the year 2000, that is going to mean that the proportion of the population will be disproportionately aged and there is going to be quite a commitment in order to pay the pensions and provide the services needed.

At the other end of the scale, however, we must recall, with the birthrate being down and immigration also being down, the number of young people under the age of 15 to be provided for in schools and other facilities will also be down quite dramatically.

The interesting fact which came forward in the Hydro affairs committee is that the number of people productively employed in order to pay the cost of the dependents, that is those under 15 and those over 65, will be higher in a few years than it is even now. That's actually good news. It means

that our tax-producing capability in relation to those we must provide for, those under 15 and over 65, is going to improve and will continue to improve slightly. But we can only use that improvement if government policy is going to direct these tax dollars for the provision of services, financial and otherwise, to those at the upper end of the age scale, those over 65, and therefore reduce them for those in the school age.

This seems terribly difficult to do. The teachers have put forward good reasons why this is the time when we can improve the quality of education by reducing the number of students and hiring more teachers. But certainly we in this House must realize that long-range policy must be towards directing those scarce tax dollars—which must be used for the provision of services to dependants—in an orderly way to those in the age groups above 65.

I also want to say something about the problems involving the provision of medical services. The member from Sudbury said he was down here in the gallery, or as a member, when John Robarts was talking about medicare being a machiavellian scheme. I remember that as well. I also remember that, a few weeks later, he attended a federal-provincial conference and reversed his position by saying that it would provide the best medical care that would be possible. I certainly believe that his second perception was correct.

I see the honourable gentlemen shaking their heads, indicating that it is inconceivable to them that John Robarts might have changed his mind in any of these views; yet I know, when they rush out and peruse the record following my remarks, that they will find I am right; as usual.

We in the Liberal Party have a commitment to the concept of universal medicare that perhaps the other parties do not have. The New Democratic Party is talking about the experience in the west, but it was Pearson and the Liberal government of Canada that took the steps which resulted in what we now have as, in my view, the best medical insurance program in the world.

We are very deeply concerned about the opting-out problems.

I would like to talk about two matters in principle. I cannot sit as a member on the Legislature and permit the services in our publicly-financed hospitals to be such that those doctors representing various specialties will not accept Ontario Health Insurance Plan fees for their full payment. It must be of great concern to the Minister

of Health (Mr. Timbrell) and to the Premier that we are providing these many millions of dollars, now directly under the day-to-day and dollar-by-dollar control of the ministry here in Toronto, and still permit those specialists who are necessary for the health and welfare of our people to demand payments above and beyond the OHIP requirements.

I have no objection to the government negotiating with the doctors, but I feel very strongly that in the long run, in public hospitals particularly, we cannot accommodate opted-out doctors in any number. This is something that I put to the government opposite.

There is one other matter that concerns me. I was interested to read that the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), who has been absent for some time travelling in China, stated without equivocation that she, as a professional, had never belonged to OHIP and never would, and that it was always her philosophy that the doctors should charge the patient on the basis of the doctor's perception of the patient's ability to pay.

I would hope that the members of the government, and particularly the Minister of Health, have rejected that completely. They may have to do it with some care, knowing the abilities of the Minister of Education as a member of the cabinet to impose her views on some of her more flexible colleagues. But as a matter of principle, for a doctor to decide what the patient should pay, when we have a system such as ours, is unacceptable; and I would hope that all members of the House would agree that it is unacceptable. It should be a philosophical basis of our program that we are prepared to provide, through our insurance program, adequate payment; beyond that, the doctors should not decide what the patient should have to pay for his services.

I want also to mention something about liquor legislation. I am very glad that the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) is in the House, because I was very impressed on March 30, 1978, when in response to a debate initiated by the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini), the honourable minister, then the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations and responsible for liquor and liquor policy, got up and said that they were going to raise the drinking age, which has been accomplished. But he went on with a package of policies which were going to reduce the pressure on young people to follow the examples of their peers and learn bad beer-

drinking habits. I do not have the quotation here, but Toronto Life had an interesting article about it by our good friend Colin Vaughan.

[5:15]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Inaccurate but interesting.

Mr. Nixon: Inaccurate? I don't believe so, because I am very interested in this. I happen to know that the Premier, as a former superintendent of the United Church Sunday school, is also interested in this. There was a commitment by the minister that by regulation we were going to require that lifestyle beer and liquor advertising be removed from television.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No; not so.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, you can recall very well the elaborate statement made by the now Minister of Industry and Tourism, in which, in detail, he indicated the regulations and controls that were going to be necessary. Being the fair-minded person that he is, he said, he wasn't going to impose this immediately, he was going to let the beer ads run out to the end of the year so that they would not have to waste all that money. We are now into another year, and if anything the beer ads are more compelling and more effective. I would say they are the best ads on television. In some respects, they are better than the programs they sponsor. I can't take time to describe them, but members know them. They sit around those tables and knock back all that foaming beer.

Mr. T. P. Reid: I'm getting thirsty.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Never watch them.

Mr. Nixon: I don't know whether it's because the ministry now has new leadership or not, but the government has gone completely back on that commitment. If the minister thinks otherwise, certainly he should make a statement in this connection, because if anything the beer ads are more compelling. We are putting, particularly on young people, more unnatural pressures which they are going to find irresistible. The argument that the people who are selling beer are simply vying for a share of the market simply will not wash. The pressure certainly has increased the consumption of beer and liquor, and I think it is of grave concern to all of us here.

I know the Premier is anxious to make his contribution to this debate. I want to talk, at least briefly, about the matter that probably concerns me more than anything else. It has to do with the state of the finances of the province. The Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) is

going to treat us tomorrow night to his budget. I have a feeling that he will, as is the custom of the Treasurer since 1971, announce a large deficit. There is no way of knowing what this will be. I would also predict that by the time the deficit is actually counted up, after the money is spent, it will be larger even than he predicts.

It appears to me that, after these 36 long years, this province has a stable of sacred cows which are the pets of the Tories, often implemented at the behest of this Premier or his predecessors, which even his cabinet ministers can't touch. The cows can't even be milked, let alone slaughtered. They are lined up there eating at the public trough, using up in every way the dollars that we, through the authority of this Legislature, tax out of our citizens.

Mr. Peterson: What about the waste products?

Mr. Nixon: I am very concerned that from one end to the other we have established an infrastructure—that phrase is often used by the Premier who likes those confusing phrases—an infrastructure that itself is almost beyond the control of this government. I just want to list a few of them.

One of the old chestnuts, one of the first ones—actually the father of this was John Robarts who made the announcement when the Minister of Education was travelling somewhere—is the county school board. We have the most expensive system of education in the world. There's no doubt about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Nixon: If you are talking about sending your kid to private school, that's different; but we have the most expensive public system in the world, and I am not at all convinced of its efficacy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was your idea. Do you remember that pamphlet from the election on county school boards? Elect a Liberal government.

Mr. Nixon: We have a system which has so many administrators that the top-heavy aspects are really a terrible and continuing draw on the taxpayers. I think of so many of the county school boards where one can't even list the officials before one gets to somebody in the school. Most of those officials, who were good teachers at one time, were wise enough and able enough to move into administration so that they can retire when they are 55 years old. With their service, if they were 20 when they started teaching—and many started to teach younger than that—it means that they can retire when they are 55, while we have the pleasure of sending

them a cheque every month from the time they are 55 until they shuffle off this mortal coil. It is just great for those people, but the costs are incredible; it is the most expensive system in the world, and I feel that we have to come to grips with that.

As a matter of fact—I mentioned this the other day—as the enrolment declines, we must reduce the cost of education. I remember the Premier responding to a question, in the absence of the then minister, having to do with cutting back on the administration. He agreed with me that administrative costs should be reduced. It was not until the then minister returned and said, "Oh, we can't do that," that all the people in administration across the province heaved a sigh of relief and went on building their empires of directors, assistant directors, area co-ordinators, subject co-ordinators, assistant subject co-ordinators—all in the \$35,000-\$50,000 range.

When we talk about the top-heavy administration, even the hospitals, which now are run almost on a day-to-day basis by the Ministry of Health, are troubled by the same disease. The penchant for bureaucracy to grow larger and larger is costing us more and more day by day, and reducing the numbers of dollars available for the actual hospital services that are so important.

In our own instance we have a new health council. They did not want to use facilities that were vacant and had been vacant because of previous cutbacks in the hospitals. They rented rooms and facilities for the new health council elsewhere. They hired a PhD as the director of operations for the health council. Once again the whole thing starts: He has got to have a secretary; he will soon have an assistant; the members of the health council will start paying themselves per diems. The whole thing builds and builds from one end of the province to the other.

Let me turn to the program of land assessment—one of the New Democratic Party members is a professional assessor, but I do not see him in the House. In 1971, one of the first acts of the Premier, at the behest of the then Treasurer, was to say, "You people in municipalities can't handle assessments." He took it over, and it has been a fiasco ever since. They have not been able to do anything with assessment. The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck) is turning gray trying to deal with it now; we can see how worried he looks.

A comparison of the cost is simply astounding. Even in Brantford we have a

regional headquarters and a district headquarters, and still the assessment is out of whack. Then they end up, in Hamilton, imposing 500 per cent tax increases on the businesses in the east end of the city.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the Volkswagen one.

Mr. Nixon: I know these people came in to see the Premier. They felt they had every right to, since they supported him with their vote and with their money for so long. Now they feel they have simply been done in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they didn't; I went to see them.

Mr. Nixon: I will be just another couple of minutes.

We are listing the sacred cows. Surely one of the fattest and sleekest is the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, which is the special pet of the Premier. They are paying millions of dollars in rent in that famous building. I hesitate to even mention that again, but it is true. We are still paying rent for that palace up on Bloor Street, even though the former Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) had recommended that OISE simply be dismantled and the furniture sold. I think he said that we should rent that property to somebody else to get a few bucks back out of it, and that the research in education be carried on by the universities. That doesn't sound irresponsible to me, but it is in the same stall as educational television. That is another one of the Premier's pets.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you opposed to it? I'll take some responsibility.

Mr. Nixon: I do not want to get into all those arguments, but I am opposed to ETV in its present form. I agree with Darcy McKeough: Educational television to provide something in the schools is fine; but if I want to watch Judy LaMarsh interview somebody, why can she not do it on the CBC? I am already paying—

Hon. Mr. Davis: She is not hired.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, she has been fired, has she?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. I said she had not been hired by the CBC.

Mr. Nixon: I never know whether the Premier is on good terms with Judy or not; sometimes she is working for him and sometimes she is not.

Just as I approach my deadline, in this stable is regional government—I do not want to say too much about that, except that regional governments now are buying land

and looking at the various plans to build their new headquarters; and they are elaborate, beautiful ones. They provide skateboards for the councillors to get from their offices to the cafeteria. The one that is going up in Haldimand-Norfolk—it is going to be in the new city proposed by John White—is certainly going to be something that the Premier will be proud of. It is his policy, it is his baby, but it is our money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was your policy.

Mr. Nixon: There are all sorts of good municipal facilities that could be used. I find that regional government is high taxes, unaccepted by the public. The Treasurer's recommendation that it was too costly to continue with is an excellent one.

Conservation authorities I have already talked about. The duplication, huge staffs, the inertia that goes with big bureaucracy—they cannot decide whether to open the dam or to close the dam. The chairman, who is a government appointee in our own area, says to Nixon, in response to my comments, that it is strange I did not know, for example, that the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) is responsible for dynamiting ice dams. I phoned my good friend, Roy, and he said, "That is news to me."

All of these conservation authorities are rapidly losing their credibility. They are building the same big headquarters, they are paying the per diem, they are having the big dinner meetings and all the rest of it. They are putting in all of the facilities to find whether the water is going up or whether it is going down, and they cannot decide how to control the floods. The only thing the conservation authority in our area does is run marvellous parks, but we have a municipal parks board, a provincial parks board, a federal parks board. I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to look at this situation if we are going to truly cut these costs.

Hydro: wow! You know, I have a new office here, room 210. You are all invited to come in because from the window—and there has got to be some justice in this—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is it as big as Margaret's?

Mr. Nixon: —I have the best view in the House of the Hydro building.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He almost called it the Moog mansion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Can you see the guns trained on you?

Mr. Nixon: It is shades of 1974, but there it is and it is an engineering miracle, except

that it came from medieval times in democracy—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You know how it worked in 1974.

Mr. Nixon: —because we simply could not find a way to build it with public tenders. Remember the arguments about that? The people have even spoken on that, but still it is a fact; we could not even do it by public tender.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It works very well.

Mr. Nixon: Yet, the decisions to do with Hydro are still made by this government; they are made by the Premier. He takes the credit when they are good and he tries to justify it when they are bad, that we are overbuilt to the extent of two-and-a-half Niagaras—something like that. But, you know, the Premier says it is nothing, it is only three cents per day per consumer. Do a little easy arithmetic and that is \$100,000,000 a year we are paying—

Mr. S. Smith: More than that.

Mr. Nixon: —for these fabulous atomic mausoleums that are sitting there and we do not even need them. We will need them some time, but meanwhile the consumers are paying the interest.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: He thinks the solution is to appoint his former campaign manager to clean up Hydro, and at least government will have a role there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let's cut Atikokan.

Mr. Nixon: I cannot rest until I have given perhaps an impartial, maybe an insider's view of what is going on over there. I quote—and I must do this—from the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, James Taylor, QC, MPP, at a meeting in Newmarket on March 28.

Hon. Mr. Davis: LLB.

Mr. Nixon: It is a short quote. "Ministries are manipulated by deputies in clever marionette-like manoeuvres, who, in turn are managed by the Premier's mandarins, with only the semblance of power at the elected level. The charade becomes more sophisticated as government becomes more involved in the day-to-day lives of the people. I say this as a concerned citizen, committed to the democratic process, who has walked the so-called corridors of power, only to be mugged in the back alleys of bureaucracy."

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: If the honourable member had been writing his own speeches when he was in the ministry, he would still be there and

he would be running for the premiership, instead of accepting that other advice.

[5:30]

In closing, I just want to say that the government with its policies and programs, is responsible for the problems the Treasurer is facing. I feel appalled to think of what he will be announcing tomorrow, that he has rejected the concept from McKeough that a balanced budget is possible and it is not possible, after these many years, for this government to do anything with the programs that have been in place and grown without control as far as administration is concerned, for 36 years, since 1943. I do not believe this government, with their supporters, has the confidence and I don't believe they have the freedom of action to do what must be done to cut the costs of the administration we control in this House from one end of the province to the other.

There is only one alternative and that is to turf them out and replace this government with one headed by my colleague from Hamilton, a man who has shown—and I have indicated this to those who were here at the beginning of my speech—through his leadership in this House that we can control the costs of OHIP, that we are not prepared to allow the Minister of Housing (Mr. Bennett) to go ahead and ride roughshod over local interests in the Niagara Escarpment, and that we are concerned about the costs of food. He has indicated clearly through our policies that we have an alternative position in education, in local government, in control of the environment, and in the development of our economy. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is the answer the people of Ontario are seeking.

The NDP, who are paying close attention to my remarks, have brought forward the old standby, the old chestnut, of a no-confidence motion. I have already indicated it surely is an embarrassment to those NDP members from Sudbury and so on that they bring forward these no-confidence motions regularly, having to do with the TTC, and so on, instead of dealing with the problems we all must face in this House.

We are not supporting the no-confidence motion but we are prepared to continue to work effectively in this Legislature for the good of the province. When an election comes, and I for one will welcome it, we are prepared to work hard for the confidence of the people. We have an alternative program the people of this province need. We have a leader in whom we have great pride and we

are prepared to work and we are prepared to win the election and govern.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At 5:34, the member for Brampton.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do we finish at 5:45, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. S. Smith: That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will do my best. The honourable member who has just finished divided the remaining time in 50-50 fashion which is really quite comparable to so many of the Liberal policies. As they sort it out, I wasn't surprised nor was I disappointed. In fact, I rather enjoyed it. I am not going into some of the observations he made because I know his memory is short and convenient on some issues and longer on others. I won't remind him on this occasion of the Liberal Party, when it was truly a Liberal Party, commitment to county school boards.

I remember bringing a pamphlet into the House: "Elect me, Bob Nixon. We will have county school boards. We will have regional government." Do you remember those great days when the Liberal Party—

Mr. Nixon: You don't have any pamphlet like that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We pick up all your good ideas. I have kept the pamphlet. It's going to be in my memoirs.

Mr. S. Smith: Fortunately, no one is going to read them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I've kept that pamphlet, I think it's one of the most significant ever used, and the very distinguished member remembers it so well.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Singer might have said that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He said regional government, but you said county school boards. That's where Jack McCarthy got the idea to give to Mr. Robarts who communicated it to me some 3,000 miles away. I heard about it in London, England, and I was delighted to get the information. Then I got the message, "Come back and put it together," which we did.

At the outset, it is traditional to express the government's appreciation to you and through you to the other Speaker—if that's the best way to phrase it—for the way in which the affairs of this House are conducted. Certainly, on this side of the House, we have total confidence in the Speaker's ability to run it in an orderly fashion—Oh, here he comes, I'll be more eloquent now.

I was just saying, Mr. Speaker, in your absence, what a great fellow you are and what great dignity you add to the House.

There are very few who can deal as effectively with the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) as you can. Certainly, the Leader of the Opposition can't deal with him, I'm sure; he has difficulty himself. I want to congratulate you, sir, on the way you do it.

Mr. S. Smith: We have great confidence in the member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition has great confidence in his colleague? So do we, but in what particular areas, I would not want to mention.

But I say most sincerely, sir, that while we do cause you problems on occasion—myself less than anyone else in the House—in terms of succinct and proper answers and always sticking to the point, we do congratulate you on the very excellent way you handle the affairs in what is on occasion not too easy an assembly.

I want to touch briefly on minority government. I was interested in listening to the observations of the member for Brantford-Oxford-Norfolk when he referred to his party's commitment to making minority government work. I guess I am no less than human, and some days I have less than total enthusiasm for minority government. I would be very surprised if the two leaders of the opposition parties would not like to see a majority government but of a different nature. That I understand.

While not getting into the by-election results in any specific way, I do not think there appeared to be anything in those that would indicate the people of this province were really that enthusiastic about the official opposition. I did not sense that, Mr. Broadbent, the leader of the New Democratic Party, said the by-election wins were great victories; they were marching towards victory federally because of that. But when one looks at the results from Wentworth, that is like Napoleon saying, as he left Moscow, "We won."

Mr. Warner: Now tell us about the win in Chatham.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In spite of what my friend's colleague said, that my speech writers were hard at work during the interim, there is my speech. The honourable member will be delighted to know it is so brief. The problem is, this could get into being an hour rather than 10 minutes.

Mr. S. Smith: At least when it's written out for you, we know when it's going to end.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I acknowledge his great talents; but today the members are having to put up with my own. I apologize to the member—

Mr. T. P. Reid: We can tell the difference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure my friend can tell the difference.

Mr. Conway: Has Gordon Dean found the winning side yet?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but I tell the member this: If Gordon Dean runs again, we will have a Tory member from that great riding; no question about it.

I do not get that involved in by-elections, but I watched Hamilton-Wentworth very closely, because we had the perception on this side of the House—and I don't think it was erroneous—that it was not the Leader of the Opposition, but a fellow by the name of Stuart Smith who was the candidate for the Liberal Party in Hamilton-Wentworth.

Mr. S. Smith: At least they didn't have to hide their leader, the way Gordon Dean did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All the material said, "Elect Stuart Smith"; then there was the name of the Liberal candidate buried somewhere in the material. And, of course, there was the campaign strategist, who is sitting right behind, and one seat over, from the Leader of the Opposition. He was the campaign manager; he was the strategist. He was the one who went into the riding and put his foot in his mouth seven days a week. I want to thank him on behalf of our party for his participation in that campaign, because without question it helped Gordon Dean acquire the number of votes he did. We want to thank him for his help. We want to express our appreciation.

Mr. S. Smith: His smartest tactic was avoiding your name.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My wife does that too on occasion. I understand that. But, talking about avoiding names, when I went into Scarborough West, very briefly, heaven's above, I had to not only seek out a Liberal sign saying "Liberal"; there was a little bit pasted over a big billboard saying, "A Stuart Smith Liberal." It was sort of an addendum from party headquarters.

An hon. member: It said, "Ontario Liberal."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, but it was a second thought.

Mr. S. Smith: We didn't see "Bill Davis" on John Larke's signs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: John Larke ran as our candidate. Our candidates do not need me to prop them up. Obviously the candidate in Scarborough West did not want his leader to prop him up.

However, that's getting partisan, and I really wanted to say most sincerely that it

is still the intent, quite seriously, on this side of the House, to make minority government work. Being relatively objective, I think we have had some measure of success. I hate to give credit—well, I do not hate to give credit; I must say to the members opposite that by and large they have been constructive on a lot of issues—not all of them; they have been misguided on some. But I think we have demonstrated that with some give and take—because I think this was the wish of the people; I may not agree with what they determined in 1977, but we have accepted it—we are making a genuine effort to see that it happens.

I want to touch briefly on two or three principal issues. The first is medicare. I will maybe correct the opposition spokesman of this afternoon for the Liberal Party. Actually it was in Ottawa at the federal-provincial conference, at about 10:30 in the morning. I was with Mr. Robarts very early that morning, and it was after that early morning or late evening that he used the word "machiavellian." It was right at the conference. It was not here; it was there. He said it right in front of Mr. Pearson. I was very young and naive.

Mr. S. Smith: Now you are no longer young.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am no longer young; I am still naive, and I hope I always will remain a little naive. That is something the Leader of the Opposition might learn, a little humility—not too much, but a little humility is not a bad thing.

I will not correct it any further, but I think I am probably right that that is where he said it, and there is no question that at that time he meant it. My guess is that if he were asked for a comment today he might say the same thing.

I want this point made clear: I am not being critical, although I did hear the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk via the electronic devices available to us, and I heard some excerpts from the member for Sudbury East—for about two minutes, but I am not going to stand here and listen day after day to people on the other side of the House, particularly in the New Democratic Party, expressing any greater commitment to the health services for the people of this province than has been demonstrated conclusively over the years by this government.

We have developed in this province one of the finest systems of health delivery anywhere in North America. I challenge them to find a better system anywhere, a better quality of service or better qualifications in

terms of the professionals who administer it. I am not saying for a moment there are not problems.

Mr. Warner: It's falling apart.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let us not kid one another, it is not falling apart. There are some problems, but, really, I have to say to the Minister of Health that what he has been able to accomplish in the last two or three weeks—actually it has been an ongoing discussion with the Ontario Medical Association—I think has been a tremendous accomplishment.

I guess this is the basic difference: The people on the other side of the House would have them all as salaried employees of the crown. They can kid themselves, but that is what they want; of course it is what they want. They want a confrontation. Those people always believe in the politics of confrontation, because that is the way they think they achieve success.

I have news for them. The people of this province do not like the politics of confrontation. They do not want to see government confronting the medical profession. They do not want to see that sort of situation if we can resolve it as reasonable people.

Our approach is very simple. We sit down with the OMA. We work out some of the problems. I do not say they are all solved, I do not know that they ever will be all solved; but we are going to continue to work in a co-operative fashion, representing the public interest but taking into account that the medical profession as a group and as individuals have certain rights and certain responsibilities that go with those rights. We understand that. I think the Minister of Health has done an excellent job in terms of resolving many of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on until about seven o'clock. I am enjoying myself here today. This is what you get for not having a prepared speech.

Mr. T. P. Reid: One out of 125 isn't bad.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I really will not go on until seven o'clock.

I want to deal with oil very briefly. I will not tease the official opposition in this province with respect to its commitment to world price and all the rest of it. I will save that for another occasion. I want to say this—and I hope the members opposite will not take offence: I am concerned with some aspects that the present federal campaign is taking on. I am a politician. I am prepared to suffer criticism. We do it; we enjoy it, I guess. I understand it. But I have differ-

ences with the Premier of Alberta. I have differences with the Premier of Saskatchewan. I will debate with them what should happen in terms of what any renewed constitution should contain.

Mr. S. Smith: What are those differences? You haven't mentioned them.

[5:45]

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I tell members this: I take exception to the Leader of the Opposition saying that Peter Lougheed is un-Canadian. I take exception to the Prime Minister of Canada going to certain parts of this country saying, for example, in Ontario: "Those people out west are greedy; they are not Canadians and they have no national interest." That sort of campaigning, that sort of approach, in my view is divisive, it is wrong. It does not provide the framework for the reconciliation of these differences.

I think political leaders should challenge one another's competence, that I understand; but I really am concerned, and I may speak out about it again. It is not a question about any policy; it is a question—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no; it is not a question of a policy, it is a question of a political leader trying to set one part of the country against the other, that is what I am concerned about.

Mr. S. Smith: That is exactly what Mr. Lougheed did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to tell members this. This also applies in terms of the great province of Saskatchewan. We took the position at the federal-provincial conference that we would support a constitutional amendment—and I forget the exact phraseology—regarding a compelling national interest. No Prime Minister of this country is going to go around lumping everything together, saying that only he can save Canada, only he believes in a strong central government.

Mr. S. Smith: What did Joe Clark say?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This province has committed itself to a strong central government, a government with the economic resources to deal with national issues. That has always been our policy; it will continue to be so and the Prime Minister does us no favour in what he says.

Mr. S. Smith: What does Joe say about Petrocan?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If I were the Leader of the Opposition, I'll tell him what he should

do. He should call his very close friend, the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, and tell him he should alter some of the approaches he is taking.

Mr. S. Smith: You ask Joe Clark what his position is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I ask him to do it. It would be a great thing. Don't become apologists for them, don't become apologists for them.

Mr. Breithaupt: Are you an apologist for Joe Clark?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are not talking policy, we are talking style and the way these things are being done.

Mr. S. Smith: What about Petrocan?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do members know what else he did? Here in Toronto, he was attempting to create the impression with the ethnic communities that only he, and he didn't phrase it exactly this way but this was the impression—

Mr. Mancini: Careful what you say now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that only he was in favour of the entrenchment of the Canadian Bill of Rights in any amended constitution.

I sat there at the same conference, and with the exception of the Premier of Manitoba everybody else agreed.

Mr. Philip: At least he didn't visit the Pope before the election; talk about playing politics.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That, to me, is not the route this campaign should take. As I say, I have always supported our federal leader, because we are one in this great party. We are really one; unlike yourselves, we are one.

At the same time, while I have always supported our federal colleagues, and I have tried to do it on a positive basis, for the first time this week I did make some observations that were critical of the Prime Minister. I don't normally do this. It offends me, it upsets me; because I think it is wrong and I make no bones about it.

I may say some of the same things in Calgary, of all places, on Wednesday night.

Mr. Conway: When did Margaret Scrivener stop making speeches?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want to come out? He would learn something about energy.

I want to touch on the economy very briefly. I listened to those people opposite—both parties, but that one in particular, which just does not have any understanding of economic issues.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh yes we do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No they don't; well that member might.

Mr. Warner: You pillage this province, you pillage it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Since I first entered this House, the honourable member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has come so far that by the time he retires, my guess is that he will have seen the light and become a Tory. I still have that hope, I still have confidence that it may happen.

Mr. MacDonald: I have too much self-respect.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The NDP would regulate everybody. It would nationalize everybody; it would take the incentive out of everything, it would leave individuals with no ambition, no desire to accomplish a thing. They don't understand what motivates people.

Interjections.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense.

Mr. Mackenzie: Your speech is deteriorating.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They have no understanding of human nature. They do not know what makes the economy work. I just wish they had some greater awareness. Do they know what their slogan should be? It should be Mackenzie King's: Jobs if necessary but not necessarily jobs.

They attack the multinationals.

Mr. Cunningham: Two chickens in every pot and a Tory on every board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They waffled around with respect to the grant to Ford. I don't know that Hansard ever recorded it, but I sat here and my recollection is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) whispered across so that I could hear it: "Give them 100 per cent. Don't lose them." But when he found out that maybe we were coming closer to a deal, then it was 50 per cent we should give them.

Mr. S. Smith: I believed John Rhodes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to tell him that because we were responsible we got something that was equitable. We got something that means 7,500 jobs, which will give a great shot in the arm to the economy.

Mr. S. Smith: I assumed he told the truth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll tell him something else. There is not a member of his caucus—

An hon. member: It's too bad the whole province isn't here to listen to this batch of bullroar.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —talking to his friends in Essex or Windsor that hasn't been quietly, if not publicly, in support of what we did for Ford of Canada. I challenge any of them to stand up in the House and say something else. And so have people from the other opposition party.

An hon. member: No way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition may feel that it is politically attractive to criticize or make life difficult for the multinationals. I'm not here to defend the multinationals.

Mr. Breagh: You not only defend them, but you finance them now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We were in Detroit with some of the senior people from the auto parts industry. We're concerned about R and D, but if one starts legislating that in order to have expansion a multinational has to have R and D, that's closing the doors to thousands of job opportunities because of the structure in this province.

Mr. S. Smith: You are going down the road that has taken us to our present dilemma. You are going down a road that has taken us to where we are today.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You're limiting yourselves. You have no understanding of the real world.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Things are so bad that we have one of the highest standards of living anywhere in the world. We have a quality of life that is the envy of most other jurisdictions. We're going downhill so rapidly that, without any doubt, the Leader of the Opposition in his negative way—

Mr. S. Smith: We're being deindustrialized.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on! We've had a greater growth in the manufacturing sector in the last year than in the past five. We've created a 133,000 new jobs. I know that offends him. It is getting close to time, but I've got several other points I want to make here.

An hon. member: You haven't made any yet.

Mr. Breagh: Dispense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you mean by dispense?

Mr. Van Horne: We have had enough.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will continue to deal briefly with industrial incentives. Three weeks ago today I spent a little time in Washington. I didn't go for the purposes that I am now going to describe, but I went there. I had some discussions and I just thought I'd inform the members of the House about them.

An hon. member: It was some place that Marvin Shore lined up for you, no doubt.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I went there to make a speech.

Mr. T. P. Reid: It looks like you found your way to the cow patch.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Until the last two or three months I know why you would go to Washington, but that is all over now, I hope.

Mr. Kerrio: Tell us what you said in your speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I went to make a speech. I had some very helpful discussions with senior treasury people there and we discussed this issue of incentives. I made it very clear to them that if they could get agreements from the governors of the northern states with whom they'd already had discussions, I would join with them in any public declaration that we as a province would not stay in this business of giving grants in competition with the northern states. Then I added a caveat. I said: "When you get the northern governors to agree to that, you've got to bring the southern governors along as well because that's where a lot of the action is going."

They're not so sure they can do that. But I made it very clear that Ontario would participate with them and try to bring to an end the kind of bidding war or whatever terminology one might wish to use. They also made it quite clear to me that they were upset.

Mr. Wildman: You encouraged it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, come on. You people urge this when it suits you. Come to my riding, talk to the members of the UAW and ask them whether they agree with the grant to Ford.

Mr. Breagh: All right, when?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have to say that 75 per cent of them did. Do members know something else they have learned in the leadership of the UAW? They came into my office; they came into the cabinet room; they said, "Mr. Premier, intervene with American Motors. We can't have the passenger car assembly moving to the United States—"

An hon. member: Donald Duck.

Hon. Mr. Davis: "—we don't want the Jeep." They raised a real fuss. I told them then and I can repeat it now: that has been the most significant move American Motors has made. We are employing people in Brampton. They are having trouble with the other aspects of the industry and so I can

go to the fellows on the line where I know quite a few and they are relatively content with a decision made by a multinational which opposition members were in the process of opposing. We have jobs in Brampton. We wouldn't have them otherwise, maybe.

An hon. member: Do you want a dump?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, we have our own landfill problems.

An hon. member: Biting the hand that feeds you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say something that would be considered provocative.

I also pointed out to the government of the United States that it's fine to complain about us and say their hands are clean, but the fact of the matter is the government of the United States also involves itself because of their subsidy programs to the states. If one wants a highway extension, an interstate, to serve a new plant, one gets a good part of the funds from the federal government.

An hon. member: Are you apologizing for the budget?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not apologizing for the budget. I don't want to steal the thunder from the Treasurer so I won't say what I was going to.

But the economy of this province is growing; it is healthy. The opposition doesn't like it; they don't like to see jobs being created; they don't like to see our standard of living improving, because it doesn't serve their political purpose.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tomorrow night's budget is going to disappoint them. There are so many more things I would love to say—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I have taken now about the same length of time as the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. I know that for good reasons the official opposition is totally in support of the throne speech. I know, with the dogmatic, stubborn, unenlightened attitude of the members of the New Democratic Party, that in spite of my eloquence, in spite of my logic, they cannot

be prevailed upon to see the light and join with the official opposition. So much is their loss, their lack of understanding. But perhaps the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) might on this one occasion separate himself from his party, vote with the official opposition in one of the very significant throne speeches that has been produced in this House.

The House divided on the amendment by Mr. Cassidy which was negatived on the following vote:

AYES

Bounsall, Breaugh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cook, M. Davidson, di Santo, Duksza, Foulds, Gigantes, Grande, Laughren, Lawlor, Lupusella, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Martel, McClellan, Philip, Warner, Wildman, Young, Ziemba.

NAYS

Auld, Baetz, Belanger, Bennett, Birch, Blundy, Breithaupt, Brunelle, Conway, Cunningham, Cureatz, Davis, Drea, Eakins, Elgie, Gaunt, Gregory, Grossman, Hall, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Johnson, Jones,

Kennedy, Kerr, Lane, Leluk, Maeck, Mancini, McCaffrey, McCague, McKessock, McNeil, F. S. Miller, W. Newman, B. Newman, Nixon, Norton, O'Neil, Parrott, Peterson, Ramsay, J. Reed, T. P. Reid,

Rollins, Rowe, Ruston, Scrivener, S. Smith, G. E. Smith, Snow, J. A. Taylor, G. Taylor, Timbrell, Turner, Van Horne, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Worton, Yakabuski.

Ayes 24; nays 67.

The House divided on the main motion by Mr. Watson which was agreed to on the same vote reversed.

Resolved: That a humble address be presented to the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

The House adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 849)

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS
ON NOTICE PAPER

POPULATION-PHYSICIAN RATIOS

100. **Mr. Breaugh:** Would the Ministry of Health inform the House of the current ratio of population to specialist physicians in: (1) southern Ontario; (2) northern Ontario; and (3) Toronto. [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

FEMALE MEDICAL STUDENTS

101. **Mr. Breaugh:** Would the Ministry of Health advise the House how many women have been admitted to Ontario's medical schools each year for the last five years. [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

NON-INSURED HEALTH CHARGES

102. **Mr. Breaugh:** Would the Ministry of Health advise the House what is the total

amount of money over the insured rate charged to Ontario residents by: (1) family physicians and (2) specialists who have opted out of OHIP, for each of the following years—1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978. [Tabled March 27, 1978.]

PETERBOROUGH HSO STUDY

103. **Mr. Breaugh:** Would the Minister of Health table any studies that have been done on the feasibility of setting up a health service organization in the city of Peterborough. [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Due to the large volume of recent Order Paper questions and their technical nature, I cannot provide an answer today. I expect to have all answers ready by April 30. Answers will be tabled as they become available, up to that date.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 9, 1979

United Way campaign, statement by Mr. McCague	835
Comfort allowances, statement by Mrs. Birch	835
Transportation services for handicapped, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. McClellan, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Swart	835
Comfort allowances, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. McClellan, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Swart	835
Toronto construction project, questions of Mr. Henderson: Mr. S. Smith	837
Suburban social services, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. di Santo, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Warner, Mr. Philip	837
Co-payment fees, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Wildman	839
Tourism, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Eakins, Mr. di Santo	840
Business of the House, Mr. Welch	842
Foreign ownership, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Laughren, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. di Santo	842
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cooke	843
Organized crime, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. di Santo, Mr. T. P. Reid, Mr. Lupusella	845
Health questionnaire, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	847
Ambulance services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Van Horne	847
Family benefits, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Peterson	847
Petition re Heritage Language Program	848
Sittings of the House, Mr. Welch	848
Motion re Administration of Justice Committee, Mr. Welch	848
Resolution re Estimates, Mr. Welch, concurred in	848
Tabling answers to questions 100 to 103 on notice paper, Mr. Welch	849
Throne speech debate, concluded: Mr. Martel, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Davis	849
Adjournment	873
Appendix, answers to questions on notice paper	874
Population-physician ratios, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	874
Female medical students, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	874
Non-insured health charges, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	874
Peterborough HSO study: question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	874

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 10, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, last week the members for Rainy River (T. P. Reid) and Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) asked questions concerning nuclear fuel waste management. At that time I undertook to describe the present status of the program and Ontario's involvement in it.

As honourable members will recall, the Canada/Ontario Nuclear Fuel Waste Management Program was announced on June 5, 1978. Under that program the federal government, through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, has undertaken to develop and demonstrate a safe and suitable method of disposal of nuclear fuel waste. Ontario Hydro is responsible for studies on interim storage and transportation of irradiated fuel. The primary responsibility for developing and demonstrating a safe and suitable method of disposal of nuclear fuel waste rests with the federal government and AECL.

AECL's objective in its current research program is to measure the properties of various rock types in order to assess the feasibility of disposing of nuclear fuel waste in a deep underground mine.

To ensure continuous close co-operation and consultation between the two governments and their agencies, a Canada/Ontario nuclear fuel waste management co-ordinating committee has been established with a chairman from AECL and representatives from Ontario Hydro, the Ontario Ministry of Energy and the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

As my predecessor stated, Ontario approval of initiatives taken under this program is required. To effect this, a step-by-step approval process has been established. Attached to this statement is a series of charts that set out the various steps in the approval process.

As honourable members will note, the concept-verification phase which AECL now is in involves a review of the 1,500 or so rock structures—or plutons, as they are

called. From among these 1,500 rock structures in 13 regions of the province, eight to 10 research areas are to be drilled to identify the most "suitable types" of rock.

Once these suitable rock types have been identified, AECL will then identify up to 100 plutons with comparable rock characteristics.

At this stage—the site selection phase—AECL will then invite the local communities located near the 100 plutons to express whether they are interested in AECL demonstrating nuclear waste storage in their area. This will be done to select a single demonstration site. This phase is at least three to four years away.

In brief, the first approval step in the concept-verification stage is for a public information program to be initiated in a region. Second, approval is required for a community relations program in a proposed research area. Third, approval is required for field research at specific locations in a research area.

Typical field research activities by AECL will involve collecting surface samples, examining surface features and drilling to obtain information on properties of rocks at various depths. Drilling should not be taken as an indication that the research area will necessarily be considered as an eventual waste repository.

I understand a number of honourable members have already been briefed by AECL including the members for Rainy River, Kenora (Mr. Bernier), Renfrew North (Mr. Conway), Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski), Lanark (Mr. Wiseman), Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Sterling), Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) and Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle).

Similar briefings have taken place with some members of Parliament and with municipal councils. For any member who has not been briefed and who would wish to be, I would be most happy to arrange for AECL to give a special briefing.

Ms. Gigantes: Aren't there any plutons in Leeds?

Hon. Mr. Auld: In keeping with the approval process, AECL has presented, and Ontario has approved, proposals for public information programs in the Rainy River

region, Kenora region and Leeds-Grenville-Lanark-Renfrew region, and proposals to conduct community relations programs in the Atikokan and White Lake areas. We have not as yet received any proposals from AECL to carry out test drilling or other field research activities in any area.

A press report last week stated AECL had proposed that it conduct field research including test drilling in the Atikokan area, that it expected approval of this proposal from Ontario within the next week and that drilling would begin within two weeks. This news report was not accurate and has subsequently been corrected. Ontario has not yet approved research drilling near Atikokan, although I understand the Atikokan municipal council supports such drilling, as does the member for Rainy River.

Before Ontario's approval is given, the Ministry of Energy will obtain and assess the views of the other ministries involved.

Apart from the Atikokan area, AECL has not yet identified any other research area in which it would like to do research drilling.

Ms. Gigantes: You've already been drilling.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HYDRO LOAD FORECASTS

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy related to the announcement by Ontario Hydro of its stretchout of its generating program to 1990. Has the minister looked at this announcement by Hydro? Is the minister and his government prepared to accept Hydro's statement, since it does in fact bring the system into rough balance by 1990 if Hydro's 4.7 per cent forecast is accepted? If the Ministry of Energy's forecast of 3.7 to 1985 and 2.2 thereafter is accepted, we will still be left with an excess of close to 3,000 megawatts by 1990 and that will of course represent a tremendous expense. Is the minister going to accept Hydro's view, or is he going to accept the view that came from within his own ministry?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I explained at some length the difference between the Ministry of Energy's energy model and the Hydro forecast. In fact, as the honourable member has pointed out, in electricity they are virtually the same until 1985, when our forecast drops in terms of electricity. However, I pointed out we were looking at all forms of energy and there were a number of variables.

Mr. S. Smith: Why can't you include those variables?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Neither our model nor the Hydro forecast used the same parameters, and consequently they aren't really comparable. That's perhaps the long way of saying I think the government is prepared to accept what I have read in the press release and which I understand is to complete Atikokan in a longer time frame and to do the same in Darlington and Bruce.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since the minister appears ready to accept Hydro's 4.7 per cent load growth forecast even in view of lower forecasts both within his own ministry and in other neighbouring jurisdictions, can the minister tell us what provision there might be should it become clear as years go by that Hydro is excessively optimistic? What provisions might there be for further stretch-out so the balance will occur even later? Can he tell us the penalty costs incurred as a consequence of accepting Hydro's present plan and present forecast and then discovering three years hence, for instance, that it was too optimistic?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The answer to that would be it would depend how far it was out as to what penalties there might be. I understand from Hydro that in most but not all of the program there is a degree of flexibility built in which could be even more flexible or could be speeded up if the forecasts are too low.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary Mr. Speaker: Can the minister say whether the Ministry of Energy gave any formal or informal instructions to Ontario Hydro with regard to the deferral of its construction program or was this a matter that was left completely up to Ontario Hydro with no input or no sense of overall policy injected by the Ontario government?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I mentioned there were meetings between Energy staff and Hydro management personnel. I had discussions with the chairman and wrote him a letter, of which I have a copy here. Without reading the whole letter, though I would be delighted to send a copy of it to the member if he doesn't already have one, I said on April 4 to the chairman:

"You have told me that the Hydro board at its meeting on April 9 will be reviewing proposed adjustments to a generation program in order to assure itself that it is the best possible and to meet its predictions as to future electricity demands in the province, and that its generation plans and its transmission plans are integrated as well as possible with particular regard to the timing

of coming into service of both stations on line. The board will, I know, want to give most careful consideration to the risk that would be involved in any decision that was predicated on too short a timetable for the public participation hearing and governmental approval processes."

I then mentioned the situation regarding the routing of a second plant out of Bruce and of a high voltage east-west tie line in the north. I said: "Obviously, it would be inappropriate for me to make any assumption as to when such processes could be completed or as to whether government approval would be granted. I had been informed of the discussion on this question that has taken place between the staffs of Ontario Hydro and my ministry and I must say that, in my opinion, it would be safer to err on the side of the processes taking a longer time than appears to have been anticipated by Ontario Hydro's staff."

"In conclusion, I regret that I am unable to give the Hydro board any assurance that the public participation and hearing processes, as well as government consideration of any requests to build either of these transmission lines, could be carried through and completed in time to permit Ontario Hydro to meet the proposed in-service dates of 1986 and 1987 for these lines."

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that Hydro's new econometric model, which is supposed to be the most sophisticated method of energy forecasting, showed a growth rate actually of 2.6 per cent and that it was a judgemental decision on the part of the forecaster which ended up at 4.7. Is he aware that the 2.6 per cent is very much in line with the forecast in all of our neighbouring utilities, such as Detroit Edison and Power Authority of the State of New York? As a result of that kind of consideration, would he now not agree that the time has come for the government to be in a position to impose a policy framework on the operation of Ontario Hydro in order to consider such contingencies as those we are faced with at the present time, such as the flexibility of contracts and this anomaly over the growth rate?

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I would answer by saying that in the remarks of the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) a couple of weeks ago, when he was talking about Hydro's program, he said it would be better to err on the surplus side than have a shortage. In my own view, and in the view of Hydro's forecasters as I recall it being reported in the

press, it is difficult to predict. He said you could have the most sophisticated system in the world, but it was a very dicey process trying to forecast 12 and 15 and 20 years ahead.

It would seem to me Hydro's present position, as indicated in the chairman's statement in their press release, was set out on the second page where he says: "The board's decision to extend construction schedules for three committed plants means that in-service dates will be rescheduled to gradually bring capacity into phase with projected electricity demands. It will provide an orderly transition to meet lowered expectations in electricity demands while attempting to minimize economic impacts on industry and employment."

And further: "The board's decision today will result in reduced generating capacity by the mid-1980s, as well as reduced capital requirement." That is not to be interpreted to mean reduced from the present level, but reduced from the projected level.

Mr. J. Reed: What if they are wrong again?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are never wrong.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether he can provide this Legislature with the penalty costs for the cancellation of Darlington now, as compared with the penalty costs we will be into if he and Hydro decide it should be cancelled next year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can't answer that question because I can't predict what may happen.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES FOR HANDICAPPED; COMFORT ALLOWANCES

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday the minister stated, and it is in Hansard here, that the fare for such services—we were referring to transportation services for the handicapped in Hamilton—is 50 cents per trip. Can the minister explain how it is she is so misinformed on a fundamental matter of this kind? Is she not aware it costs \$4.50 for a disabled person to travel from Chedoke Hospital to Bold Street in downtown Hamilton and back, and for the same trip in the evening the cost is \$21 per hour or \$42 per two-hour trip? Given that information, can she explain how she could have been so misinformed on this matter?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition implies that I am misinformed, I think he was certainly misinformed yesterday when he put the total

cost of the comfort allowance at the transportation cost for the disabled.

There is a program that has been implemented after the five pilot projects across the province were very carefully evaluated; Hamilton has applied to be a part of that program. The rules set down by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications leave the rules to be applied as they regard the fares to the local municipality. The suggestion has been made that the fares be in line with the fares charged to those using the ordinary transportation services. Those same rules will apply to Hamilton when they put in force the new program of transportation for the disabled.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, with all the tax credits and so on, is the minister not aware that from a person who at present is confined to a wheelchair and receiving, for instance, \$150 a month alimony, her friend the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell) is now going to take away \$99 of that and, via tax credit at the end of the year, give back the princely sum of \$19?

As I have told the minister, under municipal regulation and local regulation by the DARTS people it costs \$42 just to go downtown in the evening and back. Does she not recognize the need for a special provision in her comfort allowance for people who are confined to wheelchairs, but who are sufficiently mentally alert they ought to be able to maintain some contact with the community and with ordinary life, as opposed to those who are not in a position to do so?

Does the minister not see a distinction that needs to be drawn there to help these particular people who are now being punished by the chronic-care co-payment fee, a fee that in other circumstances might be considered reasonable?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There are special programs to provide for the special needs of those people who are found to be in circumstances where it is difficult for them to arrange for their own transportation. I would also like to remind the honourable member that these patients are not without family, they are not without friends and they are not without voluntary organizations—

Mr. Cassidy: Always?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —that are very involved in helping to support and provide some of these services.

Mr. Warner: You are always so satisfied to hand out crumbs.

Ms. Gigantes: Lady Bounty.

Mr. Samis: The government is giving away \$100,000,000 to the pulp and paper companies.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I think it is totally unfortunate that the honourable member focuses on a few of the people who have these particular problems that we try to meet through very special kinds of programs of help.

Mr. Warner: The whole loaf to the corporations and crumbs to the citizens.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: What we are doing is providing the \$6 increase to those people who receive all of their basic needs. These are all looked after, including free drugs. They are also the beneficiaries of many of the voluntary programs that go on within those institutions.

Ms. Gigantes: Living off the fat of the land, aren't they?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The discretionary part of their income—and they are not all able to use that money—is to maintain their self-respect by being able to buy their papers and meet other personal needs. As far as we are concerned, with the tax credit, this enables them to do just that.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary: Since the comfort allowance, which is all that is left to senior citizens in homes for the aged of their pension income, which is theirs by right, is expected to cover all of their personal, social and recreational needs, their clothing and their sundries, would the minister like to tell us and maybe the senior citizens of Ontario what commodities they will be able to buy with the government's increase of a nickel a day?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: As usual, the honourable member exaggerates to the point of pure nonsense. That's strictly nonsense, just absolute nonsense.

Mr. Wildman: How much is it per day?

Mr. McClellan: Five cents a day.

Mr. Breithaupt: Twenty cents a day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If he says five cents and it is 20, how far out are you? Do your mathematics.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It seems to me that many members have been recipients of a petition from people in some of the homes of aged from across this province asking for a \$5 increase in their comfort allowance. The recipients themselves, the ones members opposite are so quick to announce need so much more, have said, "\$5 is very reasonable and all we expect."

Mr. Foulds: They said that was a minimum.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, they did not.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, they did.

Mr. S. Smith: A final supplementary, if I might, Mr. Speaker: Now that the minister is corrected in her notion that it costs only 50 cents to make these trips and understands the cost to be \$42 in an evening, may I ask the minister if she will agree to come with me to meet the wheelchair patients at the Chedoke chronic hospital to explain to them why she has to take away their alimony and the meagre pension they may have, the insurance that they use at present to go downtown? Would she come with me to explain it and would she explain it only to the 50 per cent of them who have no family remaining interested in them, as she seems to think people have?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I will be delighted to accept the honourable member's invitation, if at the same time he agrees to attend with me many of the senior citizens' institutions that I visit so that he can see how many of the people in them are very happy with the circumstances they find themselves in.

Mr. S. Smith: That is a deal.

Mr. Warner: She would steal Tiny Tim's crutch.

DARLINGTON NUCLEAR PLANT

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment, arising out of the announcement today by Ontario Hydro of the deferral of its plans for the generating station at Darlington. Now that Hydro has admitted there is no immediate and pressing need for the nuclear power plant at Darlington and has deferred the plant by 18 months, will the minister order the Darlington power station to be reviewed under the Environmental Assessment Act from which it was exempted a couple of years ago, and will he ensure that the review extends to the need for the project and to alternatives for the project, as mandated under the Environmental Assessment Act?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: No.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain his refusal to order that, in view of the fact that in the first place he is the minister responsible for ensuring that the Environmental Assessment Act is a reality in the province and not just a paper sham; in the second place that the plant is being postponed by 18 months because Ontario Hydro has accepted that there is no need for it at the originally offered time, and that the reason for the

exemption was that the plant had to be put into place so quickly that there was not time for an environmental assessment? Now that the time exists to have an environmental assessment under the act, can the minister explain why he is refusing to order such an evaluation?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I think this matter has been given a great deal of consideration over the years. As the leader said, it was considered at that time. Granted, the time element has been extended, but I think the terms of reference still hold, and should.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I find the minister's answer a bit difficult to understand. As Minister of the Environment, is he not aware that in its system expansion plan review last year Hydro specifically stated that a major consideration in its decision at that time not to defer Darlington was its fear that the plant would come under the Environmental Assessment Act?

Can the minister not take action as the Minister of the Environment to find out why Hydro was trying to avoid this first evaluation of a power station under the act, and why will he not act to ensure that it does have that evaluation, now that the time is available?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Those exemptions, Mr. Speaker, I think were established in the original concept. I am sure as we go into the future that many of the projects Hydro will do will be under the act. There is no doubt in my mind that that is true; as the minister, I would certainly take the strident position that they should be. But in this instance I believe the decision has been duly considered and we should stay with that decision.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the only two neurosurgeons in Windsor have opted out of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan; that one of them, Dr. Victor Kleider, now is charging \$75 for a first consultation, a fee that is 85 per cent more than the amount paid under OHIP, and that this doctor's office now is asking patients on a fixed income to come to their appointments with their \$75 cash in hand?

What steps is the government prepared to take to ensure that, in the case of neurosurgeons, universal accessibility is restored to people who need health care in Windsor, and

that it is restored at OHIP rates without it being necessary to pay a surcharge?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of many things in Windsor, but I am not aware of that particular situation. I am sure the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell), as he has in so many matters, will endeavour to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since it is a matter of government policy that OHIP now be undermined, and since the Premier is responsible for the government, is the Premier not aware that not only have these two neurosurgeons opted out of OHIP, but they have also written to general practitioners in Windsor asking them to inform them if a patient cannot afford their fee schedule? Does this not reintroduce the concept of the doctors deciding whether or not the patient can pay? Will the Premier himself, on behalf of the government of Ontario, act to eliminate this kind of charity medicine in the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have complete confidence in the ability of the minister to resolve—

Mr. Breaugh: You're the only one who does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I tell my friend, I have a lot more confidence in my colleague than I would ever have in the honourable member as a Minister of Health. The member for Oshawa can do a lot of things in his own mind; but if he were to run a Ministry of Health, it would be a disaster for the province. We are not undermining medicare; the members of the New Democratic Party, if they ever had the responsibility, would be a total disaster.

Mr. Breaugh: I thank you for the compliment.

[2:30]

Mr. Cassidy: Answer the question, answer the question.

Mr. Breaugh: He would still be a step ahead of you. Why don't you come to Oshawa?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member would still be a total disaster. He is a disaster coming in here to the House—well, not every day.

As a matter of fact, we're not undermining medicare. It is the finest system, as I objectively said yesterday, available in North America for the citizens of this province. The minister, I am sure, will make every effort to deal with that particular problem in Windsor.

PROVINCIAL PARKS

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Could the minister review briefly in this House the reason or reasons for the late opening of eight provincial parks, three of which are located in the Refrew county area? At that time, could the minister also indicate whether or not he is aware of the deleterious impact these late openings will have upon both the demand for early opening by travelling Ontarians and out-of-province guests, as well as, and equally seriously, the negative impact it will have upon local employment patterns?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the list in front of me but a number of our parks will not be opening as early this year because of past experience in use and the constraints of our own budget. It is as simple as that. We are attempting to open early the parks that past experience indicates are used early and delaying opening of those where there is very little use until later.

Mr. Conway: A supplementary: The three parks, Bonnechere, Carson Lake and Driftwood, were designated as perimeter parks for the Algonquin Park master plan, parks that were to take some of the burden and growing pressure off Algonquin Provincial Park. Would the minister not agree that by the late openings he is in this way working against the policy stated by this government through the Algonquin Park master plan?

Hon. Mr. Auld: If experience indicates that is the case, then I will certainly review it for next year.

Mr. Wildman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Wouldn't the minister agree that combined with the increase in park fees last year and this year's shorter season, he's not really living up to his responsibility for providing easy access to the provincial parks in the wilderness of this province for the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think within the framework of our budget we are doing the best job we can do. I will be able to tell the honourable members better next year the results of this year's experiment, but based on previous experience we don't think we are going to inconvenience many people.

Mr. Cassidy: It all ends with the dollar sign.

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Mr. Foulds: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Energy regarding the statement he made this afternoon on nuclear waste disposal. The minister says in his statement that "we," presumably the Ontario government, "have not as yet approved any pro-

posals for Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to carry out test drilling." Can he tell the House if he has received any proposals to carry out test drilling, and can he tell this House whether or not he has any information at all that AECL plans to do some drilling within this coming summer season?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as of this morning I don't believe we had received anything and until we receive something I really won't be able to answer the second part of the question.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister inform the House when he does receive any proposals and, secondly, could he tell us at what stage the third step of the community relations in a research area, that is the public meeting co-sponsored by AECL and the town council to answer public questions, will take place in the Atikokan area as the first two steps have already taken place?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will inform the honourable member.

DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING

Mr. Eaton: A question for the Minister of Labour: Would the Minister of Labour look into the discrimination in hiring practices being carried on by the recreation committee of the Public Utilities Commission in the city of London? I quote from a letter to a student, "I must inform you that a policy has been established by the commission that citizens of London must be given preference."

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the only legislation that would cover a situation like that would be the Ontario Human Rights Code, where it refers particularly to discrimination on the basis of place of origin. I know there have been some difficulties with regard to the exact interpretation of that section. I'll be glad to look into it and speak to the member about it.

Mr. Eaton: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister also discuss with the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) the fact that grants are given by that ministry to the recreation program? Perhaps they should be withheld because the whole province is donating to it and the citizens of the rest of the province are being discriminated against by London.

Mr. Van Horne: That's a crock, and you know it.

Mr. Eaton: Did you help make that policy when you were there?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that the member is sitting very close to the Minister of Culture and Recreation; perhaps he could lean over.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Auld: On Friday last, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question about boilers. I gave him some information at the time and told him I would give him a full answer when I got further information from Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And it's full.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This has to do with damaged nuclear boilers at Pickering generating station B. Following a program of investigation of the boilers at Pickering generating station B, now under construction, it has been decided to remove all boilers installed or delivered to the project—a total of 32—and ship them back to the manufacturer for rebuilding.

This program of investigation and testing was begun late last year when partial blocking of some tubes was discovered during an inspection of boilers installed in unit 5 at the station project.

Subsequently, manufacturing of all nuclear boilers was stopped, pending investigation of this problem. The manufacturer of these boilers is Babcock and Wilcox of Cambridge, Ontario. The company also has orders to supply steam generators for the following nuclear stations under construction in Ontario: Bruce generating station B, 32 boilers on which fabrication has started but they are not yet assembled; and Darlington, 16 boilers on which fabrication has not started.

In February, a more thorough examination was conducted at the manufacturer's works on boiler 33, which had been heat treated, and on boiler 34, which had not. This testing confirmed that the damage had occurred during the heat treatment process and that it was probably repeated in all 32 remaining boilers delivered or installed at Pickering B. The heat treatment process, and some design details for Pickering B, had been modified by Babcock and Wilcox as part of the continuing effort to achieve overall manufacturing improvement.

Cost of the replacement and the effect on construction schedules are now the subject of discussion between Ontario Hydro and Babcock and Wilcox. The damage consists of denting and marking of several outer rows of tubes, bowing of tubes in the outer layers and distortion of some of the baffle blades.

It should be noted that the problems do not affect any of Ontario Hydro's operating

nuclear stations. In the eight years of operation of Pickering A, only one small leak in a single tube has occurred in the boilers, which were also supplied by Babcock and Wilcox. This was quickly located on the tube plugs using a standard technique for eliminating tube defects.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's a problem with the tubes, that's the problem.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This is an excellent performance record compared to any reactor in the world.

It should be stressed that, in the current atmosphere following the incident at Three Mile Island, this matter of steam generators at Pickering B is a particularly good example of a quality control system that works well.

The continual checking and rechecking to meet the high standards of nuclear quality control ensures that we have the best possible material, fabricated and installed to the highest possible standards, to give us the remarkable performance we have seen in the last eight years at Pickering A.

Mr. Foulds: George Orwell called that "newspeak."

Mr. S. Smith: Given that the minister seems reasonably clear in his own mind that the problem had to do with a certain process—a certain heat process at Babcock and Wilcox—why should the matter of who pays for taking out the boilers, repairing them and putting them back in again, be a matter for discussion? Why is it not perfectly obvious that the manufacturer is obligated to provide material to the highest specifications? Why is it not perfectly obvious that the manufacturer is to pay for this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't have details of the discussions that are going on, but I would assume there is no question about the refabrication. There may be some question about additional costs incurred by Hydro.

TEACHER-BOARD DISPUTE

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that should be directed to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) but, in view of the fact she is not present, I would like to direct it to the Premier.

Mr. Breaugh: Where is she? Where is the iron maiden?

Mr. McClellan: I hope she's still in China.

Mr. G. I. Miller: The question concerns the secondary school teachers of the Haldimand Board of Education and the dispute between them and the board of education. I

wonder if the Premier would use his good offices to try to bring the teachers and the board together, in view of the fact that there seems to be only a small difference between the two sides. The parents have been trying to keep the classrooms open, but the welfare of the students is at stake. I wonder if the Premier would use his good offices to bring the sides together in order to get the teachers back into the classrooms?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that a member of the opposition would think I had such capacity or talent to resolve these issues. I listen to some of his colleagues some days and I really wonder whether they would express this same measure of confidence.

I understand the Education Relations Commission has been involved in this. I think there are meetings going on today as a matter of fact. Certainly, we're keeping an eye on it. We would like to see it resolved as much as the member would, but as has been illustrated and demonstrated on a number of occasions, if it can be resolved through the commission without the direct intervention of the minister or the Premier it probably is a better route to go. I think most members would accept that.

Let's see what happens at the discussions today. If they don't come to some sort of conclusion, certainly the ministry will endeavour to help, but I would like to see it resolved through the Education Relations Commission. That is their responsibility, and on balance throughout the province they have done relatively well over the past two or three years.

CONTINUOUS COLOUR COAT LIMITED

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment concerning emissions of pollutants from Continuous Colour Coat Limited in Rexdale. Can the minister inform the House why his officials waited until this time to invite residents in the area to a meeting on April 17 to discuss whether or not they agree that the ministry should extend the deadline to clean up operations, a deadline of March 31 which has already passed and a deadline which was agreed to some three years ago?

Can the minister explain the apparent discrepancy between the new deadline proposed by his ministry, namely September 30, and that circulated to the residents by the company, which was that it would be completed by the end of the year? I'm wondering if the minister would give us a final deadline now and tell us what his ministry and the

Ministry of Labour and Manpower are going to do to make this company meet that new deadline which obviously will have to be set?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, we covered rather extensively the point of extending deadlines in committee. I welcome the opportunity to make the point here. The extension of the deadline that the company requests, in my opinion, should be after it has put its case to the public. It's their deadline, and it's their responsibility to tell the public why they cannot meet it rather than the onus being on the ministry. I think the member would agree with that concept.

The amount of time to meet the conditions that have been set will be part of the submission by the company as to why it needs either six or nine months. I understand that company is quite prepared to put a lot of money into a different process. I hope the hearings will very clearly set forward for the member and constituents of that area why the company needs that time. The onus now is clearly on the company to make the case. [2:45]

Mr. Philip: By way of supplementary, is the minister saying that after three years his ministry only knew recently that the deadline of March 31 would not be met? I wonder if the minister, in answering that, is also aware of the comments made in a letter of February 8 by Dr. Fitch of the occupational health and safety division of the Ministry of Labour and Manpower, a letter which I supplied to the minister yesterday in case he hadn't received a copy before then.

In this letter Dr. Fitch suggested that the Ministry of the Environment had not yet supplied precise contents or the composition of 11 different solvents and 15 coatings used at the plant, and that on reviewing the toxicity information on the products which could be identified, most are listed as moderately toxic, that is three on a scale of one to six. Can the minister tell us when we will have specific details from his ministry about what is being emitted from that plant and about any potential hazard to the residents in the area?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I think the ministry does know the contents of the 26 elements used in the plant itself. What we don't know, and what I guess is next to impossible to determine, due to the various combinations and permutations of 26 different products as they combine, is what they might emit in the way of stack emissions; that is very difficult to ascertain.

The same Dr. Fitch has suggested to us—and I would hope, to the residents—that in

his professional opinion he did not see a health hazard to the local people.

Mr. McClellan: Ignorance is no hazard, is that the principle? Ignorance is no hazard.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it should be put on the record that the same person who is asking us for information, given his best knowledge doesn't feel there is a hazard to the people there.

We did know that the company wanted an extension, but until that date arrived, we weren't able to extend it, obviously. Secondly, it was only very recently, with this change in policy, that it became the responsibility of the company to make the case rather than the ministry. I think that is a very sensible change in policy and it has happened in only the last three or four weeks, six at the outside. There has been quite a change in policy about extension of deadlines.

BRADLEY-GEORGETOWN HYDRO CORRIDOR

Mr. J. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. Will the minister please justify the recent cabinet decision on the Bradley-Georgetown hydro corridor, under which the government is now trying to force this into existence through order in council; realizing the stretchouts announced today and approved yesterday, realizing there is no bottling of power taking place at Bruce at the present time, realizing that existing 230 kv lines can be further upgraded if necessary, realizing that Bruce B will not come on line until 1983 and realizing that there is still time for the independent study requested for the last six years by the Interested Citizens Group in that area?

Mr. Hennessy: You don't want anybody to work.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in the news release which I made on this matter this morning, there are—

Mr. Warner: Don't read it all, please don't read it.

Mr. Wildman: You should have read it this morning.

Mr. McClellan: Who writes this?

Mr. Wildman: It goes from left to right.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —15 pages of the history, the hearings and the various events that have taken place.

Mr. Martel: If you stood on your head it would be easier.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'm sure the honourable member realizes—we have discussed this on a number of occasions—that the reasons

haven't changed since perhaps a year or so ago when they were put together.

Mr. Worton: I never realized that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can tell him that Hydro's report, as of this morning, of the latest cost of the lack of that 10 miles, in terms of generating losses, is about \$17,000,000; and they calculate it's going to continue at the rate of about \$1,200,000 or \$1,300,000 per month for the rest of this year.

Mr. J. Reed: Supplementary: Could the minister tell us how many hours he spends in the office of the Ministry of Energy apprising himself of the real facts surrounding this case and getting a first-hand view, rather than leaving it entirely to his deputy minister to continue to feed him with the kind of twisted sets of so-called facts—

Mr. S. Smith: Precisely.

Mr. J. Reed: —that have been proved in court, that have been proved in public hearings—

Mr. Warner: Ask the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor), he knows.

Mr. J. Reed: —to have been false premises upon which government decisions have been made?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I spend a great deal of time on energy matters—some in the Energy ministry, some in the Natural Resources ministry office, and some at home.

ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES

Ms. Bryden: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Recent events both here and in the United States involving oil tanker breakups, propane-gas-car derailments and even a nuclear plant accident, have highlighted the need for adequate contingency plans covering environmental emergencies in order to protect the public from dangerous air and water contamination. While I know there is a provincial contingency plan in Ontario, I would like to ask the minister about its implementation. Last November his ministry issued a booklet.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Ms. Bryden: It is about this booklet. Last November this ministry issued a booklet—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member has had enough experience to know how to put a question properly. Please do so.

Ms. Bryden: I would like to ask the minister if he could tell me why, when I addressed a refresher course for community health workers in March and referred to this booklet, called Response to Environmental and Environ-

mental Health Emergencies, many of them had not even seen this booklet. They had not seen the Ontario contingency plan, either.

I would like to ask the minister how can he expect these community health workers, medical officers of health and so on, to carry out their role in dealing with environmental emergencies if they haven't even received his guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Back in the days when I was Minister of Colleges and Universities I would certainly have understood that question much better. I would have said immediately that I would see the colleges—I think the member suggested she was presenting a lecture at a community college, to a group of students?

Mr. Wildman: It was the medical officer of health.

Mr. Conway: That's her husband.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: That's what I thought I heard her say, that she was addressing these students at a college. In that event I would have been able to say I would certainly see that distribution of this booklet among the colleges is greatly improved. Perhaps I had better have a word with the Minister of Education now. We will try to disseminate that information.

We do our very best to see that people have this information. If they choose not to read it, it may be because they are attending too many lectures, I am not sure.

Ms. Bryden: It was not community college students, it was a refresher course for people who are in the field right now—medical officers of health and community health workers. These are the people who would be in the front line if there were an environmental emergency.

I would like to ask, by way of supplementary, if the minister can comment on page 10 of this report, where it states that in determining the rate of emission and concentration of contaminants in the immediate vicinity of the emergency, there is only limited capability at the present time, for the air resources branch or the laboratory services branch to provide emergency analytical service. In fact, there is little or no capability to provide instant analysis of air or water contaminants likely to be involved in environmental—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question? Order, another question over here.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Roy: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications; it deals with his 1979-80 construction program.

Could the minister advise why it is there are no projected programs for resurfacing highway 417, the Ottawa Queensway, when in fact a report from his ministry, dated January 1979, states what everybody in Ottawa knows; that is that the Queensway is congested, has poor skid resistance and the pavement is deteriorating, so that it is therefore necessary to do some remedial work in the short-run. The report goes on to state that the skid resistance in many areas is very low, with the skid resistance numbers on wet pavement approaching those expected on an ice surface.

What kind of priorities does the minister have in his ministry which would tolerate a situation like this on the Ottawa Queensway?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen that particular report the honourable member is holding up. If he would like to send me a copy of it, I'd be very glad to look into this matter.

Mr. J. Reed: Pretty slippery answer.

Mr. Cassidy: You're skating on thin asphalt.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We have had discussions for many months with the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton with regard to proposed reconstruction work and improvements on the Ottawa Queensway. I think just recently we have come about with some conclusion to those discussions.

Another thing I'd like to say is that on the projects that go into that particular book, which was published two or three weeks ago, the decisions basically as to the establishment of that program were made last October.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the minister's construction program states that "each project has been selected within the context of need, priority and budget constraint to provide for the essential," and in view of the fact that this report from the ministry, dated January 22, 1979, states that the skid resistance on the wet Queensway is 20 to 33 and on an ice surface is about 19, and the report states that the absolute minimum is 27, in view of the fact that this is not something that happens overnight, could the minister advise if he is in touch, when establishing these priorities, with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications office in Kingston, and is he not aware that in Ottawa we have a canal to skate on, we don't need a Queensway?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I know the honourable member has had considerable time recently to research this project. I have told him that I will ask for a copy of the report. I believe my ministry estimates start tomorrow

morning at 10 o'clock. I don't believe the honourable member came last year. I invite him to come this year and we'll have a good discussion about this matter.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. In view of the fact that the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) is in China and therefore not available to consider what the ethnic communities feel about the destructive cutbacks in the heritage language program and in view of the fact that boards of education are examining their budgets and the heritage language program may be cut off, will the Premier respond to the concerns and anger in the ethnic communities in the province and see to it that the 50 per cent cutbacks will be scrapped and inform the boards of education and communities of that commitment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I want to make it very clear, because I've had some discussions on this matter, that the heritage language program will without any question be maintained. There is some complexity in the grant regulation as it relates to certain municipalities, but the ministry is working on it to see that it has an equitable formula for distribution.

I assure the honourable member that before he raised it here I had raised it with the minister and the ministry officials. I spoke to the 'separate school principals' association some four weeks ago, at which time I assured them that the heritage language program, which I think has been extremely helpful and beneficial in terms of the educational system in this province, would in fact be maintained.

I do point out to the honourable member that to try to draft regulations that distribute the moneys equitably where there is need et cetera, is not quite as simple as he might suggest. I'm not asking him to understand that, and I'm not being critical; I can just assure him, as I have assured several other people who have raised this matter with me in the past two to three weeks, that the heritage language program without question will be maintained.

Mr. Grande: At half funding.

Hon. Mr. Baetz: You knew that, Tony. Why did you ask?

Mr. Grande: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the Premier is suggesting that the heritage language program will be maintained at half funding, will—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I don't mind a little give and

take in here, but I don't recall my saying that it would be maintained at half funding. I don't recall using that phrase.

Ms. Gigantes: Then what are you saying?

Mr. Cassidy: How will it be maintained?

[3:00]

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Premier's suggestion at his last speaking engagement, or whatever, to the principals of the separate school board here in Metropolitan Toronto, is the minister aware that the cutbacks came the day after the Premier spoke at that particular conference; and can the Premier make a commitment—since, as I said, he has taken a personal interest in this matter since May 1977—that (1) no child who is currently in a class will be cut off, because the 50 per cent funding is going to reduce by 25,000 the number of children in that program, and (2) no family in this province will have to pay a \$25 deterrent fee to enrol children in that program?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member—I will phrase it as generally as I can and, at the same time, as specifically as I can—that the quality of the heritage language program will be maintained. I cannot tell him exactly what the regulations may say with respect to weighted enrolments, class size, et cetera, because the complexity in this is to distribute those funds. I am not talking about half funding, nor am I talking about cutbacks; I am talking about a fund of money that is distributed equitably amongst those boards which have introduced this program. I can assure the honourable member that the quality and the scope of the program will be maintained.

DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE

Mr. Mancini: I have a question for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is aware that last Thursday the township of Mersea, which is in the riding of Essex South, was struck by a hurricane, causing well over \$300,000 damage. I wonder whether the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is aware that many of the greenhouse crops were totally destroyed and many families suffered much personal damage.

I wonder whether he could have his ministry staff apprise themselves of the problem and if he is going to set up the same type of relief emergency fund that he had set up for the township of Dover when they had an emergency situation.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the proper procedure for my friend to follow is, if he would like to get an official letter from that municipality, he can give it to me, as his colleague from Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon) did. We will be happy to have someone investigate it and process it. The disaster relief fund is there and, upon application from a municipality, we will be happy to review it and then I will get back to him.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister would give some consideration to recommending a new approach to disaster relief to his colleagues. This dollar-for-dollar situation often leads to surrounding municipalities making commitments from their own treasuries simply to assist their neighbour in getting some decent funding from provincial Treasury sources.

Would the minister not accept the recommendation from the city of Nanticoke which calls for the establishment of a program funded by the province to assist those areas and individuals which suffer damage from acts of God of this type?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am always happy to look at any new arrangements that might make anything better, but I draw to my friend's attention that the plan we have now is not a bad one. It involves responsibility at the local level; if they raise half the money, we will match it dollar for dollar. That is a pretty good program.

ELECTION EXPENSES

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Why has the Attorney General not initiated prosecutions in cases of violation of the Election Finances Reform Act which have been documented for the minister in letters by Mr. Arthur Wishart, chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses, in August 1978?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as I made it quite clear to the chairman of the commission, in my view it is very clear from the statute that the responsibility for initiating prosecutions lies with the commission. I would think the honourable member has been a member of the Legislature long enough to realize the Attorney General does not initiate prosecutions. Prosecutions are generally initiated by police law enforcement officers. I have made it very clear in these circumstances that I think it is the responsibility of the election expenses commission to initiate prosecutions relating to breaches of the legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: The commission's obligation under the statute is to report cases of violation to the Attorney General. Although this admittedly is something of a loophole, it implies he is the person who should initiate the prosecutions. If he is not willing to accept that obligation, and therefore makes a mockery of the implementation of the act, why doesn't he respond to the commission's request for amendments, among those amendments to give them specifically the power to initiate prosecutions?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I would recommend that the member for York South read the legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: I have.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think if he has read it, it should be abundantly clear to him that it is within the prerogative of the commission under the present legislation to initiate such prosecutions.

Mr. MacDonald: The chairman doesn't agree with you.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am telling the member this is my view. The matter has been reviewed by senior officers of the crown and they are in agreement with the view as expressed. I think it is the proper one.

Mr. McClellan: The chairman was the former Attorney General, too.

Mr. Swart: Can you resolve the difference?

Mr. Cassidy: This is a conspiracy not to act.

Mr. MacDonald: You are making a mockery of the act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't think the member understands the act. That is his problem and not mine.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Mr. Speaker: As is customary when we have a group of pages leaving who have been with us for the last four or five weeks, this will be the last opportunity I will have to say how much we appreciate their assistance and their co-operation. I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to read their names into the record:

Reid Chesney of Brant-Oxford-Norfolk; Steven Clark of Grey-Bruce; Maria Costa of Dovercourt; Leslie Cyfko of Mississauga East; Rayanne Dupuis of Cochrane North; Lori Entwistle of Cornwall; Amelia Golden of Armourdale; James Gordon of Riverdale; Melanie Harrison of Northumberland; Andre Loiselle of Cornwall; James MacLellan of

Wellington-Dufferin-Peel; Julia Marchesan of Hamilton East; Peter Noble of Don Mills; Lisa Osbourne of Essex South; Michael Power of High Park; Edward Remillard of Sault Ste. Marie; Anthony Siblall of Cochrane South; Francine St-Denis of Cochrane South; Gregory Thomas of Sarnia; Nicola Thom-Neilsen of Kingston and the Islands; Rita Vasilopoulos of York East; and Allison Webb of York Centre.

I am sure all members would like to thank them for their services to this House.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FIRES EXTINGUISHMENT REPEAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 43, An Act to repeal the Fires Extinguishment Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This is the first of three acts I am introducing to repeal acts which are no longer necessary in this province. This act was enacted in 1890, and it provided for a means of extinguishing forest fires. It enabled county councils to authorize certain people appointed by township councils to order male residents of the township to help fight a forest fire. This can now be handled under other acts and is not necessary.

VACANT LAND CULTIVATION REPEAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 44, An Act to repeal the Vacant Land Cultivation Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This act was enacted in 1918. It authorizes councils of local municipalities to grant permits to any person to enter upon, hold and use any vacant land in the municipality for cultivating it and raising crops. In today's world it would be seen, I think, as perhaps an infringement on individual property rights, and therefore we are repealing the act.

FIRE GUARDIANS REPEAL ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 45, An Act to repeal the Fire Guardians Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: He is extinguishing a lot of acts.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This act was enacted in 1889. It enables township councils to appoint fire guardians whose responsibility is to regulate the setting of open-air fires in the town-

ships between April 1 and October 31. It is obviously an obsolete and unnecessary piece of legislation now and there are other more modern acts to take care of the things that this act was meant to take care of.

LOCAL IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved first reading of Bill 46, An Act to amend the Local Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This amendment to the Local Improvement Act will give municipalities the option of issuing debentures to finance local improvements before the work is completed. This will eliminate the necessity for temporary borrowing which currently results in increased interest expense to some municipalities. This change is in keeping with other recent amendments aimed at streamlining municipalities' financial operations.

In addition, the bill contains amendments to forms two, three and four to change the wording from per foot footage to per metre footage. Another amendment seeks to enable municipalities which have begun proceedings for a local improvement under the imperial system to continue in the imperial system until the project is completed.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answers to questions 95, 96 and 99 standing on the Notice Paper. (See appendix, page 910.)

[3:15]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Ministry of Transportation and Communications Act.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain if I should be anticipating any comments by the minister on this legislation. I would just say that in keeping with the spirit of making minority government work, and work expeditiously and clearly, we will be very brief on these four bills.

This particular piece of legislation is somewhat self-explanatory, and I think is in keeping with the concept of eliminating red tape, especially as it relates to the minister's own personal activities.

I should profess at this time a slight conflict of interest, insofar as if in the near future we are over there and they are over here, my signature is not all that legible. Were I in the fortunate position to enjoy the responsibilities the current minister has, it would eliminate for me the embarrassment I have every time I sign my name.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have no such conflict of interest; people will be able to understand my signature. I see nothing wrong with the bill, so let's get on with it.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

STATUTE LABOUR AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 14, An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act.

Mr. Cunningham: Again, this particular piece of legislation will be supported by the Liberal Party. As I see it it is a sweetening of the pot, I guess, to add some incentive to have an individual serve as secretary-treasurer of the roads commissions. Recognizing the amount of work that is involved, it seems to be a realistic move by the government.

I would hope that sometime the minister might convince the authorities within the cabinet to sweeten the pot for people who are required to serve on jury duty as well.

Mr. Philip: We are in support of the bill. I would be interested in having it go to committee of the whole House, and perhaps have the minister simply give us some of the background of this amendment and perhaps a concrete example of how and when there would be an instance where it would apply or is being applied. That is my only question on that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am not against the bill going to committee, but maybe I can just explain here and save that problem.

This is really a housekeeping bill that simply removes the \$50 maximum limitation presently in the legislation on the annual salary which may be paid to the secretary-treasurer out of the funds for Statute Labour Act road support. There are only 23 of these boards left in existence in Ontario, and I presume when this act was passed, \$50 was an appropriate fee. I understand many of the boards are paying their secretary-treasurer more than the \$50; some of them are paying the secretary-treasurer as much as \$300 or \$400 to administer the act.

Because of the limitation in this bill, my ministry is only able to subsidize the boards for the first \$50, and we think it is in keeping with having the act up to date that we should remove this unreasonably low figure and let the boards establish their own fees for the secretary-treasurer.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

LOCAL ROADS BOARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 15, An Act to amend the Local Roads Boards Act.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I made a few phone calls to people I thought might be interested in this. They can find no problems with it. We are supportive of this and think it should simply go to third reading.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

AIRPORTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 16, An Act to amend the Airports Act.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, this too appears to be a simple amendment to the Airports Act. I wonder if the minister might favour us with some examples as to how he sees this amendment serving the current legislation and how he would see it work in practice. I am just wondering what the motivation was. I thought he might have an explanation for it.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I had only a couple of questions on it and the minister answered those questions during our fire drill or whatever it was yesterday. I believe the member for Beaches-Woodbine has a couple of questions. We would like it to go into committee so that she could ask those questions. I see no problem with the bill.

Ms. Bryden: On the principle of the bill, I would like to ask a question that perhaps the minister could reply to: I understand that the purpose of this bill is to speed up the approval of grants for airport construction and change, and certainly we would like to see the process speeded up.

I would like to ask the minister about a story which appeared in the Globe and Mail on March 26, suggesting that the government had expressed an interest in getting into the regional airline business on its own. I would like to ask him if this power that is being given to him instead of to the cabinet would

be used in the implementation of such development, if that is being contemplated.

I would like to ask him also if his ministry has actually made plans to submit an application to the Canadian Transport Commission for the province to enter into the regional airlines business. If so, would grants for airports involved in such business come under this particular act? In a case like that, I think we would want cabinet approval, but if it's more for small grants for local airports, then it's a different matter.

I would like him to comment on that story in the Globe as to whether the ministry is thinking of making an application to get into the regional airline business on its own.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, as I recall the questions, I think the answer basically to all of them is no.

The member for Wentworth North inquired as to why we are doing this. My ministry will administer transfer payments to municipalities of something in the neighbourhood of \$535,000,000 this year in the way of grants for road construction, road maintenance, bridge construction and transit capital and operating expenses. All of those grants come under the different acts involved. Once the appropriation of funds is approved by cabinet, the ministry is free to make those allocations of grants to the different municipalities under various formulas.

The Airports Act, I believe was set up back in 1968. Up until that time the government had not been involved in airports. There was no real past experience, so a provision was put in the act that each airport grant required an order in council. This now requires something in the neighbourhood of 40 to 50 orders in council per year.

The grants we're talking about are mainly grants to northern and eastern Ontario communities for the construction and maintenance of their airport programs. The grants are usually quite small, or relatively small, compared to many others. The proposed grants, for instance, for the coming year range from \$5,000 up to about \$310,000, which I believe is the highest we propose to make on the capital program. In maintenance, they range from \$10,000 to \$25,000.

As it is now, for each one of these grants the ministry staff must prepare an order in council; it must go to cabinet; it must go on the cabinet agenda. If all my ministry's grants, for instance, for roads to municipalities were done in the same way, I don't think we'd ever get the grants distributed to the municipalities because of the paperwork.

We now have the experience in airports. It's cabinet policy that only airports in northern Ontario and certain areas of eastern Ontario qualify for capital grants, and only those in northern Ontario qualify for maintenance grants. It's under that policy we distribute these funds.

As a matter of interest, the grants provided this year are to Atikokan, Cochrane, Deer Falls, Elliot Lake, Fort Frances, Hornepayne, Iroquois Falls, Kirkland Lake, Nakina, Parry Sound, Sioux Lookout, Terrace Bay—I think that one would interest you, Mr. Speaker—Thessalon, Belleville, Brockville, Cornwall, Kingston, Morrisburg and Smiths Falls. Maintenance grants, for instance, are provided to Atikokan, Sachigo, Elliot Lake, et cetera.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nothing for Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Snow: All this will do is let us operate the grants to the municipal airports on the same basis as we do all the other grants in the ministry. It has nothing to do with any airports in southern Ontario; nothing to do with any federal airports, and nothing to do with any possible provincial airline.

Mr. Wildman: Add Wawa to that list.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Wells moved second reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend the Ontario Unconditional Grants Act.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I should make a few comments before we discuss this bill on second reading. The bill proposes two amendments to the present Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

Section 1 of the bill clarifies the tax levying procedures of those area municipalities within regional municipalities which have been recently reassessed under section 86 of the Assessment Act. The municipalities affected are those within the regions of Waterloo and Durham and the city of Timmins in the district of Cochrane.

Prior to the implementation of section 86, these area municipalities had different property tax bases and different mill rates for each of their merged areas. Application of section 86 not only removes inequities between similar properties in these areas but also produces a single tax base for each municipality.

The proposed amendments to the Unconditional Grants Act are merely a clarification

in order to bring it into line with the administrative implications of section 86 of the Assessment Act. It ensures that a single set of mill rates is struck across the local municipality rather than separate rates for each of its merged areas.

[3:30]

Section 2 of the bill allows for the payment, in the year 1979, of a special one-time grant to a number of municipalities which have been judged to be adversely affected in the calculation of the resource equalization grants because of the equalization factors which have been frozen and unchanged since 1970. I believe that all the members have had a copy of our statement and an explanation of how this ad hoc grant was arrived at, plus a list of those municipalities that would benefit from the ad hoc grant. We've already written to the municipalities on the strength of this bill being introduced for first reading and, of course, subject to the passage of the bill, the municipalities which have had indication that they will receive this ad hoc grant will then be paid the grant. I will be happy to discuss the bill in further detail with the members of the House as we debate it now.

Mr. Epp: I am pleased to be able to speak to Bill 18, which is An Act to amend the Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

We will support this bill in principle, Mr. Speaker, but we have some serious reservations about the enactment of the bill and, in particular, the many years that have passed from 1970 to 1979 before trying to resolve some of the problems, although they are only being resolved in a very minimal way.

We see from the act and from the releases that the minister has made accompanying the bill itself that 39 municipalities will be gaining some amount of money from the provincial government. These 39 municipalities and the grants they will be receiving vary considerably. For instance, the city of Windsor will be receiving a sum of about \$3,097,000, whereas the last one on the list, the city of Kitchener, will be receiving about \$20,000; for a total expenditure by the government of around \$6,628,000. This is somewhat short of the \$8,000,000 we understood the government was going to allocate to the various municipalities last fall when a number of statements were made by the minister and by the Premier.

All these municipalities are deserving of the money they're receiving and there are other municipalities that should be receiving

some of the dollars. I appreciate the fact that the government has not an unlimited pot of gold that they can dish out to the various municipalities, but I think that some of them, such as Windsor, Sarnia, St. Catharines and maybe a few others, have been singled out in the past as being deprived of this revenue. The reason they've been deprived, as I understand it, particularly some of them such as Windsor, is because they had a high assessment rate back in 1970 when the assessment for the province was frozen.

As a result of them having a fairly high assessment rate, they didn't get some of the resource equalization payments that they should have received and now, in order to correct that particular problem, the government is coming forth with this one-time unconditional grant.

My colleague, the member for Windsor-Walkerville, who wanted to speak to this matter and, unfortunately, will not be able to—

Mr. B. Newman: I will speak.

Mr. Epp: Oh, pardon me, Bernie. I was looking for you in your seat. You will be here. Sorry.

Mr. Nixon: He's always here.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, he's always here.

Mr. Swart: Don't hassle your own member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are other people missing.

Mr. Swart: Leave that to us.

Mr. Epp: He will want to speak to this matter a little later, but in order to cover the matter, I just want to say that I'm proud of my colleague from Windsor-Walkerville who was probably the first member in this Legislature to raise the matter. He was the first, I'm told, so there's no probably about it. He was the first, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Darcy McKeough admitted it to me later on.

Mr. Epp: If Darcy McKeough admitted it, that's quite an admission by the former Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. The present minister will appreciate that.

As a result, the member for Windsor-Walkerville, the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Bradley), another colleague of mine, the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston), the member for Essex South (Mr. Mancini) and the member for Sarnia (Mr. Blundy), all of whom were affected by this shortfall in grants from the province, have drawn this matter to

the attention of the government, and rightly they should.

As I understand it, back in 1973 when the resource equalization formula was first adopted there was a base of \$10,300 for equalization across the province, on a per capita basis. Whatever municipalities were short of this \$10,300—and this figure today, in 1979, has been increased to \$10,800—the province picked up up to 60 per cent of that in resource equalization.

I know that my own municipality, which—fortunately or unfortunately—doesn't qualify for the grant, has a per capita figure of \$11,823. They have to have more than \$1,000 over the base figure in order to qualify for the grants. I don't think the city of Waterloo, for instance, has ever received a cent from the resource equalization payments.

These unconditional grants the government is now giving out raise another matter—one that has been raised in this Legislature a number of times by myself and by a number of my colleagues. That is the principle of "unconditional" grants. As the minister knows, approximately 83 per cent of the grants the province gives to municipalities are of a conditional nature. The former Treasurer commissioned a study—and that body was chaired, I think, by the deputy minister of the present Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs—which indicated the province should open up the flood gates—a little anyway—with respect to unconditional grants. They constitute only about 17 per cent—and I could be corrected here; it might be that 84 per cent are conditional or 82 per cent, something of that nature. Nevertheless there should be more unconditional grants given to the various municipalities. This, in turn, would provide greater need and greater opportunity for the various municipalities to make autonomous decisions at the local level.

I hope the minister will have something to say with respect to unconditional grants and the easing up by the government on the formula it presently has for giving out the very few unconditional grants. I know one of the ministries that is particularly reluctant to go along with this request is the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. The reason is that it likes to have its finger in the pot and likes to be able to control where the money goes and say how much municipalities are going to receive and where it is going to be spent.

This bill also clarifies the levying procedures of those municipalities which have opted for section 86 of the Assessment Act. For those members who aren't aware, what section 86 essentially does is equalize assess-

ment within classes in the various municipalities. This is particularly important for such municipalities as Cambridge, where I think they have somewhere between 10 and 12 different assessments. They have both commercial and industrial assessment as one and the residential assessment as another, and then they have the three municipalities of Cambridge, Galt and Preston, which meant there were six assessments. They had another two assessments that were brought in from some areas annexed from the township of Waterloo. There were another two assessments from North Dumfries, and I think there was another small piece taken in from one of the townships in Wentworth county. In total, that would make 12 different assessments. There was, of course, a considerable problem and great consternation in Cambridge, where they had 12 assessments to work with, rather than two, which would have simplified it considerably.

Bringing in section 86—which I support in principle, as the minister knows—will simplify the matter for the municipality of Cambridge. That same problem carries through to other municipalities in the province, although maybe not to the same extent.

One of the problems that we have on this side of the House is that equalizing assessment within classes means that a house—and this was the example given by the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck) last summer in Cambridge; I remember him saying this—one house in Cambridge might be taxed to the extent of \$1,400 or \$1,500, while another house of similar market value might only be taxed to the extent of \$600; so obviously there was that inequity.

Applying section 86, which this bill helps to clarify, means they will have more equalized assessment and, to follow through with that, more equalized taxation to pay during the current and future years.

The fact that these various municipalities—six of them in the region of Waterloo and another seven in other municipalities in Ontario—requested the government to invoke section 86 of the Assessment Act would help to strengthen the municipal governments' bid in trying to equalize the assessment.

Earlier in this session, one day when the minister was absent, I drew to the attention of the Premier the fact that the assessment on one piece of property in the region of Waterloo went up by 11,000 per cent. The Kitchener-Waterloo Record reported: "The biggest increase is for a small parcel of land at Pine Bush Road. Taxes for the land used for water purposes have increased from \$44 last year to over \$5,000 this year."

In this particular case the region, which owned that property, was in a position to pay that tax; but there are many other people who have difficulty in paying the increased taxes.

We on this side of the House recommended that the government seriously consider in the case of every municipality that asked for permission from the minister to invoke, I think, section 505 of the Municipal Act, granting that permission. I understand the municipality of Hamilton has requested this, and I believe the Premier indicated they would be permitted to use that.

Section 505 of the Municipal Act actually permits municipalities to phase in increases of more than \$50 over a five-year period. As I indicated, this may not be of particular significance to the regional municipality of Waterloo, but it is significant to a number of property owners and particularly to property owners who are living on a fixed income, such as senior citizens, disabled people and so forth, and other people who have businesses where, because of some zone change or something of that nature, they suddenly find themselves paying hundreds and sometimes thousands of dollars more in their property taxes, which in some cases would force them to go out of business and which would be most unfortunate at a time in this province and in this Legislature when the emphasis is on trying to help small business people within the provincial community. [3:45]

Another example we have is from the city of Kitchener, where a ratepayer experienced an increase in taxes of 4,300 per cent on an empty lot. His taxes go up from \$39.10, which I agree is somewhat low for an empty lot, to \$1,751.06. He found that increase extremely high and he obviously was going to appeal it, but if that assessment is correct it does mean that he has to experience a very sharp increase.

All this brings me to another point which I would like to raise with the minister right now, and that has to do with the transfer payments that the province is making to the municipalities in the province. I want to read into the record the release that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario made to the minister in 1979. It's called: "AMO response to the provincial announcement of 1979 transfer payments to municipalities." I'm sure the minister is familiar with this document but I also think that he probably appreciates having it read into the record so it's there for posterity.

I quote: "At its 1978 annual conference, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, reacting to the structural changes at the provincial level following the resignation of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, issued a policy statement regarding future provincial-municipal financial relations. The spirit reflected in that statement flowed from the sincere hope that the new partnership being espoused by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and wholeheartedly supported by the association would foster mutual respect and trust between the province and its municipalities. Such a condition in many respects had been absent since the initial manipulation of the Edmonton commitment.

"AMO believes that it provided both the new Treasurer and the new Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs with an unparalleled opportunity to develop the partnership anew. Even more basic however, was the municipalities' willingness to permit the province to extricate itself from the millstone the Edmonton commitment had become.

"AMO came away from a November 16 meeting with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs believing that the government had accepted the municipal proposal that transfers to municipalities in 1979 would be 'commensurate with the rate of growth of provincial expenditures.' The association's confidence was short lived however. Seven days later the Treasurer of Ontario advised the Legislature that while the government was prepared to accept the municipal transfer proposal, and while it was estimated that provincial expenditures would grow about six per cent, transfers to municipalities would average five per cent!

"At the December 8 Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee meeting the government's dichotomous position was reaffirmed, continuing the same type of tactic used previously to avoid the intent of the original Edmonton commitment. Such action can only lead the association to believe that once again the province has abused the good faith shown in it by its municipalities and resorted to the type of bookkeeping legerdemain associated with past announcements.

"The recasting by the province of the Edmonton commitment and now its successor, has become an annual ritual. For 1976 the municipalities believed the province would live up to the Edmonton commitment; the province's answer was to introduce the concept of overpayments. For 1978 the municipalities asked the province to live up to the Edmonton commitment. The province's re-

sponse was to redefine it—retroactively, arbitrarily and unilaterally. This year, in a spirit of goodwill, the municipalities recommended that the Edmonton commitment be abandoned and that the rate of growth of provincial transfer payments to municipalities be commensurate with the rate of growth of provincial expenditures; the province's reaction was to manipulate its expenditure figures in an attempt to prove that six per cent at the provincial level equals five per cent at the municipal level.

"The association is also concerned about the manner and timing of this year's announcement. First of all, AMO believes it most unfortunate that the Treasurer of Ontario chose not to accompany the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee meeting to hear first hand the municipalities' reaction to the transfer announcement.

"It was recognized that with two new ministers in key positions there naturally would be a delay in making the transfer announcement. However, once it did come, apart from announcing that the general increase would be limited to five per cent, the municipalities were told that they would have to wait for individual ministries to release the details of their particular transfers. What AMO anticipates will be a dribbling out of information over the next three months will only add to the confusion and in essence will mean a return to the exercise of individual ministry prerogatives to the detriment of the overall process. Clearly, the absence of an early, comprehensive announcement inhibits timely and realistic budget preparations for the municipalities which begin a new fiscal year on January 1.

"AMO is concerned with a statement made by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs at the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee meeting that his ministry is just a ministry like all other provincial ministries and must be subject therefore to the same expenditure guidelines. That may be true for ministry operating expenditures but that is not the issue. Transfer payments to municipalities cannot be considered as just another ministry appropriation.

"As the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs suggested in the Legislature on November 21, local government is an order of government just as the federal or provincial governments are orders of government.

"While the establishment of overall expenditure guidelines may be a new departure for the province, municipalities have utilized this approach for some time. AMO understands the provincial government's desire to achieve

expenditure restraint, but does not accept the proposition expounded by the government that municipalities are not subject to the same financial pressure as it is. Like the province, municipalities are faced with certain expenditure commitments which cannot be arbitrarily restrained.

"Debt charges incurred on required municipal infrastructure during the rapid growth period of the past few years are a fixed commitment. In this respect, it should be remembered that not so long ago the Treasurer of Ontario was urging municipalities to make more use of their long-term borrowing capacities.

"Municipalities are committed to increase pension payments for their employees to meet the pension enrichments introduced in 1978 by the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System.

"Municipalities presently are committed to assuming their share of rapidly growing social service costs for such items as general welfare assistance, children's services and extended care for senior citizens.

"The province's decision to withdraw Ontario Provincial Police services from a number of municipalities has left those municipalities facing rapidly rising police costs. Presumably, there were off-setting savings at the provincial level.

"Several years ago the province encouraged municipalities to expand urban transit systems. Today the deficits from these operations continue to grow.

"Clearly, even if normal operating expenditures are constrained at the five per cent level, with the current level of provincial transfers there will have to be substantial property tax increases to meet the shortfall in transfer revenues.

"To understand the depth of despair and disappointment the association feels, it is only necessary to contrast the present position in which municipalities find themselves with the era of good faith which dominated provincial-municipal financial arrangements in the early 1970s:

"Municipalities had a revenue-sharing agreement"—which had been formulated in 1973 in Edmonton, as the minister is well aware—"now they must rely solely on government largesse—ministry by ministry by ministry.

"Municipalities had a long-term commitment which facilitated planning; now they have no such guarantee.

"Municipalities were provided with early announcements of grant levels; now this has disappeared.

"Municipalities were provided with a comprehensive announcement; now this is no longer the case.

"In conclusion, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario views with apprehension the significance of the 1979 transfer announcement. The association fears that it clearly portends a further deterioration of provincial-municipal relations.

"In the current atmosphere, it is difficult to see how the committee currently being constituted to study long-term provincial-municipal financial relations can possibly function. This is particularly true since municipalities already have expended expensive time, effort and resources dealing with such critical matters as property tax reform, grants reform and provincial-municipal transfers—all to little avail.

"AMO applauded the announcement that the government was in accord with the municipal proposition, that transfer payments to the municipalities in 1979 increase at the same rate as provincial expenditures, only to be faced—once again—with the manipulation of figures that if it is not, at least gives the impression of, duplicity on the part of the province."

That statement made by the association of municipalities on February 1, 1979, outlines the dilemma that the municipalities are faced with on a daily basis in trying to meet their financial commitments to their taxpayers and citizens. I am not sure but I hope that the present minister does not have the same attitude the former Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Treasurer of Ontario had—namely, that the municipalities are not taxed enough. He said on more than one occasion that he thought that municipal property taxes weren't high enough and there was no reason why they couldn't go higher. I think he would find serious disagreement by municipal elected representatives and by the citizens of Ontario.

I appeal to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to give serious consideration to the brief that the Association of Municipalities of Ontario has placed before him, dated February 1, 1979, and seriously try to restore the feeling of good faith that was evident in the early 1970s, particularly in the period after the Edmonton commitment in 1973. The municipalities would much appreciate that. I can't emphasize that enough.

We on this side of the House would give him the kind of support he needs in order to try to live up to the commitments that the municipalities felt he had made last fall. If it is not possible to carry it through this

year, we hope he will restore that good faith later this year and provide the municipalities with the kind of resource equalization payments, transfer payments and other kinds of payments they need and expect.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say, first of all, that I accept the explanation of the minister with regard to the purpose of this bill, which, I think is quite simple. It makes exceptions for those areas where section 86 has been invoked. The most important part of the bill is section 2, which provides for some interim ad hoc payments to municipalities where it has been proved that they have suffered rather severely because of an unfair equalization.

I think we all recognize that this is an interim measure only applicable for the one year. Because it was not necessary and because it had never been proposed by the former minister, I should say to the present minister that we welcome this bill and commend him for bringing it in.

[4:00]

I perhaps would make that commendation much more laudatory if we did not know the figures in it are really minimal figures. The minister may correct me if I am wrong, and I hope he will explain this, but I believe the equalization will be paid only to those found to be out by more than eight per cent.

Is that correct? Is he in fact, giving this ad hoc assistance to municipalities so those which have a six per cent or a seven per cent error in their equalization are receiving nothing? However, having said that, it is obviously an attempt on the part of the ministry to assist those which have been hurt the most.

I must say though I do not intend to get into the whole issue of transfer payments, as did the member for Waterloo North. It seems to me this bill deals solely with the matter of payment because of unequal equalization factors and does not deal with the whole question of transfer payments. I must say this bill is an admission of the mistake the government over there made in freezing assessment in 1970. I have never yet heard a reasonable explanation as to why those equalization factors were frozen.

If we extrapolate the figures which we have before us at this time of some \$6,000,000 being transferred to the municipalities as payment for above an eight per cent error for one year, we can make some kind of an estimate of what the municipalities—those same municipalities and the others where there have been unfair equalization

factors—have lost in the way of equalization grants.

In my understanding, for instance, in the case of Windsor, their equalization or their correction was about 18 per cent. Perhaps the minister could tell me if that figure is wrong. In fact, they only got over the eight per cent which would have been a 10 per cent adjustment—the difference between the 18 and the eight—and they got \$3,000,000. If they had had the whole 18 per cent, they would have had something like \$7,000,000. We do not know for how many years that figure of \$7,000,000 would have applied. It would have applied this year; perhaps something less would have applied in previous years.

If you spread that over the 10-year period when equalization factors have been frozen, we are certainly talking in the neighbourhood of \$35,000,000 to \$50,000,000 that Windsor alone has lost. They are getting \$3,000,000 paid to them as compensation for a loss of some \$35,000,000 to \$50,000,000 which they would have received if the equalization factors had never been frozen.

In the case of Welland this figure would have been in the neighbourhood of \$3,000,000; granted, this is a ballpark figure. Welland is receiving \$441,000.

If we spread that across all of those municipalities which have lost money—transfer payments—from the provincial government because of the frozen equalization factors, we are talking in the tens of millions of dollars. Taxpayers have lost perhaps \$100,000,000 at least because of the equalization factors being frozen by this government way back in 1970. Of course, the new one won't be applicable until 1980.

I recognize of course that had there been an equalization factor there may have been other municipalities whose transfer payments would have been lowered—resource equalization would have been lowered—because of that. Nevertheless, if we in this Legislature are concerned and if the government was concerned about a degree of fairness over those years, they would have been making some adjustment during those years. Municipalities have unfairly lost money to which they were entitled.

It has been stated by the member for Waterloo North that a member of his caucus was the first one to make the proposal for these payments. I won't deny that, but I would point out that it was this party that proposed in 1976, and moved an amendment in 1977, and then last fall, 1978, tabled another amendment to lift the freeze that brought about the new equalization. That cannot be denied.

Mr. B. Newman: The minister first admitted it to me by letter. It's the first time he ever admitted making a mistake.

Mr. Swart: Their application was for ad hoc grants. Our amendment, which was first proposed in 1976, was to lift the freeze on equalization so that there would be a fair system across this province. I say to you here, if the Liberal Party had supported us in 1977 in that amendment, this year Windsor would be getting its \$7,000,000 and all the other municipalities across this province that are losing, whether they are above the eight per cent or below the eight per cent, would also be getting theirs. There can be no denying that fact.

Mr. Epp: Now the reason.

Mr. Swart: The reason the municipalities are not getting it this year, the amount to which they are entitled, is because the Liberal Party did not support our amendment.

Mr. Roy: It would have been out of order.

Mr. Swart: It was not out of order; it was not ruled out of order. It was voted on in committee in this House, and the Liberals voted against it. I have to say, in all fairness to the Liberal Party—

Mr. J. Reed: Since when have you been fair to the Liberal Party?

Mr. Swart: —it is true that their critic at that time didn't really understand what the amendment meant.

Mr. Epp: For the record, tell us.

Mr. Swart: Maybe that was our fault because we didn't explain the amendment well enough. But, in fact, they did not understand what that meant. I would just like to read into the record—

Mr. Epp: For the record.

Mr. Swart: —the events last year leading up to what is taking place here today with regard to the member for Erie (Mr. Haggerty) saying: "If we were to accept this amendment as put forward by the member tonight"—referring to my amendment—"it would cause complete chaos in assessment in the other 800-odd municipalities in the province of Ontario."

Mr. Ruston: That is quite correct.

Mr. Swart: That is the same amendment we passed this last fall, and the Liberals voted for it.

Mr. Philip: Another flip-flop.

Mr. Swart: The member goes on to say: "If one was to accept this, as I said before, it would assist one or two municipalities but perhaps cause chaos in all those other municipalities. I can just see every municipality"—and I am still quoting the member for Erie—

"every clerk, every treasurer making application to the Ontario Municipal Board for a hearing on the matter of equalized assessment. I feel you are only going to open a can of worms and perhaps cause serious difficulty to the municipality and to almost every taxpayer in the community.

"First of all, you are going to have a person in the community say: 'I feel I have always paid higher taxes than my neighbour; I want to appeal my assessment on that basis.' I can just see the assessment appeal tribunal flooded with assessment appeals under this particular amendment."

That amendment in 1977, as in 1978, had nothing to do with individual appeals of assessment, as the member for Waterloo North now well knows. It was to provide for equalization between municipalities so they would pay their fair share into counties and into education costs, and receive their fair share of transfer payments, of resource equalization grants. The Liberals voted against that in 1977.

Even the minister at that time—that was the Honourable Mrs. Scrivener, and I know that wouldn't be true of the present minister—didn't understand that. She was saying: "If this amendment were to be incorporated within the bill, it would create assessment chaos in Ontario. Most definitely it would, Mr. Chairman, because it does introduce market value." She was saying it would introduce market value at that time.

"The equalization must be based on market value, and that is according to section 27 of the act, as the member must know."

We passed the amendment last fall, and it did not introduce market value. All that amendment is going to do is provide that an equalization will be in effect next year and that municipalities will get their fair share of the very minimal provincial grants that are passed out to municipalities; they will pay their fair share into the counties and regions and into the boards of education. That is all the amendment did in 1977, and that is all it did in 1978.

Today we are talking about an ad hoc payment of \$6,000,000 when, if the Liberals had voted for our amendment in 1977, we would be having \$100,000,000 being transferred this year to those municipalities that were rightly entitled to it because their equalization factor was at fault. It is only \$6,000,000, but we are going to support this, because we think that a crumb of a loaf, or a very little bit of a loaf, is better than none.

We look forward to the new equalization factor being used next year in this province, and undoubtedly it will give a greater degree of equity.

Before I conclude, I would like to ask the minister on what basis the equalization was made to provide these additional grants. Was it on the work that had been done on market value, or has there been a fast equalization done since the amendment was passed? The reason I ask is that the figures are so much at variance with what was suggested by the previous minister as to the municipalities that were entitled to it and the amount to which the municipalities were entitled.

Finally, I have to say in conclusion that I doubt if there has been anything that this government has done over the past 10 years—and that is a pretty broad statement—that has shown as much ineptness and mismanagement as what it has done in the whole assessment field. To spend \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 of taxpayers' money on market value assessment and then abandon it, as this government has done, shows a very high degree of mismanagement.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill; but in doing so I would like to bring to the minister's attention that this legislation could have been passed and the problem resolved years ago.

If I am not mistaken, it was back in 1973 that the finance department of the city of Windsor, in comparing that city with the city of London, found that everything was not according to Hoyle; that Windsor was being unjustly treated as far as the resource equalization formula was concerned. It was in 1975 that Windsor first appealed to the cabinet in the city of London.

Bob Agnew and the mayor of the city, Bert Weeks, as well as other members of city council, made a very strong plea and presented a fairly substantial brief to the cabinet at that time, showing where the resource equalization grant did not treat the community of Windsor in the way that it should have been treated.

That was repeated again in 1976; I can recall talking about it myself in the House, practically reading the entire brief to put it in the record, so the ministry officials could study Windsor's submission to the cabinet and act accordingly.

[4:15]

I have had the opportunity to speak on this issue in 1975, in 1976, in 1977 and in 1978; but it was not until 1977, I think, that the then Treasurer did admit in a letter

to me that there were inequities. But no solution was being proposed. Once the city found out there were inequities in the resource equalization grant, members can rest assured the city gathered its forces and did everything it possibly could do to emphasize to the ministry that a remedy was needed immediately.

I can recall a petition being signed in the community by well over 15,000 individuals. The petition was signed in the various shopping malls in the community and was strongly endorsed by the chamber of commerce. Practically every organization in the community supported the city in its stand for a better distribution of the grants. Finally, this year the present minister realized the community was not being treated as fairly as it should have been and, as a result, introduced the legislation we have here today.

I can only say that the \$3,000,000 the ministry is actually going to be giving as a one-time grant to the city of Windsor is not even the interest on the money it would have owed them had it treated them fairly right from 1975 on. From what I understand, at one time we figured there was approximately \$10,000,000 to \$11,000,000 and a total of about \$30,000,000 that the city was short-changed. Invested in securities, \$30,000,000 today would certainly have presented us with at least a \$3,000,000 return.

I support the legislation. I'm glad to see that once and finally the government has seen the light of day and decided that at least it can meet the communities, not half way but one tenth of the way. We appreciate the fact we are going to get the \$3,000,000. It will be put to good use in the community. Our only regret is that we're kind of sorry the government couldn't have given us our fair share back when we first pointed out to it the errors in the way the resource equalization grant was calculated.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak very briefly. I want to point out to the minister that today's victory for Windsor is as much a victory for the mayor of the city of Windsor, Mayor Weeks, as it is for the New Democratic Party. I seriously believe that if it weren't for the pressure from the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart) and the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Charlton), our revenue critic, to get the freeze on the resource equalization factor removed last year, after which the Liberal Party finally saw the light of day and decided to come along with us last year, if it weren't for those moves on the part of the New Democratic

Party, Windsor would not receive the \$3,000,000 it received this year.

Over the years Mayor Weeks has fought very hard for this particular grant. He spearheaded the attack against the government, collected petitions, got the labour unions behind him, got other communities across this province behind him and made them aware of their problems, wrote letters and had constant meetings with the local members of provincial parliaments about this problem. Windsor council passed resolutions that were circulated among all the municipalities.

As I say, this victory today for Windsor is as much a victory for the mayor of the city of Windsor as anyone else. I think he needs to be congratulated. I also think the former member who represented my riding, Fred Burr, deserves some credit, as he raised this matter back when he was first elected and when the mayor of the city of Windsor first started this fight. I'm sure Fred Burr is aware of the victory and he should share a part of the credit for today's bill.

I do want to say to the minister that I hope he'll talk to the Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities (Miss Stephenson) because, as I understand it, Windsor and other communities—

Hon. Mr. Walker: Gee, I thought you would give the minister some credit.

Mr. Cooke: —are also missing out on a fair amount of money through the same problem through grants from the Ministry of Education. While we're getting \$3,000,000, the government does owe us \$50,000,000. Paying us what amounts to six per cent of what we deserve is a pretty good deal for the government, but not that good a deal for the city of Windsor.

Windsor has been among the highest-charging cities for property tax for many years. I think we're number two or number three right now in mill rates across the province, which does have an effect on industries that come to the city. Chrysler, GM, Hiram Walker and so on are paying much higher property tax than they would be if we received our fair share and that, obviously, is a deterrent for them to expand or locate new operations in Windsor. Over the last couple of years, we've had an unemployment rate in Windsor of around 12 per cent and I would think, if anything, the government should be trying to lower the mill rate even more in Windsor in order to attract more industry to that city.

I know the minister said when he was at the sod-turning for the Ford Motor Company in Windsor that we didn't really need the

\$50,000,000 because we were getting \$28,000,000 from the province for the Ford Motor Company. I hope he doesn't use that same argument today to say everything has been equalized because that argument just doesn't wash either with myself or with the people of Windsor.

To conclude, I see the member for Essex North is still here, and I know that when the Liberal Party—

Mr. Ruston: I'm always here, Dave.

Mr. Cooke: —in 1977 voted against our amendment that would have solved this problem for 1978, he was down at Windsor attending a meeting and he tried to justify the Liberal position. It was very difficult to justify something indefensible.

Mr. Ruston: No problem. I'll send you an article from the Windsor Star from Mayor Blundy of Sarnia.

Mr. Cooke: I read the Windsor Star from cover to cover.

Mr. Ruston: He understood it better than you fellows.

Mr. Cooke: The fact of the matter is the Liberal Party didn't understand the problem—

Hon. Mr. Walker: Would you guys stop attacking each other?

Mr. Cooke: —in 1977 and, thanks to the Liberal Party of this province, Windsor lost out on money in 1978. We would have got the \$7,000,000 last year. We would have got more money in 1979—

Mr. Bradley: You are being overly partisan.

Mr. Cooke: —and the problem would have been resolved, but because the members of the Liberal Party didn't understand the situation and the members of the government didn't understand the situation—

Mr. Epp: I didn't know we were running the administration of this province. Thanks for the credit.

Mr. Cooke: It's too bad they didn't have a member like our member from Welland.

Mr. Ruston: That is the radio fellow. That is the fellow that owns the radio station.

Mr. Cooke: You people were saying that night that the member from Welland didn't understand the problem and he couldn't implement his proposal.

Mr. Epp: Are you giving us credit for this now?

Mr. Cooke: Today his position has been vindicated and once again the New Democratic Party has been proved right and the people of Windsor, again, are benefiting from good NDP representation.

Mr. Epp: That is twice this year you are right.

Mr. J. Reed: If there is nothing to say he will say it.

Mr. Philip: Give us another flip-flop.

Mr. Ruston: I just have a few words to say with regard to Bill 18, on equalization grants. It is a bit of a problem for some of the people in the county of Essex. Out of the 21 municipalities, 15 received some form of increase because of this new legislation. Naturally, any amount extra is appreciated.

I've had calls from the reeves of a couple of municipalities and the mayor of another one that they are concerned that one of them got such a little bit and a number of other ones got nothing whatsoever. Of course, by doing the proper figuring, I'm sure someone will show they weren't entitled to anything, but the old saying is that figures don't lie but liars can figure.

The problem, I think, is with our grant structure—per capita grants, police grants, highway grants, education grants—which is rather complicated. A lot of people don't take the time to understand or figure them out. To a layman who sees the report that just came out it's a little concerning because Windsor received \$3,097,000, a little over \$15 per capita, and the town of Tecumseh with a population of 5,000 received \$2,100, which is about 40 cents per capita.

The township of Tilbury North have asked their auditors to look over the whole situation of grants and find out why they weren't entitled to something extra. It is a little confusing to them.

However, Windsor did receive this, and certainly Mayor Weeks has worked a long time on it as well as many other people. I can tell him right now that he doesn't have to worry about where this money can go. There are two things in the county of Essex, being from the riding of Essex North, where I can tell him he can certainly use some of that money. One of them is on a sanitary landfill site. I am getting completely fed up with taking all the junk and garbage from Windsor out in my riding. It is unbelievable. In fact, they are talking now of setting up roadblocks of human beings to stop it from coming out.

Mr. Bradley: Including the members?

Mr. Conway: There are no Tories in Essex, but there is a lot of garbage.

Mr. Ruston: It is time the city started putting in its own system of handling its garbage. We are not going to stand for it much longer. Mr. Weeks can use some of

that money right now to start putting in his own garbage disposal system.

Mr. Mackenzie: Did you clear that with the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman)?

Mr. Conway: Send it to Agincourt.

Mr. Ruston: The people of Essex county will be very happy because we are using up the most valuable farmland in Ontario to take their garbage.

He is worrying about the rates for suburban roads. He can put some of the money in suburban roads because, after all, they are getting all that taxation from the industrial buildings in Windsor. We are furnishing houses for the people. It is about time they shared a little more of the suburban roads.

I can tell the mayor of Windsor that there are two places he had better start looking at very fast or he may have a little bit of—I am not sure we are going to have any kind of confrontation, but from watching television on Sunday night, I wouldn't be surprised if they put up a few roadblocks to stop all those dirty garbage trucks and the papers and everything else that go with the garbage and blow all around Maidstone township.

Mr. Roy: You don't have to take that kind of abuse.

Mr. Charlton: I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. Reed: It will be the first time in NDP history.

Mr. Charlton: I don't want to have to rub things in for too long. I just want to say that I am happy to see this bill here this afternoon. I am very proud of the efforts this caucus made to help this happen. I am having some difficulty understanding the position the Liberal caucus is taking this afternoon, in fact a great deal of difficulty.

Mr. Bradley: You always have difficulty understanding other caucuses.

Mr. Ruston: You have difficulty understanding, period.

Mr. Charlton: The member for St. Catharines, for example, has been complaining in his own municipality about how St. Catharines isn't going to get any money this year.

Mr. Bradley: Are you supporting us now?

Mr. Charlton: What is painfully obvious about that complaint and what is painfully strange about it is that if the Liberal caucus had supported our amendment in the fall of 1977, the first fall that I was here, St. Catharines would be in a position of getting full equalization this year.

Mr. Bradley: No, we would have got nothing one year earlier.

Mr. Charlton: They are not, because the government party and the Liberal Party didn't see fit to remove the freeze on equalization in 1977. It seems strange to me that we are all here applauding this action this afternoon when on at least two occasions in this House that I can recall since I was elected, members of the government party and members of the Liberal caucus got up and spoke very adamantly and very strongly against removing the freeze because of the chaos they claimed it would cause.

Mr. Wildman: That's right.

Mr. Charlton: Now we are here applauding it as if we had all been for it all the time. It just seems to me it should be made quite clear that, although we have this bill here this afternoon as a government bill, it didn't come easily and the government didn't present it all that willingly and not even on the first shot around.

I myself worked extremely hard over the past summer and last fall discussing the possibilities with the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck). It wasn't until the very last minute the Minister of Revenue admitted his willingness to deal with this particular line of action we are dealing with here tonight.

[4:30]

Mr. Bradley: Pressure from the Liberal caucus.

Mr. Charlton: We are also in the position—although they didn't come out against it this year—of having a great deal of difficulty in convincing the Liberal caucus that they should have supported the amendment we were prepared to propose this year—

Mr. Swart: Again:

Mr. Charlton:—again, for the third time—if the government had not finally come forward with its own amendment. I think it should just be made very clear that none of these actions we're all applauding here today came very easily from the government party. Certainly, they weren't supported immediately and forcibly by the members of the Liberal caucus. The complaints some of them are making here today, in reality lie on their own shoulders. I just wish that on occasion people would have the guts to let people know why things really happen around this province.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, our first regret in the city of St. Catharines—and I'm sure this is shared by some of the other munic-

ipalities perhaps—is the fact that we did not have an earlier decision on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Walker: You are wearing a button. What does that say?

Mr. Bradley: We know that municipalities across the province attempt to do some preliminary work, in terms of striking their budgets even in January and February. Certainly, they are well into them in March and April. We were hopeful that a decision on at least the interim payments would have been forthcoming earlier, in order to facilitate some of that budgetary planning.

In St. Catharines, strangely enough, we were often at odds with the former provincial Treasurer and some of the policies he implemented in the Niagara Peninsula, particularly as they affected the constituency of St. Catharines. When the new Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs visited us recently, I found myself in the unique position of agreeing with the former provincial Treasurer, and disagreeing with the new Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, as to the formula to be applied, recognizing that the new minister has used a formula he feels is fair and equitable.

I never did feel I would come to the day when I would be casting my lot with Mr. McKeough. However, on this occasion, the figures provided—particularly those concerning Windsor and Sarnia—led us to believe that perhaps the city of St. Catharines would be the recipient of some \$1,200,000 per year and, therefore, that a pro-rated interim payment might be forthcoming from the province. So naturally, we were disappointed when we found that not this formula but a new formula was to be used.

Our disappointment naturally was the joy of other municipalities. I'm sure the member for Welland-Thorold is delighted with the fact that both Welland and Thorold are to benefit from the new formula. One wonders whether, after all these years, he has been able to cultivate the kind of rapport with the government that has enabled it to bring forth a formula that would benefit his constituencies to such an extent. Of course, we recognize that's probably not the case.

Mr. Cooke: Just good representation.

Mr. Bradley: So we were disappointed that the cupboard was bare when it came to the city of St. Catharines, in terms of that interim payment.

We recognize, and the minister was kind enough to point this out on the occasion of his visit, that not all the moneys were used. If certain municipalities across the province

are able to present compelling cases to the province for use of those leftover funds and justify their cases in an appropriate manner, such funds might be forthcoming. We're just a little bit encouraged by that and happy that the minister was able to provide this information on that occasion.

I know the member for Brock (Mr. Welch), who shares at least part of the city of St. Catharines with me in terms of representation, was making representations through cabinet channels while I was making representations on the other side. At least, he asked me to say that during my remarks.

We recognize on this side of the House, as I'm sure many members of the government do too, that municipalities—and the reason we like to see these interim payments is as a shot in the arm—municipalities in this particular year, and certainly last year, are facing great difficulties in terms of deciding to increase the property tax—which most people consider to be the most regressive kind of tax available to us and which is the only form of tax available to municipalities—or being forced to cut back what some consider to be essential services because of the lack of the level of provincial funding that they would like to see.

For instance—and, Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me for one sentence in varying from the bill—it is my understanding that the per capita grant to libraries is frozen again this year and that the only way that municipalities can gain further revenues in this regard is through an increase in population. We see not necessarily what one would call cutbacks; not the kind of increases that we would need in municipalities at least to keep up with the rate of inflation or even just below the rate of inflation.

I am optimistic in the second aspect. The first aspect I mentioned was those extra funds which the minister indicated are available.

The second aspect, and perhaps in the long run the most important aspect, is—we cannot say the thawing of the factors—the unfreezing of the factors that has taken place which will enable, at long last, the various municipalities across the province to receive the appropriate amount in resource equalization grants. We see this as being a very positive step, disappointed as we are that we are not receiving some of the interim payments.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few short comments, but I suppose my opening comment should be that the wheel that squeaks the most gets the most grease. Perhaps I can apply that saying to some of the municipalities in this bill that

will receive additional resource equalization grants.

I am concerned about the formula that is presented in Bill 18. As I look at the bill and the municipalities within the regional municipality of Niagara that will be receiving additional grants related to Bill 18, I do not know whether I can justify the minister's moving in this direction. As I recall the implementation of regional government in Niagara and the bill that established the regional municipality of Niagara, one of my comments at the time the bill was introduced was that revaluation of assessment was necessary before we entered into regional government.

I can recall my days on Welland county council, and we had difficulties, as the member for Essex North has mentioned, relating to suburban roads. At different times, the chairmen of the Welland county roads committee questioned the share that the city of Welland was contributing to the county, because we did not have a true picture of the assessment in the city of Welland.

At that particular time I thought the county assessment was perhaps one of the best in Ontario. We had an exceptionally good county assessor, Mr. Ralph Wilson, who I think is with the department at the present time. We often questioned this matter of assessment. We tried to compare certain houses within the city of Welland with houses of similar nature and construction in other parts of the county, but we could not get a clear picture. We had problems with one or two municipalities.

The point I raise with the minister is this: Equalized assessment apparently is based upon the principle that industry, say, should pay some portion of it. As I look at the present assessment in the city of Welland—I am glad the minister lifted the ban on it—I hope we will have revaluation of assessment throughout the region. I think there are many municipalities that are handicapped by the freeze on assessment, or reassessment, throughout the region.

Mr. Swart: Then why did you vote to lift the freeze in 1977?

Mr. Haggerty: Because, under section 86 of the Assessment Act, we said it was going to cause some difficulties in certain municipalities throughout Ontario, and that has come to the forefront already. We can take Hamilton—

Mr. Swart: What has section 86 got to do with the freeze on assessment?

Mr. Haggerty: It relates to assessment, if the member isn't quite aware of it, and that is the point I am trying to state. There is

inequity in assessment as it relates to equalization grants; I am aware of that. All I am suggesting to the minister is I feel, or in my opinion, although the cities of Welland and St. Catharines did receive additional grants, I think he is going to cause injustice to other communities within that region. I can think of the city of Port Colborne and their tax base, as it relates to residential and business, or commercial, or industry; and the town of Fort Erie, on the same basis. They don't have the same wealth of industrial assessment as Welland or St. Catharines.

When he brings in a bill like this he is saying, "Here, we are going to apply additional grants, additional subsidy to that municipality." I question whether it is justified. As I said before, the wheel that squeaks the loudest gets the most grease, I guess. In this particular instance, I feel this is what has happened.

I suggest before any additional equalization grant is provided to the communities of Ontario, he should take a close look at the assessment practices carried on and look at other assessments within that region or within that county structure. There is an injustice there and as my colleague says about Windsor, perhaps with their tax base they don't require the additional unconditional grants. All I am saying is I think he has opened the door now and he had better take a close look at revaluation of assessment.

The first mistake he made was freezing assessments. He has got a tiger by the horns here, I will tell the House right now, because he doesn't know what to do with the freezing of assessments.

Mr. Ruston: How do you get a tiger by the horns?

Mr. Haggerty: Well, there is a lot of bull that goes behind it and that is what we have heard over the last 10 years here in the Legislature. He has created a monster there and he doesn't know what to do with it.

Mr. Ruston: That is right.

Mr. Haggerty: The whole crunch of this thing is he doesn't know what to do with it. By changing this bill now—the minister is smiling perhaps at that comment—he has got a problem and it is causing unjust inequity in assessment in communities throughout Ontario.

I am all for market value assessment and there is no reason they can't move in this direction. They will have to move with some caution, there is no doubt about it, because the impact is going to be tremendous to certain taxpayers in communities in the province. It is his responsibility as to how

he is going to tackle it and what he is going to do with it, but he has created that monster. I suggest to him the bill may mean great things for the city of Welland or the city of St. Catharines, but I can tell him there are other inequities within that region.

Mr. Swart: Welland and Thorold, Ray; St. Catharines didn't get any.

Mr. Haggerty: There are other municipalities that pay a large apportionment of the cost of regional government in Niagara that can't well afford it without a good sound tax base and they don't have it. Let's take a good look at this thing; let's take a look at revaluation of assessment within the regional municipality of Niagara. I have seen so many reports on it and so many different approaches to it, no wonder the minister is confused, or his predecessor was, because he didn't know in which direction to go.

Mr. Swart: He went the right direction—out.

Mr. Haggerty: He can put anything in that computer and come up with an answer, but is it the right one? I give the member for Welland-Thorold credit for bulldogging the minister into bringing something to that area, but I think there are other communities within that region that perhaps need increased unconditional grants.

Mr. Wildman: They need better representation.

Mr. Haggerty: I suggest the minister look into that area. Again, I suggest that before he implements any restructuring of county government, revaluation of assessment should be the top priority so we can correct the problem there before it gets out of hand as it has now in different municipalities within a region or a county.

[4:45]

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to tell my friend, the member for St. Catharines, the member for Brock speaks with me on his behalf quite regularly at quite great length. But he is also I think quite capable of speaking on behalf of the region. I think the message from the Niagara region reaches me from all sources.

I was most pleased by my visit there to learn about some of the problems in the Niagara region. I am sure my friend from Welland-Thorold probably will disagree but I learned one of the major needs in the Niagara region is for an economic study on industrial development and growth.

Mr. Swart: I do not disagree with you at all. Bring in the study and bring in the industries.

Hon. Mr. Wells: For too long all of us here have been led to believe that whole region was nothing but tender fruit and grape-vines. While we want to preserve those, we sure need industry in that region, and I told them we have to do something about that.

Mr. Swart: I am sure you never thought all the Niagara Peninsula was grapes and peaches.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. Mackenzie: The problem is whenever you want to develop something it is on the fruit land.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly the key message to me was that the problems of the region of Niagara could be greatly alleviated by a little industrial development and growth down there. I am certainly going to do what I can to see that can happen.

Mr. Haggerty: It is all taking place in Welland-Thorold and in St. Catharines.

Mr. Mackenzie: It is all taking place on good fruit land.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In general terms, dealing with some of the things concerning transfers to municipalities—and of course this bill is transferring more money to municipalities—the statement the member for Waterloo North read from the Association of Municipalities of Ontario I thought was a rather ill-conceived document they sent to us. I appreciate they are probably playing a little politics with us too. But we discussed it at length at the final arrangements subcommittee of the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee.

I am sure my friend also knows the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee presented what I thought was a very reasoned response to our statement this year. We indicated we were going to achieve transfer payments at around the same percentage of growth and direct operating expenses of this government, which is five per cent. That is what we told them. They came back to us and said—

Mr. Swart: Read the statement Miller made.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am talking about the statement I made to them. The statement I made said it would be about the same. They said to us, "You increase your grants to us by about the same percentage as you are going to increase your own spending."

(The fact of the matter is the actual percentage increase in transfers to municipalities will not be determined until we are further into this year. I would say when we table our document here in a few days on

financial assistance to municipalities the growth rate may be around 5.3 per cent. When the year is out it may be closer to six per cent; it may be right at five per cent. The fact of the matter is the municipal liaison committee said to us, "Make it six per cent or add another \$16,000,000." We are only talking about \$16,000,000 difference between the five and the six per cent in grants to municipalities, excluding school boards.

As I am pointing out to the members now, when all is said and done and the books are balanced, we may be very close. So really the kind of statement that AMO made to us I thought was not particularly called for. Maybe they made it for their own political reasons; I accept that; we all make those kinds of statements. We have read it, I have responded to it. I am not going to read into the record my letter which I have written to about 253 municipalities that sent me a copy of the AMO statement and said, "What about it?"

The fact still stands, notwithstanding that statement, that we do have a long-term fiscal arrangement subcommittee meeting and AMO and the other municipal associations are taking part under the aegis of the municipal liaison committee. We are talking about long-term fiscal arrangements. We are talking about how the province and the municipalities can share revenue. I hope that out of that is going to come some new arrangement.

Notwithstanding that kind of statement there is a high degree of co-operation and co-ordination going on between ourselves and the municipalities. This bill represents a part of that process.

The member for Welland-Thorold asked why equalization factors were frozen in 1970. The equalization factors, as I am told, were not very accurate. Those that were in place in 1970 were certainly not very accurate, compared to market value assessment. Because at that time we embarked upon the kind of work that would perhaps lead to the imposition of market value assessment, it was felt that the whole process could carry on best if the factors were frozen, reassessment took place and then the whole thing was assessed and put in place.

As we all know, history shows us that didn't happen. The process of reassessment and of consideration of market value assessment was put off, year by year, and the factors remained frozen. That brought us to last fall, when it was decided that, once the imposition of market value assessment had been put on the shelf, so to speak, as a massive provincial project that would occur all at once, once that was put to rest last

summer, the idea of unfreezing those factors certainly had to come to the fore, as it did.

My colleague the Minister of Revenue brought forward certain proposals to unfreeze the factors. We looked at using new factors for the year 1979, but it was obviously too late to introduce them in a proper manner and to have them in place for the taxation and apportionment system that would be used in 1979. So the announcement was made that we would bring in new factors this year, in 1979, allow for all the processes that will occur, such as appeals, et cetera, and then have those factors in place for 1980. That is what is going to happen. Those factors will be announced very shortly—by July—and then they will be used for 1980.

I want to read again, in case the members have forgotten it, one of the paragraphs from the Minister of Revenue's statement when he made that announcement. He said: "Even though the use of the new factors will cause a redistribution of grants among municipalities and school boards—there, of course, would be no point in using them if there were no redistribution—no municipality or school board will receive less grant in 1980 because of the introduction of new factors." I think it is important to remember that: no municipality or school board is going to receive less grant in 1980 because of the introduction of the new factors which will be in place.

Mr. Epp: In dollars, but not in per cent.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am talking about less grant, in dollars, in 1980. Let's remember that. That's the pledge we put in with the introduction of the new factors, which the members will have a chance to see and we will all have a chance to talk about as the year unfolds.

That being in place, we decided that because there certainly were some inequities, some perceived inequities, we should put in at least an ad hoc program for this year to bridge the gap. That is what we are talking about in this bill, an ad hoc program to bridge the gap until this plan comes in, and remembering the pledge we have made as far as this plan is concerned. Here we have the legislative authority to pay some ad hoc grants to municipalities that have been affected because of the frozen factors.

I was asked how we arrived at the municipalities that would get some of the money that was available this year for the ad hoc grants. I think it was outlined in the statement I sent around when we sent the list

of the 49—and it's 49, not 39—municipalities. It may be that the last page of the copy of the statement which the member for Waterloo North has is missing; there are 39 on the first two, and then there are some on the last page. If the member has the ones from Stormont down to Waterloo, he should get 49.

On the statement we sent around when we announced these around the middle of March, the members will find the explanation of how we arrived at who would receive the money and how it would be allotted. In order to assess the impact, we calculated the 1979 resource equalization grants entitlements on the basis of the regulations. Then we compared that figure with what would have been payable had the 1978 local assessment been based on the 1975 market value, which is the latest market value data that the Ministry of Revenue's assessment department has available.

We decided there was justification for a special payment to those municipalities where the increase in the grants—that is, the increase in the grants using the 1975 market value figures over what was used, which is the normal way of calculating the resource equalization grants—would have reduced the 1978 levy by eight per cent or more. All those municipalities where, if they had got the difference, the levy would have been reduced by eight per cent or more were then considered eligible.

Having by means of this formula determined the municipalities eligible for special payments, in order to fit in with the money which we had available—which was not an unlimited amount and was in fact a set amount of money—it was then further decided that the grant would be one third of the potential gain.

When the city of Sarnia says, for instance, that the \$411,000 it received is not what it was expecting and quotes a larger figure, it actually is a third of the amount it would have gained had we been using the market value assessment figure. In the same vein, the \$3,000,000 that Windsor got would have been three times that or \$9,000,000, which is about the figure that the mayor constantly quotes to us as being the amount it is losing because the new factors are not there.

When one applies the formulas we have applied, one will see that we have used a fairly equitable system with a special notching provision so that at the bottom of the list there weren't some who gained a lot more than those which would have been

immediately below the eight per cent cutoff figure. By using that special formula there, we arrived at 49 municipalities that could share in the roughly \$6,600,000 we had available.

It may not be the world's most perfect system, but it's the best system we have been able to figure out to distribute \$6,600,000 on an ad hoc basis in a program that is only for one year and which will not be necessary next year because of the unfrozen factors in the commitment that we have given.

So I think this bill is equitable and fair. I know there are areas like St. Catharines that really felt, because of commitments or statements that were made, particularly by my predecessor, that they were entitled to something, but just happen to fall below the level in the formula. In the St. Catharines case, it is quite simple, as I explained at the time. The eight per cent cut off meant that St. Catharines, which was at about a five per cent figure, just didn't qualify. Conversely, we had the mayors of Thorold and Welland coming and asking me why they were getting money. They somehow didn't

seem to realize that they were entitled to it. However, I must tell the honourable members that nobody has sent it back.

Mr. Swart: Before the minister sits down, what was the basis for the equalization factors he used?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The basis was 1975 market value data. We used actual 1975 market value data and used that as the basis for the equalization factors that were used, as opposed to the 1970 ones which are used to calculate the resource equalization grant at the present time, and then we took the difference.

I am happy that the members are supporting this bill. If we can pass it fairly expeditiously now, we can get out the money which has been promised to the 49 municipalities that will share in this special grant.

Motion agreed to.

Third reading also agreed to on motion.

Mr. Speaker: Since we've concluded this afternoon's business, we're going to call it six o'clock. We will resume at eight o'clock.

The House recessed at 5 p.m.

APPENDIX
(See page 892)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
ON NOTICE PAPER

TRANSLATION BUREAU

95. **Mr. Grande:** Will the Ministry of Culture and Recreation provide the following details of the translation bureau of the ministry: What languages are contracted out? What languages are translated by the bureau's staff? What percentage of the bureau's budget is spent on free translation services to newcomers? What percentage of the bureau's budget is used for translation of English into French and French into English? [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Baetz: All languages not covered by bureau staff are contracted out.

Languages translated by the bureau's staff are: French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Russian, Italian, Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian, plus some Latin, Bulgarian, Roumanian, Polish, Ukrainian and Arabic.

Based on the current level of service:

Multilingual and French/English (free service to newcomers)	8.79%
Multilingual (to government ministries)	3.18%
French/English (government)	3.81%
English/French (exclusively government)	76.43%
General administration	7.79%
	<u>100.00%</u>

AID TO MULTICULTURAL GROUPS

96. **Mr. Grande:** Will the ministry table a list of all groups to which consultative and financial assistance was given for the purpose of the promotion and advancement of multiculturalism in Ontario in 1978/1979 fiscal year? [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Baetz: The ministry has been requested to table a list of all groups which have received consultative and financial assistance in fiscal 1978/79 "for the purpose of promotion and advancement of multiculturalism."

It is the view of the ministry that multiculturalism—namely, the fact that Ontario's population is composed of individuals and groups of diverse ethnocultural backgrounds—is now and has for a very long time, been a characteristic of the society of this province. It is therefore impossible to identify programs

intended to promote and advance what is already present.

The ministry does, however, have programs in place which are in response to the multi-cultural nature of Ontario's population. These would include provision of consultative and financial assistance on the part of several divisions and agencies directly, and indirectly by ministry-supported bodies. They would also take place province-wide.

It is not practicable to table the requested data because of the sheer volume being sought. The ministry would be pleased to supply information regarding consultative and financial assistance if the specific area or areas in which the honourable member is interested could be identified with greater precision.

USE OF HERBICIDES
AND PESTICIDES

99. **Ms. Bryden:** Would the Ministry of the Environment provide the House with figures, for the four most recent years for which they can be compiled, on the amount by active ingredient of each of the following herbicides which was applied in Ontario: 2,4-D and 2,4-DP; 2,4,5-T and 2,4,5-TP; other phenoxy herbicides; paraquat; atrazine? Would the minister further provide, for each herbicide in each year, a breakdown by method of application and agricultural versus non-agricultural use? [Tabled March 27, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Parrott: In recognition of the social, health and economic benefits of the use of pesticides and of the risks associated with some of these products because of their purpose and nature, Ontario has developed a control program that complements federal activities and responsibilities. All pesticide products offered for sale or use in Canada must be registered by Agriculture Canada. The registration process requires the applicant to provide detailed information on the toxicity of the active ingredients and other formulation compounds, on the efficiency of the product on target species, on the impact on the environment and on persistence as well as on proposed use patterns and related environmental impact. The application and data are thoroughly scrutinized by a multi-disciplinary group of experts before acceptance for registration.

Ontario complements and builds onto the federal process using a licensing and classification system to extend control. It is a responsibility of the Ontario Pesticides Ad-

visory Committee to assess need, efficiency and risk for each product and recommend a classification that regulates transport, sale, availability and use. Some products present no risk and may be sold in grocery stores and are available to all persons. Other products must be securely stored, are available only to a limited group or may require a specific use permit.

The availability of records on use is dependent upon the permit system. Few of the products for which data is requested are subject to permit and therefore limited data has been assembled within the ministry.

Atrazine and paraquat are in a classification that limits availability to licensed applicators and to farmers. Since permits are not required, data on use is therefore not available. Some formulations of paraquat are available to the homeowner because the concentration of active ingredient is very low and the package small.

There are several forms of the active ingredient for the phenoxy herbicides, 2,4-D, 2,4-DB, 2,4,5-T, 2,4,5-TP, MCPA and MCPB which results in placement of each product in three classes. Those having a high volatile ester form are available by permit only. No permits have been issued for these. Those having a low volatile ester form are available to farmers and licensed applicators without permit. Aerial and aquatic applications of this form require a use permit. Those having an amine form, and the trend has been to this form, are available to the public on the basis that they are effective and safe.

No permits have been issued for any formulation of 2,4-DB or 2,4,5-TP.

Figures available from the permit files for other phenoxy herbicides are listed in the attached table.

It should be noted that through a recent amendment to the regulations under the Pesticides Act, 1973, all formulations of the two herbicides—2,4,5-T and 2,4,5-TP—are now subject to specific use permits.

Quantities of Active Ingredients of
Phenoxy Herbicides from Use Permits
(in kg)

		Agric. (1)	Non Agric. (2)	Aquatic
1975	2,4-D	243	33,277	55
	2,4,5-T	0	8.16	0
	MCPA	163	0	0
	MCPB	50	0	0
1976	2,4-D	0	81,583	161
	2,4,5-T	0	1.81	0
	MCPA	0	0	0
	MCPB	2,023	0	0
1977	2,4-D	0	91,771	795
	2,4,5-T	0	0	0
	MCPA	0	0	0
	MCPB	0	0	0
1978	2,4-D	139	63,965	331
	2,4,5-T	139	5,442	0
	MCPA	0	0	0
	MCPB	0	0	0

(1) All aerial application.

(2) Aerial except for 2,4-D which includes ground application of mixtures requiring permits because of application in combination with picloram.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 10, 1979

Disposal of hazardous wastes, statement by Mr. Auld	879
Hydro load forecasts, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. J. Reed, Ms. Gigantes	880
Transportation services for handicapped, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. McClellan	881
Comfort allowances, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. McClellan	881
Darlington nuclear plant, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Cassidy	883
Health services, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy	883
Provincial parks, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Conway, Mr. Wildman	884
Disposal of hazardous wastes, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds	884
Discrimination in hiring, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Eaton	885
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith	885
Teacher-board dispute, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. G. I. Miller	886
Continuous Colour Coat Limited, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Philip	886
Bradley-Georgetown hydro corridor, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. J. Reed	887
Environmental emergencies, questions of Mr. Parrott: Ms. Bryden	888
Road construction, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Roy	888
Heritage language program, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Grande	889
Disaster relief assistance, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Mancini, Mr. Nixon	890
Election expenses, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. MacDonald	890
Legislative pages, Mr. Speaker	891
Fires Extinguishment Repeal Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	891
Vacant Land Cultivation Repeal Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	891
Fire Guardians Repeal Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	891
Local Improvement Amendment Act, Mr. Wells, first reading	892
Tabling answers to questions 95, 96 and 99 on Notice Paper, Mr. Welch	892
Ministry of Transportation and Communications Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second and third readings	892
Statute Labour Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second and third readings	892
Local Roads Boards Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second and third readings	893
Airports Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second and third readings	893
Ontario Unconditional Grants Amendment Act, second and third readings	894

Recess	909
Appendix, answers to questions on Notice Paper	910
Translation bureau, questions of Mr. Baetz: Mr. Grande	910
Aid to multicultural groups, question of Mr. Baetz: Mr. Grande	910
Use of herbicides and pesticides, questions of Mr. Parrott: Ms. Bryden	910

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
Baetz, Hon. R. C.; Minister of Culture and Recreation (Ottawa West PC)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Charlton, B. (Hamilton Mountain NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
Epp, H. (Waterloo North L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hennessy, M. (Fort William PC)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Van Horne, R. (London North L)
Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)



No. 21

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 10, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

BUDGET RESOLUTION

Hon. F. S. Miller moved that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Applause.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I wish I could count on the same response after I speak, Mr. Speaker.

As I look around me and before I start my prepared text, I feel very honoured to see two of my friends and former Treasurers in the audience, Mr. Jim Allan and Mr. John White, who are in the balcony.

Mr. Sargent: What about Gordon Sinclair?

Mr. Roy: Where's Darcy McKeough?

Hon. F. S. Miller: He is a private operator. He is out earning money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That we are going to tax.

Mr. MacDonald: Where is the Treasurer's haberdasher?

BUDGET STATEMENT

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, this evening I am pleased to present to you and to the members my first budget. It's an honour to serve as Treasurer of Ontario and, under the leadership of the Premier (Mr. Davis), to share with my colleagues the opportunity to mould the future of this great province.

In carrying out the responsibilities of the Treasurer of Ontario, my goal is clear: to continue the outstanding achievements which have benefited this province so greatly in order to guarantee future employment, prosperity and happiness for our citizens.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You can at least look happy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Smile over there.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Without question, the most important problem facing Ontario today is the need to create more jobs. The employment creation record of the province over the past few years has been outstanding. But because our labour force is growing so quickly—more than three times as quickly as Great Britain's or Germany's—we must further strengthen our efforts so that all new

entrants to the labour force find employment.

In creating jobs, we must not fan the flames of inflation. If we do so, we will do lasting damage to our economic prospects. While employment problems affect some people, inflation affects everyone. It is especially hard on the elderly and those on fixed incomes.

When I sat down to prepare this budget, the issues of unemployment and inflation were the first priorities I had to face. I realized that Ontario was subject to national and international forces that strongly influence our economy. No one government can single-handedly wipe out inflation and unemployment. Also, while much of the responsibility for tackling these problems lies with the federal government, Ontario can and must provide responsible leadership and policy initiatives that will help create jobs and reduce inflation. I believe that the proposals I will place before you tonight will do just that.

The path to greater economic prosperity in Ontario is clear. Only by stimulating the private sector can we create lasting jobs and growing incomes for our citizens. That is also the only way for us to provide the taxable resources so essential to provide the high standard of public services our citizens have come to expect. The efforts of this government must be concentrated on making sure that we create the confidence and the atmosphere needed for private sector investment in Ontario.

The private sector flourishes best with a minimum of government regulation. In fact, one of the main reasons prompting me to enter politics was my perception as a small businessman of the need to encourage government to lighten the burden of regulation and interference on the business community in Ontario. To be candid, I also believe that businesses should prosper without a lot of government financial concessions. But we do not set the international rules of the game. When other jurisdictions are aggressively competing for new investment, we cannot bury our heads in the sand and let job opportunities slip outside Canadian borders into other countries. We must take effective action to make sure that the Ontario economy is secure.

In the weeks before preparing this budget, I met with many individuals and groups: small businessmen, consumers, corporations, union representatives, bankers and farmers. The meetings were very useful. I learned a great deal about the individual problems of each group. I want to thank them for the time they took to give me the benefit of their thinking about our economy and about our way of life. I can assure them all that I have listened to their recommendations very carefully and have weighed them while preparing this budget.

One point came up repeatedly in these conversations. If government keeps its own house in order, maintains a positive climate for the development of the private sector and aims for reasonable cost and salary increases, the outlook for our continued prosperity is very bright.

This government wholeheartedly shares those opinions. Accordingly, this budget proposes to maintain a high quality of public services in Ontario; to help create more jobs; to provide incentives for economic growth and small business development; to continue our sound management of provincial spending, thereby helping to contain inflation; and to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Bradley: You need water after that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Who says it's water?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do. So there.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's water.

Mr. Conway: Tell us you can turn water into wine.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I hope the television sets are not colour sets, because I am blushing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Who could tell against your jacket?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the interjections are supposed to come from the opposite side of the House.

Mr. Foulds: That's how bad your budget is.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They don't know what's in it yet.

Before outlining specific measures to achieve these objectives, I would like to review briefly the economic outlook for the province.

Ontario's economy continued to perform well in 1978. Growth was 3.6 per cent in real terms and a record 133,000 more people were employed in Ontario than the year before, on average. All of these jobs were created in the private sector. This was an outstanding accomplishment by any standard. I was particularly encouraged by the

fact that our manufacturing output growth accelerated by almost one full percentage point, to 4.8 per cent, and 36,000 new jobs were created in manufacturing. In part, our economic performance was assisted by the lower value of the Canadian dollar, which improved our export competitiveness, as well as by the temporary reduction in retail sales tax.

There were disappointments in the year as well. Because of the rapid growth in the number of young people entering the labour force, an unacceptably high level of unemployment has persisted. While this surge will pass in two or three years, currently almost 75 per cent of the unemployed in Ontario are young people under 25 or adult women. Reducing the rate of unemployment is a major challenge for all governments. Comparatively speaking, however, the Ontario record of job creation has been outstanding.

Turning to the outlook, I have noted that many economists believe that the Canadian and Ontario economies will grow at a modestly slower rate this year. I have included a forecast for 1979 that reflects a consensus of economic forecasters, both inside and outside government. It calls for a slight moderation in the rate of real growth in Ontario to 3.3 per cent. This moderation in growth is predicated on the assumption the United States economy will experience some slowing down during 1979. Nevertheless, we can look forward to seeing well over 100,000 new jobs created in Ontario this year.

I would like to observe that this year—and it is almost our centennial year in this sense—Ontario's gross provincial product will, for the first time, exceed \$100,000,000,000. This landmark takes on even more significance when one realizes Ontario's economy has tripled since 1969. As a matter of fact, I look back to 1953 and the Ontario economy was just under \$10,000,000,000 in that year, so in 26 years it has gone up 10 times. They are all Conservative years too.

An hon. member: Most of it in price increases.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If the federal friends of members opposite could get a deficit in line with ours they would be proud.

Mr. Conway: Wait until Maureen gives them \$7,300,000,000 extra.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's more than Margaret does for Pierre.

Ms. Gigantes: You are stupid.

Hon. F. S. Miller: At this point I would draw the attention of the members to budget paper A, which provides a thorough review of the performance of the Ontario economy through the 1970s and looks at our prospects for the next decade.

I noted with interest the federal Minister of Finance in his November budget referred to a recent survey which showed 300 large corporations in Canada are planning to increase their spending on plant and equipment this year by an average of eight per cent in real terms.

I have also had a survey conducted of 100 corporations in Ontario and that indicates that Ontario business is moving ahead with expansion plans at a healthy pace.

Mr. Foulds: What are the details?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am confident, as we continue to provide a sound climate for investment in Ontario, our citizens will reap the benefits of better jobs and higher incomes.

Mr. Warner: No one believes you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In fact, I would, personally, not be surprised if the forecasters have underestimated growth in 1979. It may turn out, in my opinion it will turn out, to be a year of better economic performance than 1978. This growth-oriented budget is designed to make this happen.

I have emphasized the need to improve the climate for employment growth in investment in Ontario. We must continue to seek new ways to help our people, especially the young, to find lasting and rewarding employment. To do this, the government of Ontario has led the way with programs such as the Ontario Career Action Program and the Ontario Youth Employment Program. Last week I announced the details of OYEP for 1979.

Mr. Wildman: Is that lasting and rewarding employment?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My statement contains a table showing the funding and job creation levels of Ontario's programs for youth employment in 1979-80. In total we will be spending \$79,000,000 and creating directly some 70,000 jobs this year for young people in Ontario.

When we look at the problem of unemployment, we are confronted with the paradox that many job vacancies exist while a large number of people are seeking work. During my pre-budget consultations, both employers and union representatives told me of their concerns about the shortage of skilled workers. In fact in some parts of our prov-

ince I am told machines are lying idle because there is no one to operate them.

Mr. M. Davidson: Because you never trained anybody.

[8:15]

Hon. F. S. Miller: Some of us are untrainable, and I am just hearing from one.

My colleagues, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie), are developing long-term measures which will improve the situation through better training and closer co-ordination among unions, employers, job seekers, and the educational system.

We will support these efforts with a new program to assist employers directly to hire and train people in areas of critical skill shortages. This program will be financed through the employment development fund which I will describe shortly.

The details of this new thrust for skilled training will be announced later in the session, but I'm convinced labour and industry leaders will co-operate with each other and with the government to design and carry out practical skill training programs.

In preparing this budget I conducted a thorough review of our taxation system to see what changes might be made to stimulate business development and enhance confidence. In this regard, I would direct the members' attention to budget paper B, which discusses the appropriate fiscal policy for today's economy and looks at the changing role of fiscal policy over the next decade.

At this stage, I don't believe any kind of across-the-board tax cut would be justified, but I do believe that some taxes bear particularly heavily on small businesses—and generally hurt the climate of confidence in the province.

Mr. Sargent: This is the year you were going to balance the budget.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, no; the member wasn't listening.

Ms. Gigantes: Next year, Eddie.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'd like to outline additional incentives to create jobs and improve our economic performance. In 1969, the honourable Charles MacNaughton, then Treasurer, observed that the introduction of capital gains tax would gradually eliminate the need for succession duties and gift taxes in Ontario. As revenues from capital gains increased, Ontario would be able to phase out succession duties and so avoid what many consider to be double taxation.

At the time, the province was prepared to vacate the succession duty field in return for

a share of the federal estate tax. The federal government, however, unilaterally abandoned the estate taxation in 1971 when it introduced the capital gains tax. The province, therefore, continued to levy succession duties and gift taxes, although its long-run objective was to get rid of these taxes. Over the past seven years we've progressively reduced the burden of succession duties. But meanwhile, our sister provinces have vacated the field one by one, leaving only Ontario and Quebec.

I am convinced that the continuation of this tax is hurting our economic performance and costing us jobs. Business people making investment decisions, particularly as to location, are bound to take into consideration the tax position of their estates in Ontario. Succession duties and gift taxes have been a source of great concern to farmers and small business owners in Ontario. In spite of the fact that less than three per cent of estates in Ontario are subject to tax there is a widespread opinion the successors of the average citizen will be subject to tax.

For estates which are taxable, complex and costly legal procedures are involved to keep businesses within families. As well, individuals often experience great difficulty in disposing of assets so that they may pay duties. I'm satisfied the present combination of other taxes provides government with an adequate return as wealth is accumulated. As of midnight tonight, there will be no succession duty or gift taxation in Ontario.

Interjection.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Gordon, last till midnight. Pardon me, the House leader has adjusted it to one minute after.

Later I will be introducing bills to repeal the Succession Duty Act and the Gift Tax Act effective with respect to deaths or gifts occurring after midnight, April 10, 1979. I should point out that the legislation will continue to apply to deaths occurring and gifts made up to midnight this day.

I estimate that the annual revenue loss from this change eventually will amount to some \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 a year; however, in this fiscal year, the revenue loss will be \$28,000,000.

It is much more difficult to estimate the revenue gains and employment gains that will occur in Ontario due to the elimination of succession duties. However, I am satisfied that on balance Ontario will profit in many ways from this decision. Our citizens will have one less burdensome concern to deal with in planning their private lives.

In addition, I heard the lawyers were a bit slack this week, and it will make for a lot of rewriting of wills.

Provincial revenues are bound to increase as investors take advantage of this decision.

I would now like to turn to the mining industry. The importance of mining in Ontario is unquestioned. Almost 20 per cent of Ontario's dollar earnings from exports are from its mines. Many northern Ontario communities depend entirely upon the mining industry for their employment. I am disturbed that this province has not seen a major new mine brought into operation for some years. Last year the federal government and the provinces reviewed the current situation in the mining industry. This review showed that high marginal tax rates were considered to be one of the most important problems facing the industry.

The members will recall that several beneficial adjustments were made to the Ontario mining tax last year. Tonight I am proposing additional changes to improve further the investment climate for mining in Ontario. First, the top marginal mining tax rate will be reduced from 40 per cent to 30 per cent. Second, the basic exemption from mining tax will be increased from \$100,000 to \$250,000 of mining profits. This latter move will encourage the creation of more small mining companies and assist those already operating.

I am also proposing a modest reduction in the top processing allowance rates. This will bring them more closely into line with those offered elsewhere and will soften the impact of the rate reductions on our revenues. These measures affecting the Ontario mining industry will apply with respect to fiscal years of companies ending after April 10, 1979. Enabling legislation will be introduced tonight by my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld).

I would like to discuss the situation in the province's hospitality industry. This important industry provides employment for over 400,000 people, or about 10 per cent of Ontario's labour force. In 1978, tourist spending in the province exceeded \$5,000,000,000, including \$1,000,000,000 of sales to nonresidents.

Mr. Warner: It would be nice if you would be a tourist.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In this job there is no time.

In the last two years, the government has undertaken to stimulate this industry through the temporary removal of the sales tax on transient accommodation, and other measures. This positive support has helped produce a momentum in the industry that I

believe should be sustained. Accordingly, I propose the following:

First, the sales tax on kitchen machinery and equipment used in restaurants serving the public will be temporarily withdrawn as of midnight tonight. This will provide restaurants with the same kind of exemptions currently available to manufacturers.

Second, purchases of furniture and furnishings for use in the hospitality industry will also be temporarily exempt from the retail sales tax.

These two exemptions will be available until March 31, 1981, and will provide the hospitality industry with an incentive to upgrade and expand its facilities.

Third, the temporary sales tax exemption for transient accommodation that was originally scheduled to expire December 31, 1979, will be extended to March 31, 1981.

The combined additional cost of these measures to stimulate tourism will be \$13,000,000 in this fiscal year and \$45,000,000 on an annual basis.

One of the best incentives for economic development that any government can provide is to manage its spending and its affairs efficiently, and be seen to do so. This province has led the way in Canada in containing public sector spending. A great deal of the credit for this must go to my predecessor, Darcy McKeough.

In the fiscal year just ended, we have held spending below the original estimates for the third year in a row. This year, the estimates provide for an increase in our ongoing expenditure base of only six per cent. When we add the employment development fund supplementary estimates, our total growth rate will be 7.4 per cent. This is still well below the projected growth rate of the economy.

I want to make it abundantly clear what our expenditure control policy is all about. We are not trimming the growth of government spending because we cannot find the money to pay for high rates of growth. Ontario's credit is sound and its economy is strong.

Mr. Swart: There are 319,000 people out of work.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Rather, we believe that the same high quality of our programs can be maintained without excessive cost escalation. We do this by demanding more efficiency, and we are getting it.

Mr. Gregory: You would not know the meaning of that over there.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The government will continue to allocate most of its resources to

areas of high social priority, including health, education and social service institutions. The existing high quality of Ontario's health services is being upgraded with the extension of the home care program for the chronically ill to additional centres in the province. The budget of the Ministry of Community and Social Services has been increased by 6.9 per cent to provide greater emphasis on support services to the elderly and the handicapped. To enhance the participation of the physically handicapped in community activities, the five pilot projects providing special transit services will be made permanent. Additional funding has been made available to extend this program to other municipalities in Ontario.

Ms. Gigantes: What about all those people with estates?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I thought marriage would silence you.

Mr. Foulds: Why?

Mr. Breaugh: I have never seen a plaid sexist pig before.

Ms. Gigantes: Explain that to my husband.

Mr. Martel: The jolly miller.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In case that last remark be misinterpreted, I quickly explain to my wife I did not mean it.

In addition to the measures I have just discussed, I would now like to outline details of another important new program to stimulate the development of our economy. This is the employment development fund announced in the speech from the throne.

The fund will be managed by a committee of ministers called the employment development board, which I shall chair. The Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman) will be the vice-chairman, and his ministry will carry out the administrative functions of the fund. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle) will also be on the board. The major function of the board will be to co-ordinate the government's policies as they relate to providing direct economic development incentives to the private sector. The board will also participate in the development of, and provide funding for, the new job training program to which I referred earlier.

[8:30]

The amount of the fund has been set at \$200,000,000 for 1979-80. I stress that the proceeds from the sale of our shares of Syncrude and of Ontario Mortgage Corporation mortgages, as well as additional revenues the province will raise from the corporate sector, are more than adequate to finance

the employment development fund this year. This means that ordinary taxpayers' dollars are not being diverted away from the normal programs of this government.

To maximize the economic benefit to Ontario of the employment development fund, the board will encourage projects that make a long-term contribution to employment, foster the development of needed job skills, have the potential for significant export development or import replacement, involve the development of new products and processes through Canadian-based innovation and stimulate key industries and regional development.

There are some people who have questioned why we should be giving financial incentives to industry, particularly large and successful firms. Quite frankly, I was one of them. Nevertheless, I have concluded we must follow this course of action. Many jurisdictions are aggressively competing for new investment. This is a challenge we cannot afford to ignore if we are determined that Ontario should have its fair share of new investment. The financial incentives for the automobile and pulp and paper industries will be provided from the employment development fund. Further details on the operation of the fund are provided in appendix C to this statement.

We must recognize that Ontario's pulp and paper industry is facing tough competition. At the same time, the industry is under pressure from this government to clean up its pollution. The facts are simple. If we are going to impose high environmental standards we must recognize the competitive and cyclical environment in which the industry operates. Therefore, it must receive special assistance.

Mr. Cassidy: They didn't even ask for it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I've talked to a lot of workers in towns like Iroquois Falls, workers who follow the party of socialist members opposite, and they think we're right.

Mr. Martel: You're wrong.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You're never going to get another vote in Iroquois Falls.

Mr. Foulds: I'll bet you a dollar.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, who in this assembly prefers the alternatives of continued damage to our environment, or perhaps mill closures and whole towns out of work? Such alternatives simply are not acceptable to this government.

I would now like to turn to the area of small business development. Let me state I am a strong supporter of two principles. First, I believe the future success of our society is

dependent upon the maintenance of a very strong commitment to free enterprise. Second, I believe the bedrock strength of free enterprise lies in private equity investment. Individuals should be encouraged to take risks through the ownership of equity, and hopefully most of them will turn a profit. I make no bones about this, and I say woe betide those who think we can prosper in the future yet give up on those principles.

Mr. Cassidy: Like preaching to the converted.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Ah, they're waking up on the right-hand benches on the left-hand side.

Mr. Eaton: You confused them, Frank.

Mr. Breagh: If you were only a foot taller, Frank, you could get away with this garbage.

Mr. Cassidy: There is no left-hand side of those benches; none left.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Members will recall the government introduced the Venture Investment Corporations Registration Act in 1977 to encourage corporations to increase the supply of venture capital and managerial advice to small business. To be candid, this program has not worked. There appear to be a number of reasons for this. First, the federal government chose not to support the initiative, thereby reducing the tax incentives for investors; second, the incentive excluded individuals; third, some of the provisions in the legislation may have been too restrictive.

I believe it is vitally important to make sure there is a stream of equity capital available to new enterprises. Ideally, the lure of profit in return for risk capital should be enough to attract investors. People today, however, receive such generous tax treatment under the personal income tax for much safer investments, that they are reluctant to invest in new ventures. I believe we must do something about this.

Accordingly, I am proposing to introduce legislation this evening to encourage the development of new ventures in Ontario and to make it more attractive for more people to become directly involved in financing small business and building our economic future. Specifically, I am advancing the following program:

A Small Business Development Corporations Act will replace the existing venture investment corporations legislation. Individuals and corporations investing in small business development corporations, called SBDCs, will receive a share credit from the province equal to 30 per cent of their equity investment. The SBDCs will be empowered to invest in a broad range of new and ex-

panding small business enterprises. This means if an individual purchased \$1,000 worth of equity in an SBDC, the province would refund, directly, \$300 to the private investor.

Mr. Sargent: In the meantime you won't loan them five cents.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Eddie, don't judge us all by your own loan applications.

Mr. Sargent: How did you know?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There's very little we don't know. I had your SIN number.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That should be numbers.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Honestly, I timed this earlier and it's not going to be as fast as I thought it would.

It is not possible to estimate with any precision the cost of this program; however, as the year progresses, I will set an upper limit to costs. Further details of the small business development corporations programs are included in appendix B to this statement.

I would like to propose a further measure to assist small business. Perhaps the tax that creates the most problems for small businesses in Ontario is the capital tax. While rates are not high, this tax poses complex paperwork problems for many firms.

Recognizing this problem and the nuisance of filling out a capital tax return, a reduced flat tax for small corporations was introduced in 1977. Tonight I am proposing to extend this benefit. The flat tax for corporations with taxable capital in excess of \$50,000 and up to \$100,000 will be reduced from \$100 to \$50. For corporations with taxable capital in excess of \$100,000 and up to \$200,000, a flat rate of \$100 will apply instead of the regular rate. Also, in order to phase small corporations into the regular rate smoothly, I will introduce a formula to apply to taxable capital in excess of \$200,000 and up to \$300,000.

I am proposing one additional measure to lighten the burden of this tax. Real hardship exists for some small businesses in a year in which they have lost money, yet they still must pay the full tax on their capital. In recognition of this I am introducing, in lieu of the regular rate, a flat tax of \$100, which will apply to corporations with taxable capital of up to \$1,000,000 that have experienced a negative cash flow during the year.

I estimate these capital tax changes will reduce revenues by \$20,000,000 in a full fiscal year, but they will ease and simplify the capital tax for some 58,000 small busi-

nesses in Ontario. Large corporations will continue to pay tax at the regular rates.

I would like to review briefly the area of provincial-local finance. Later this week, my colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells), will be tabling a document entitled Ontario Assistance to Local Governments. This publication provides an overview of total transfers to the local sector and the details of the province's unconditional grants in 1979.

There has been some criticism of the government's announcement that total provincial transfers to the local sector would be increased by five per cent in 1979-80. This increase was directly in line with the target growth rate the government set for the total of its own regular ministry programs.

Mr. Speaker, politicians at every level of government worry about the amount of taxes they must collect, and so they should. Predictably, most politicians would rather see any level of government but their own raise taxes. Taxpayers, however, do not see it that way. They are concerned with the total amount of taxes they must pay. The obligation, therefore, rests with each level of government to contain the tax burden. We have to do this by controlling spending as much as possible.

To the extent that tax increases are necessary, politicians at every level of government have to take the responsibility for raising them. We have not asked any more of local governments and their agencies than we have asked for the last four years of our own ministries. If there still is a need to increase local revenues, then I'm sure the councils and local school boards will accept that responsibility, just as I must do.

I am pleased to note that local governments have followed the province's lead by achieving steadily decelerating growth rates in their spending. I estimate that total local spending in 1978 rose by only 8.2 per cent, compared to a growth rate of 20 per cent in 1975. In 1979, it appears likely the local sector will increase its spending by around seven per cent. I find this progress in restraint at the local level most encouraging.

This restraint, combined with realistic increases in provincial assistance, is reflected in local taxation developments. On average during 1978, residential property taxes per household rose only about five per cent and remained at about 2.6 per cent of average household income. In 1979, we expect increases in per household property taxes to average around seven per cent.

I would remind the members that the province's tax credits continue to modify con-

siderably the impact of property taxes, particularly for low-income families and pensioners. This year some \$375,000,000 in property tax and rent relief will be provided through this program.

Mr. Speaker, the financing of health care in Ontario has been a contentious issue in this assembly, and in this context—

Mr. McClellan: Sock it to them, Frank.

Mr. M. Davidson: Hit the working poor again.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —I think it is useful to draw to your attention the magnitude of our existing health budget. This year the health budget will increase by \$213,000,000 to a total of \$4,200,000,000, or on average \$488 for every man, woman and child in Ontario.

Some members of this House participated in the review of health-care financing conducted last year by the select committee on health-care costs. In spite of its best efforts, the committee could not arrive at a consensus on the best way to pay for our health system.

The government has considered the committee's report and continues to study the issues. In so doing, we are aware of a number of important principles. We must continue to provide first rate health care on a universal basis, as we are now doing; the health-care system has to be adequately financed, and we must continue to control costs, despite the public musings of the spendthrifts in Ottawa.

With these principles in mind, the government continues to believe the OHIP premiums should be maintained. In my view, a visible financing link between individuals and their health-care system is useful. In an area of government expenditure as massive as health care, it is important that people contribute some portion of costs through a public insurance system.

Of equal importance, I do not believe our economy should be subjected to the massive disturbance that would be caused by a shift away from health-care premiums. I would remind the members that about 70 per cent of health costs are already financed out of general revenues. An analysis of the question of OHIP financing is included in budget paper D.

[8:45]

Mr. Speaker, we have made considerable progress in controlling the growth of health-care spending. We have done so without reducing the quality of services provided. However, costs continue to escalate; there-

fore, I propose to increase premiums by \$1 per month for single people and \$2 per month for families, effective for the benefit month of October. This modest increase of 5.3 per cent will be less than the growth of the cost in insured services, which are projected to increase by 5.5 per cent. I need not remind the members that elderly people in Ontario and those who receive social assistance do not pay premiums and will not be affected by this change. I estimate this measure will raise \$40,000,000 in this fiscal year.

Turning to the question of providing assistance to lower income people, we have studied the features of a possible new health tax credit for Ontario citizens. A credit might better ensure that all who are entitled to premium assistance actually get it. Budget paper D lays out a possible design for a health tax credit. The government will be interested in the views of the members and of the public on the ideas outlined in this paper. In the meantime, lower income people remain eligible for assistance under the existing program operated by the Ministry of Health.

I now come to the most difficult part of the budget for any Treasurer, particularly a new one. I am going to talk about tax increases.

When I examined our tax structure, I was concerned not only with improving economic incentives but also with the overall level of revenue coming to the province; for while we have pared down the growth of spending our revenue growth rate has also been declining, therefore we still have a deficit level in Ontario, which in my view should be reduced. For those interested, I would direct their attention to budget paper C which analyses Ontario's revenue and expenditure performance over the past several years.

I will now propose a number of tax increases to restore a more appropriate balance between provincial revenue and spending. I shall begin with the area of corporate taxation.

I have outlined tax reductions for some businesses and given the House the details of the new employment development fund. While such actions unquestionably are needed, we must recognize that corporate profits, as a whole, have been growing at a healthy rate. It's only reasonable to expect the corporate sector to contribute a fair share of both the cost of incentive programs and the tax revenues required to improve the overall financial position of the province. At the same time, our industrial policy places a high

priority on the need to upgrade manufacturing and to support small business.

I propose, therefore, to maintain the low 10 per cent corporate income tax rate on small businesses, and the 13 per cent rate on manufacturing and processing income as well as on income from farming, fishing, mining and logging. Effective midnight tonight, there will be a 14 per cent rate for all other corporate income. I anticipate additional revenue from this measure of some \$36,000,000.

In addition, I propose to increase the capital tax rate on banks from three fifths to four fifths of one per cent effective midnight this date. This measure will increase our revenues by \$5,000,000. The capital tax rate for loan and trust companies will remain unchanged.

Mr. Laughren: You really clobbered them, Frank.

Mr. Foulds: How much did you gouge out of hospital premiums? It was \$40,000,000, and \$5,000,000 from the banks.

Mr. S. Smith: You are sure they won't close their doors on that one, Frank?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I withdrew my \$12.30 just in case.

Returning to the retail sales tax, I propose to expand the base of this tax by including all services relating to telecommunications. This will take effect at midnight tonight. Currently, only telephone and telegraph communications services are taxable. The major new areas affected by this change will be Telex and teletype communications. Cable television will be affected also. On average, cable TV subscribers will pay an additional 50 cents per month. This measure will augment provincial revenues by \$30,000,000 this fiscal year.

The gasoline tax and motor vehicle fuel tax rates have not been changed since 1972. Fuel taxes are not applied on an ad valorem basis and, therefore, revenues have grown slowly. In the meantime, the cost of building and maintaining our highways has continued to escalate. Accordingly, I propose to raise the tax on both gasoline and diesel fuel by four tenths of one cent per litre to 4.6 cents and 5.9 cents per litre respectively. Contrary to what many people believe, revenues from road users still fall below spending on highways, roads and related services.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you talk to the ayatollah from Alberta?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I also propose to increase the tax rate on aviation fuel from 0.66 cents to 1.32 cents per litre. This tax has not been changed since 1968. Since that time, the province has significantly increased its expendi-

tures for building and upgrading airports, particularly in the north.

Mr. Wildman: You give with one hand and you take away with the other.

Hon. F. S. Miller: With the \$11,000,000 the government is planning to spend this year, the province will have spent \$27,000,000 on airports since 1976. Railway locomotives, unlike other commercial transportation vehicles, are at present exempt from the tax on diesel fuel. To improve equity among commercial carriers, I propose to impose a tax of 2.2 cents per litre on diesel fuel used in railway locomotives. I might mention that until now Newfoundland and Ontario were the only provinces which did not tax diesel fuel used in locomotives.

These gasoline and fuel tax changes will become effective midnight tonight and will add an additional \$79,000,000 to provincial revenues.

I also propose to increase revenues from alcoholic beverages and tobacco.

Mr. J. Reed: The wages of sin.

Mr. Bradley: How about cigars?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And pipe tobacco.

Hon. F. S. Miller: With respect to alcoholic beverages, I am making mark-up and licence fee changes effective April 30 to increase revenue by \$22,000,000 in 1979-80. The changes are as follows:

Mark-ups on domestic spirits will be increased by the equivalent of 20 cents per 25-ounce bottle. Ontario table wine mark-ups will be increased by the equivalent of 20 cents per 26-ounce bottle.

The licence fee on the production of beer for sale in Ontario will be increased by the equivalent of 10 cents per 24-bottle case. A licence fee on sales by Ontario wineries through their own stores will be reinstituted tonight at 10 per cent. The mark-up will be reduced on lower alcohol strength Ontario wine by the equivalent of 15 cents a bottle and the mark-up on Ontario brandy will also be reduced.

Mr. Conway: You will have to stick to moonshine.

Mr. Breaugh: That's the first Baby Duck you ever had.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Finally, there will be no mark-up increases for imported spirits and imported wine or for other provinces' domestic wines.

Mr. Foulds: What happens to Kool-Aid? Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's easy to see where you spend your money.

Mr. Eakins: The tourism industry comes last.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Eakins: We need help for the tourism industry.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In spite of these changes, Ontario continues to have the lowest beer prices in the country, as well as the lowest prices for domestic spirits in any province that has a sales tax. Ontario's prices are still the second lowest in Canada for imported scotch whisky before sales tax is added.

With respect to tobacco, the tax on a package of 20 cigarettes will be increased by two cents effective midnight this day. Also, the taxes on cut tobacco and cigars will be increased.

Mr. Breagh: By how much?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Retailers will not be required to take inventory of existing tobacco stocks. This will lighten the load for retailers and allow cigarette products on hand to be sold at existing prices. These tobacco tax increases will yield some \$22,000,000 in additional revenue.

I propose to change and increase the basic rate of land transfer tax to two fifths of one per cent on the first \$45,000 of the value of a transaction, and to four fifths of one per cent on the remainder. This change, which will take effect midnight tonight, is the first adjustment on the basic land transfer tax in seven years. I anticipate additional revenues here of \$20,000,000 this fiscal year; and as well I propose to provide a tax-free roll-over for transfer of land to family farms and small business corporations.

Many fees and licences are related to the cost of services and I believe that they should be reviewed regularly. This year a number of fees and other charges will be increased. In total, I estimate that revenues will increase by some \$15,000,000 as a result of the changes; my colleagues, whose ministries are involved, will announce the details in due course.

Before concluding taxation matters, I would like to propose a number of other changes, changes that reduce taxes. First, I propose to raise the retail sales tax exemption—and this is for administrative reasons—for all candy, confection and soft drinks to 49 cents, effective midnight this day. This measure will provide a tax saving to consumers of \$16,000,000 this fiscal year. What it will really do is assist a lot of—

Mr. Cassidy: Is your mother a dentist?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Judging by the size, the member must be edentulous. Is that the right word? I have a dentist behind me to check that.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Send him my card and I'll make sure he is.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Did the member hear that offer from the dentist behind me? He said if he sent him his card he would make sure he was edentulous.

Second, I am proposing that, with respect to admission fees, the ticket price exemption for theatres and so on will be increased from \$3 to \$3.50. The annual cost of this measure will be only about \$1,000,000. Exemption from the 10 per cent tax will be available to all entertainment provided by organizations qualifying as charitable, non-profit or amateur athletic associations under the Income Tax Act, Canada.

Third, all purchases of aircraft and aircraft parts will be exempt from retail sales tax for all carriers licensed to provide commercial, public transportation and cargo service. This action will eliminate an administrative discrepancy between inter- and intraprovincial carriers and will assist Ontario airline operators. It will cost \$4,000,000 this fiscal year.

Fourth, to encourage energy conservation, promote safety and help homemakers cope with the cost of living, the following changes will be introduced. These measures will also be effective midnight tonight.

Retail sales tax will be rebated on all materials purchased for incorporation into solar heating systems. The maximum rebate will be \$700. This measure will ensure that people who build their own solar heating units receive the same tax benefit available to those who buy factory-built models.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Can we have a brief caucus? I understand members supported that one.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this what you mean by a sunshine budget?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Anyone who goes around with a cloud over his head like the honourable member wouldn't recognize sunshine if he saw it.

Household smoke alarms will be exempted from sales tax.

In response to requests from consumers, I propose to provide a full sales tax exemption for yard goods and clothing patterns purchased for household use. The cost of these retail sales tax reductions will be \$6,000,000.

[9:00]

In concluding my discussion of tax changes let me inform the members that my colleague the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maec), will be introducing a bill later tonight which will maintain Ontario's personal income tax rate at 44 per cent of basic federal income tax for 1979. This rate remains the second lowest in Canada. The Minister of Revenue will also be introducing other legislation to implement tax changes announced tonight.

For the next five to 10 minutes I will speak in Canada's other official language.

Monsieur le Président, avant de résumer notre position financière pour le nouvel exercice qui s'annonce, je voudrais récapituler brièvement, dans l'autre langue officielle du Canada, les principaux éléments contenus dans ce budget. Permettez-moi également de mentionner que cette année encore, le texte complet du discours sur le budget et des documents budgétaires est disponible en français.

J'ai déclaré que nos principaux objectifs consistent à maintenir la haute qualité des services publics offerts en Ontario, à créer des emplois, à prendre les mesures requises pour encourager la croissance économique et le développement des petites entreprises, à continuer notre sage gestion des dépenses provinciales et à combattre l'inflation en réduisant notre déficit.

Je crois que nous arriverons à atteindre ces objectifs grâce aux nouvelles initiatives que j'ai proposées.

Grâce à son programme d'emploi pour les jeunes, le gouvernement pourra fournir plus de 70,000 emplois aux jeunes de l'Ontario. Nous consacrons également de plus en plus d'efforts, en vue d'améliorer la formation professionnelle, afin que notre population puisse se trouver de meilleurs emplois et que nos industries deviennent plus productives.

L'élimination des droits de succession et des taxes sur les dons, contribuera à améliorer le climat susceptible d'attirer des investissements qui entraînent la création d'emplois, dans la province. Cette mesure fera également disparaître une source d'inquiétudes réelles pour les fermiers et les propriétaires de petites entreprises.

Le Fonds pour la croissance de l'emploi veillera à ce que les investissements et la création d'emplois dans le secteur privé continuent de s'accroître à un rythme vigoureux. Grâce à ce fonds, il sera également possible de réduire les effets polluants dans l'industrie des pâtes et du papier.

Notre nouveau programme pour stimuler les placements dans le capital-actions des

petites entreprises contribuera à l'essor des petites entreprises, en vue de créer plus d'emplois et de revitaliser les collectivités. Je propose également de réduire l'impôt sur le capital et d'en faciliter la perception pour 58,000 petites entreprises en Ontario.

An hon. member: You do better in French.

Hon. F. S. Miller: At least members opposite are quieter when I'm speaking French. En tous les deux langues, c'est magnifique—n'est-ce pas?

Mrs. Campbell: Quel dommage.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Quel dommage?

Mr. S. Smith: Your French is better than your budget.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your colleague said that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: L'industrie hôtelière, qui assure des emplois à plus de 400,000 personnes en Ontario, bénéficiera d'un stimulant qui prendra la forme de trois exemptions provisoires de taxe sur les ventes.

L'industrie minière, si importante pour le nord de l'Ontario, bénéficiera des amendements que j'ai apportés à l'imposition des compagnies minières.

Je propose certaines exemptions de taxe sur les ventes et une remise de taxe pour aider les consommateurs, promouvoir la sécurité et la conservation de l'énergie, et aider les ménages à faire face au coût de la vie. Ces mesures s'appliqueront aux friandises, aux boissons gazeuses, aux éléments utilisés pour la construction de systèmes de chauffage solaire, aux détecteurs de fumée pour usage résidentiel et aux textiles vendus au mètre.

Dans le secteur des services médicaux, j'ai proposé une très modeste augmentation des primes du régime d'assurance-maladie, de \$1 par mois pour la couverture individuelle et de \$2 par mois pour la couverture familiale.

Le gouvernement a fermement gardé sous contrôle ses propres dépenses. Cette année le taux global d'accroissement de nos dépenses sera de 7.4 pour cent. Si l'on retranche du total les sommes allouées au Fonds spécial pour la croissance de l'emploi, le taux d'augmentation de nos dépenses se ramène à six pour cent. Ces taux sont de beaucoup inférieurs au taux de progression de 10.9 pour cent prévu pour l'ensemble de l'économie de l'Ontario.

Je considère important de réduire le déficit de la province, si nous voulons continuer de lutter avec succès contre l'inflation. Dans ce but, j'ai proposé un certain nombre d'augmentations des taxes et impôts. Au total, notre déficit sera réduit de \$184 millions.

Les augmentations de taxes affecteront les corporations, les utilisateurs d'essence et de carburant diesel, les usagers des services de télécommunication, les personnes qui consomment de l'alcool et du tabac. Il y aura également une hausse de l'impôt sur le transfert des terrains et de certains droits et permis relevant des autorités provinciales.

Même si nous maintenons un strict contrôle de nos dépenses, nous avons quand même réussi à allouer des sommes additionnelles pour répondre aux priorités sociales d'importance majeure. Par exemple, nous avons prévu une augmentation spéciale du budget du ministère des Services sociaux et communautaires, afin d'offrir plus de services aux handicapés et aux personnes âgées.

Je suis persuadé que le caractère progressif et judicieux de ce budget contribuera à assurer une plus grande prospérité à tous nos citoyens.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to sum up our financial position.

Looking at the fiscal year just ended, interim figures show that our total spending was \$14,500,000,000, an increase of 6.9 per cent, which was under the original target. I would like to commend my colleague, the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. McCague), for the fine job he has done in managing our expenditures, and his predecessor.

As I said earlier, for the third year in a row, we have spent less than was originally budgeted. That is what good management is all about.

Ms. Gigantes: Who pays? Who pays?

An hon. member: If you estimate high, you'll do it every time.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They always wake up when the news is good.

Our revenues in the 1978-79 fiscal year were under \$13,200,000,000, with the result that net cash requirements amounted to \$1,300,000,000. This represents a substantial reduction of \$425,000,000 from the previous year. Details of this improvement in our financial position have been documented in the quarterly Ontario Finances.

At the beginning of this statement I indicated that one of my objectives was to further reduce the province's net cash requirements and establish a better balance between revenues and expenditures. The government's expenditure plan, which the members will be asked to approve, projects total spending, including the \$200,000,000 we have allocated to the employment development fund, of \$15,600,000,000 in 1979-80. The increase in

ongoing spending, excluding the fund, is only six per cent.

The tax changes I have proposed tonight will increase our revenues by \$181,000,000 and all of these new revenues will be applied to reduce the deficit. The resulting net cash requirements of \$1,153,000,000 are well within the financing capacity provided by the province's non-public borrowing sources. In fact, we will have additional financing flexibility this year of over \$400,000,000. I plan to use part of this flexibility to reduce outstanding treasury bills by \$195,000,000. This will help alleviate upward pressure on interest rates and improve the availability of capital for the private sector.

As members know, the bulk of our non-public borrowing comes from internal pension funds and the Canada Pension Plan. The entire pension system, both public and private, has been a matter of concern in recent years. In 1977 the government established a Royal Commission on the Status of Pensions to examine the issues and make recommendations for improvement. Later this year the government expects to receive the report from the very able chairman of the commission, Miss Donna Haley, Q.C.

Mr. Martel: I thought you were going to balance it by next year.

An hon. member: Here it comes, Old Man Ontario.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Look, I am becoming theatrical so sit down.

May I just add this concluding word? When I became Treasurer I wanted to set for myself a high standard. I could think of nothing better than to follow the creed of one of the finest Treasurers this province has ever known, the honourable Leslie Miscampbell Frost. A new portrait of Mr. Frost hangs in the lobby of the building which also bears his name and beside it is a plaque quoting from his first budget speech.

He said: "For the fine old province of Ontario there will be a great future. We are building not only for these times; we are planning for a greater population, for industrial expansion, for prosperous farms, for happy, healthy people. We are laying the sure foundations for a greater and stronger Ontario."

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the proposals I have put before you will meet the needs of our people and help build for the future. This budget will create more jobs for Ontario's young people. It will restrain inflation by keeping the cost of government in check—something you guys could never do;

it will reduce the deficit; it will provide new incentives for job-creating investments; it will help our farms, small businesses and manufacturing industries to grow and prosper; it will eliminate the costs, delays and fears of inheritance taxes; it will improve the investment climate in Ontario; it will promote economic development and employment in the north; and it will ensure a dynamic and prosperous future for all of the people of Ontario. [9:15]

On motion by Mr. Peterson, the debate was adjourned.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SUCCESSION DUTY REPEAL ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 47, An Act to repeal the Succession Duties Act.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

AYES

Ashe, Auld, Baetz, Belanger, Bennett, Bernier, Birch, Blundy, Bradley, Brunelle, Campbell, Conway, Cureatz, Davis, Drea, Eakins, Eaton, Elgie, Epp, Gaunt, Gregory, Grossman, Haggerty, Hall, Havrot, Henderson, Hennessy, Hodgson, Jones,

Kennedy, Kerrio, Lane, Leluk, MacBeth, Maeck, Mancini, McCaffrey, McCague, McEwen, McGuigan, McKessock, McMurtry, McNeill, Miller, F. S., Miller, G. I., Newman, W., Nixon, Norton, O'Neil, Parrott, Peterson, Ramsay, Reed, J., Riddell, Rollins,

Rowe, Roy, Ruston, Sargent, Scrivener, Smith, S., Smith, G. E., Snow, Sterling, Stong, Sweeney, Taylor, G., Taylor, J. A., Timbrell, Turner, Van Horne, Villeneuve, Walker, Watson, Welch, Wells, Williams, Wiseman, Worton, Yakabuski—80.

NAYS

Bounsall, Breagh, Bryden, Cassidy, Charlton, Cooke, Davidson, M., Davison, M. N., di Santo, Foulds, Germa, Gigantes, Grande, Laughren, Lawlor, Lupusella, MacDonald, Martel, McClellan, Philip, Samis, Swart, Wildman, Young—24.

Ayes 80; nays 24.

GIFT TAX REPEAL ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 48, An Act to repeal the Gift Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 49, An Act respecting Small Business Development Corporations.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 50, An Act to authorize the raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. F. S. Miller moved first reading of Bill 51, An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act.

Motion agreed to.

MINING TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moved first reading of Bill 52, An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 53, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 54, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

GASOLINE TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 55, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to.

TOBACCO TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 56, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

LAND TRANSFER TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of Bill 57, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

RETAIL SALES TAX
AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of
Bill 58, An Act to amend the Retail Sales
Tax Act.

Motion agreed to.

CORPORATIONS TAX
AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Maeck moved first reading of
Bill 59, An Act to amend the Corporations
Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Wells, the House
adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 10, 1979

Budget resolution, Mr. F. S. Miller	917
Budget statement, Mr. F. S. Miller	917
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Peterson, agreed to	929
Succession Duties Repeal Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	929
Gift Tax Repeal Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	929
Small Business Development Corporations Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	929
Ontario Loan Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	929
Financial Administration Amendment Act, Mr. F. S. Miller, first reading	929
Mining Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Auld, first reading	929
Income Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	929
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	929
Gasoline Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	929
Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	929
Land Transfer Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	929
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	930
Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Maeck, first reading	930
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	930

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 22

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, April 12, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

MEMBER'S BOOK OF POETRY

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, last week in this House the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis)—I wish he were here—in open assembly demanded a copy of a certain book. I think it's called "the psychotic personality of our time." Of recent date I have received a letter, and I'm sure it's no breach of confidence if I might just read one paragraph.

This letter which is addressed to the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) says: "The author very kindly in his usual non-business-like approach"—I suppose he's talking about me—"to things gave me an autographed copy. However, I am enclosing \$10 since I would be more than delighted to receive another autographed copy."

I want the Premier of this province to know that poets, in my opinion, are probably the most business-like people. I would rather trust my business affairs to the poets than to a lot of lawyers I know, as with the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), and, even more so, than to a good many government people I have come across.

I took great personal offence to that particular remark. I have autographed another copy for the Premier and I'd be delighted to receive the money. Would a page take it and put it on the Premier's desk please?

VISITOR

Mr. Speaker: I doubt that there is a point of privilege there. There's obviously a very strong point of view.

I am pleased to inform all members of the House that we have a distinguished visitor in the Speaker's gallery today. In keeping with the order of business we've just completed, I want to assure him that I didn't consider that a point of privilege. We were discussing that at lunch today.

Mr. Lawlor: Neither did I.

Mr. Speaker: Our distinguished visitor is the Honourable Ripton McPherson, Speaker of the House of Representatives in Jamaica. I know that members will join me in welcoming him to our assembly.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT PITS AND QUARRIES

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that the government has received representations concerning imminent shortages of aggregate in the Niagara Escarpment area and has decided to initiate a comprehensive review process to consider new licences for pits and quarries on a site-by-site basis in the Niagara Escarpment restricted zone. The restrictions which were a freeze on new licences, were applied to the Niagara Escarpment area six years ago. Originally, the freeze was only intended for a three-year period because it was initially felt that the master plan for the escarpment could be completed and in place by the end of that time.

Mr. Cassidy: You cave in as soon as you are pushed. Another sellout of the escarpment.

Mr. Foulds: Name the places where the aggregate is in such short supply.

Mr. Swart: One more step backwards.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: However, the complexities of the issues in the Niagara Escarpment area have delayed the preparation of the proposed plan. It will not be ready for release until later this year.

Mr. Swart: After six years, you ought to be able to wait another six months.

Mr. S. Smith: That is one way to save the escarpment. Chop it up and put it into buildings.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Are you against buildings?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The subsequent steps in the process, including public review and discussion at hearings, are expected to take a considerable period more before the plan is finally adopted.

Mr. S. Smith: If you can't build it up, you are going to dig it out.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the meantime, the aggregate industry is experiencing difficulty in meeting immediate demands for their product in some areas of the escarpment.

Mr. Foulds: Table the information in the House.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also some businesses fear they may be forced to close their operations because their licensed reserves are approaching depletion.

Mr. Cassidy: For every year you go forward, you go three years back.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government decision to consider applications for pits and quarry licences in the escarpment area has been made after discussions with the various interests involved, including the industry and environmental groups. It is expected that most of the applications to be considered will be for extensions of sites currently being extracted.

The overall process to be followed will identify sites where additional supplies of aggregates are needed and will enable interested citizens and groups to have their concerns heard. The final decision on a licence will be made on the basis of specific circumstances affecting each site and after the following process:

To obtain a licence, an applicant would first have to satisfy the Niagara Escarpment Commission and the Minister of Housing, pursuant to the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, and then the requirements of the Minister of Natural Resources pursuant to the Pits and Quarries Act.

Mr. Foulds: That shouldn't be too hard.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If objections are received at either of these points a hearing will be held before the appropriate bodies. In addition, cabinet must consider and decide whether the restriction should be lifted for each site in question.

Mr. Swart: Who will the hearing be before? The Minister of Housing?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The government agencies involved will do their licence processing within a six-month schedule, which is designed to give all parties an opportunity to be heard and, at the same time, not to delay or constrain acceptable aggregate supplies in the area more than is absolutely necessary.

WATER POLLUTION

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I dare to rise with a statement today, notwithstanding the Claire Hoy award, but I notice that I have company in the leader of the Liberal Party. Perhaps we can go down that road together in this instance. I am not sure.

Mr. S. Smith: He doesn't like you, he doesn't like me, and he does not like homosexuals.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think there are lots of us so named that we could choose our places wherever.

The major incentives in water management being taken by this government were described in the speech from the throne. I would now like to outline some of these incentives. Foremost, I believe, is our major commitment to identify and trace hazardous substances and to establish strict controls aimed at eliminating possible hazards from the trace contaminants which can build up in living tissue.

It is our policy to prohibit any new discharges of mercury, PCBs, Mirex or any similar new hazardous contaminants which are identified. This is one of the policies spelled out in our new handbook, "Water Management—Goals, Policies, Objectives and Implementation." May I say to the member for Lakeshore that it's readily available at the government bookstore without cost. I don't know whether he might consider doing the same for his own. I am not sure of that, but our books are available at the bookstore or from my ministry.

This new publication is a final revision and expansion of "Guidelines and Criteria for Water Quality and Management in Ontario," published in 1970.

Our policies and objectives, as they are set out in this document, have been brought up to date in terms of the newest scientific developments and the criteria established in the international Great Lakes water quality agreement.

Our water management goals are: to protect the quality of all waters for the sake of human and aquatic health and to restore quality to impaired waters; to manage our water quantity to ensure it is shared fairly by its users.

We achieve these goals by monitoring and strictly controlling the effects of proposed waste discharges to surface and ground waters—

Mr. Kerrio: And making the polluter pay, Harry.

Mr. J. Reed: Nineteen seventy revisited.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —and stating clearly in my ministry's approvals to specific users our requirements for both the quality and the quantity of discharges.

To meet the challenge of sound water management, we have incorporated provincial water quality objectives in detail in our new publication. These objectives are based on a comprehensive study of all available information and on years of experience gained by my ministry and by other agencies and jurisdictions.

Other jurisdictions have incorporated inflexible standards in their water management procedures. We, in Ontario, have reviewed this approach, among others, and we are convinced that Ontario's traditional procedure of management is most effective in meeting our specific environmental needs.

Our water quality objectives are met by controlling the size of the discharges in relation to the size of the receiving waters and their ability to deal with these discharges. This approach assures adequate protection at all times and saves needless costs in some areas. Instead of assigning inflexible standards to the quality of the receiving water, we have chosen to use control programs and our approvals process to establish firm effluent limits at the point of the discharge.

In other words, individually determined effluent requirements are incorporated in control orders and approvals issued by this ministry and are, therefore, legally enforceable.

I would like to mention two achievements resulting from this approach: Every day, 200,000 pounds of suspended solids, 180,000 pounds of oxygen-consuming organic matter, and 40,000 pounds of phosphorus are removed from our municipal wastes. Secondly, our abatement program has served to reduce mercury levels in fish in Lake St. Clair steadily since the crisis of 1970, and we can now foresee levels below the guideline of 0.5 parts per million in average sized fish in most common species.

Our program is enabling us to prevent some serious problems before they occur. This is obviously a hard point to document, but let me give the member one example. We, in Ontario, were first to detect and identify Mirex from US sources in Lake Ontario fish. While the effects from our neighbour's discharges are still with us, we caught the problem in time to avoid any possible discharges into Ontario and in time to assist our neighbour in dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, one of my major commitments has been and is to ensure that Ontario residents have continued access to a safe, secure water supply. This water quality program will help achieve that goal.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege regarding the credibility of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) in regard to my efforts last Friday to obtain copies of Ontario Hydro's internal significant event report.

Last Friday the Minister of Energy denied that these reports were classified secret and at

any time anyone could go into Hydro and get a copy. I will read from Hansard what was said.

"I have knowledge that there is a series of happenings with dates on them that is of great concern to me as a citizen. If he has seen these reports, would the minister be so good as to supply the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) and both parties with copies of these reports as they come out. I know they are classified as secret, but what is more important at this point than that the members of the Legislature know what is going on in this very serious field?"

[2:15]

Hansard says:

"Hon. Mr. Davis: They are down in the Hydro library. Read them on the weekend.

"Hon. Mr. Auld: As I said, all the member has to do is walk down the street. They are in Hydro's reference library. They are not secret reports.

"Hon. Mr. Davis: Take them home.

"Hon. W. Newman: Why don't you do some reading for a change?"

Following this, I went to my office and called the minister's office and asked the exec for copies of the report. He said: "Yes, the minister says you can have them right away. I will send them right over."

I waited for a long time in my office. Nothing happened. I phoned back. They said, "There is a meeting arranged for you to go down to Hydro. You are supposed to meet this exec under the information board."

I did that. I waited there for a long time. Finally, the cloak and dagger started. For the next 45 minutes I met four other top execs who examined me and asked me questions. Finally, after 45 minutes, they took me to the top technocrat—

Interjection.

Mr. Sargent: —who wanted me to pinpoint a happening I wanted to see about. I said: "How do I know?" Finally, he produced a volume. He said, "Now, what do you want?" I said I wanted to look at it. He stood at my shoulder and watched what I was reading. I could not move around without him beside me. The net result was I could not have the book to take home, it had to remain there. It is very important; it is not for public consumption.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I say I am shocked the minister and the Premier would be party to a total coverup of this very dangerous thing. I know things are being experienced in nuclear energy. We should not laugh this matter off. I am very con-

cerned about the credibility of the minister at this point.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister is not here and I am sure he will have something to say about the matter. We will defer any decision as to whether or not it is a bona fide point of privilege until we have heard the other side of the story.

SALES TAX ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Mr. Speaker, since the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) presented his budget on Tuesday night, my ministry has been engaged in implementing the proposed tax changes. About 750,000 copies of nine special bulletins have been distributed to taxpayers—

Mr. Kerrio: We thought you were going to apologize.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: —including the taxpayers of the members over there.

Mr. Kerrio: We thought you were going to apologize.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Members will be interested to know my officials are working with taxpayers and industry associations to ensure the tax changes are implemented smoothly. However, there is one area of difficulty which I would like to clarify at this time.

Mr. S. Smith: Get Roy to represent you.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: This concerns the extension of sales tax on telecommunications services.

An hon. member: Why don't you withdraw it?

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I would like to take this opportunity to describe the principles by which the tax will be administered.

First, I shall emphasize the policy is essentially an expansion of existing taxation of telephone and telegraph services to include a broader range of telecommunications services provided by substantially the same suppliers.

Second, the move parallels taxation in other Canadian provinces and is not new to major suppliers of such services across Canada. It is important to understand this involves only a tax on charges for the use of transmission facilities. It is not a tax on services provided by news wires, stock market quotation businesses or similar organizations.

What this means is that businesses will be required to pay tax on payments for the purchase of telecommunications services. They will not be required to collect tax on the sale of their services to customers.

Further, people who do not provide telecommunications services to others will not pay this tax on such services they provide for themselves. They will, however, pay the normal sales tax when they originally purchase the equipment.

Finally, what we are proposing is well understood by the telecommunications industry itself, both because of its familiarity with existing Ontario practices and because of similar taxation in other provinces. We have already met with a number of industry representatives and have scheduled further meetings to inform the industry their billings of telecommunications services will be taxed in the same way as telephone and telegraph charges are already taxed. We also want to reassure the industry my ministry will be taking appropriate measures to ensure Ontario's administrative provisions will avoid inequitable tax treatment for telecommunications services which cross provincial boundaries.

Let me now give some examples of how the new tax policy will be applied:

News wire services: Tax does not apply on charges made to customers of a wire service operator. The expanded tax only applies on charges made to the wire service operator by a telecommunications carrier.

Radio and television broadcasts to the public free of charge are not subject to the tax. Tax, however, will apply to telecommunications services purchased from carriers to distribute programs. For example, microwave or line transmission of programs from one station to another will be taxed if this service is purchased from a telecommunications company. However, if the radio or television network owns its own facilities for transmission between stations, no tax will apply to its own use of these transmission facilities.

Mobile telephone services: Charges for mobile telephone services are currently taxable. However, the tax will now cover charges for private mobile telephone and paging services which are sold commercially.

Cable television service, which is the transmission of signals, is clearly included as a taxable telecommunications service, and charges to customers by cable companies will be taxed.

Other private communications networks which do not involve the purchase of telecommunications services and which are not intended for sale to others will not be subject to tax. Examples of these nontaxable, in-house services are taxi dispatching systems owned and operated by the taxi operator, and in-plant voice and data communications serv-

ices owned and operated by businesses and intended only for their own use.

I trust this explanation clarifies for the benefit of members in the House our approach to the taxation of telecommunications services, which we are developing with the co-operation of the industry.

The Treasurer's budget and bulletins issued by my ministry provide telephone numbers of staff who can be contacted for further information or assistance on any of the new tax changes.

PAYMENTS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, first I am tabling today a booklet entitled 1979 Ontario Assistance to Local Governments, which will be in the members' boxes very shortly. This booklet contains a general overview of 1978-80 provincial transfers, as well as details of the 1979 unconditional grants program.

Mr. McClellan: Is this stuff all packaged?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Figures shown in this booklet are projections of provincial grants for municipalities and agencies based upon the most recent information available to us.

Overall transfer payments to municipalities and agencies in the fiscal year 1979-80, excluding payments into teachers' superannuation and the home care program, are expected to total \$3,872,000,000; this represents a 5.4 per cent increase over the 1978-79 figure.

The booklet shows the provincial funds allocated for various types also of conditional grant programs for this coming year.

Mr. Cassidy: Now you're two per cent under the promise.

VISITORS

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would also, in another vein, like to draw the attention of the House to the fact—since we won't be sitting tomorrow, we'll do this today—that tomorrow is baseball day in Toronto.

Mr. Bradley: Not beer day.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not beer day.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Toronto Blue Jays will be playing their home opening game; and this will mark the beginning of the third season of Toronto as a city in the American League.

We all know the Blue Jays had a very good spring training season. Part of that spring training season occurs because of the very fine area where the Toronto Blue Jays train: that is in Dunedin, Florida, a place known to many citizens of Ontario—

Mr. S. Smith: Do you have a condominium down there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't have a condominium there, but it is a very fine place, and if any of the members wish to visit Dunedin you will find the hospitality is exceedingly warm and they will be made welcome, just as the Toronto Blue Jays have been made welcome.

Mr. Warner: They have beer in their ball park.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Toronto Blue Jays enjoy very fine facilities in Dunedin, because the mayor and the citizens of that community—

An hon. member: Do you have a real estate licence down there, Tom?

Mr. Samis: See Canada first.

Mr. Cassidy: Are you planning an inter-governmental tour?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would think the House would like to show a little more decorum in this particular matter—

Mr. Cassidy: Are you criticizing the Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —because we have with us today in the House the mayor, the Honourable Cecil Englebert and several of the councillors from the city of Dunedin, Florida, who are here to attend the ball game tomorrow. I would like to welcome them.

Mr. Nixon: Bring your own beer.

Mr. Roy: Are you going to buy them the beer tomorrow?

Mr. Kerrio: I hope they bring their own beer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I made my remarks in the way I did so that the mayor and his fellow councillors would see that the Ontario Legislature is just like the Dunedin city council meetings.

Mr. Samis: Did you tell them about the dry ball park, though?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you and the House are happy they're here and we're all happy that the Blue Jays are starting their third season tomorrow. We hope they have a very good season.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's bad luck for me to have to give a statement after that one.

Mr. Breaugh: Is this beer in the ball park, Larry? Have you finally come around?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would have gone before him if I had known it was on baseball.

Mr. Bradley: It must be private members' afternoon with all these statements.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Listen, I was in Chicago yesterday as part of our tourism

campaign and I was supposed to throw out the first ball at the Blue Jays-White Sox game, but I was rained out, of course. It's not the first time that's happened to me. Don't you wish I were rained out here?

Mr. Speaker: I want to remind the ministry we can only allocate a maximum of 30 minutes to ministerial statements; so if the minister doesn't get on with his he may be rained out here, too.

Mr. Cassidy: Dispense.

Mr. Grande: Thirty seconds.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Don't interrupt me, please.

TOURISM

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, somewhat apropos the last statement, I wanted to inform the House that our "We treat you royally" campaign has made the Stanley Cup playoffs. Tonight at centre ice at Maple Leaf Gardens the ministry's "We treat you royally" symbol will be seen by millions of people throughout Canada and the United States. As you know, the symbol is fast becoming a recognized sign of hospitality in Ontario.

I would take this opportunity to remind the House that it serves as a constant reminder to all of us to welcome visitors to our province, even including hockey players from the Atlanta Flames.

We expect fewer penalties on the ice this evening.

Mr. Bradley: I hope the Attorney General will be there tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would seriously like to thank the Maple Leaf Gardens and its president, Harold Ballard, for their role in promoting the Ontario tourism industry and we would also take this opportunity to congratulate him for his recent \$135,000 donation to the Ontario Community Centre for the Deaf.

Mr. Wildman: I thought you were going to congratulate him on his release.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We know you'll be watching the "We treat you royally" sign at centre ice this evening.

GATT NEGOTIATIONS

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding earlier events, perhaps I might ask the consent of the Legislature at this time to make a five-minute statement on the GATT negotiations. I would first ask the consent of the House because we may go beyond the 30 minutes by a few moments; and, secondly,

because the announcement came out at 11 o'clock this morning, we have not had an opportunity to distribute copies to the opposition, as is ordinarily the case. Might that be okay?

Mr. Laughren: I think the Treasurer should make this statement. The Treasurer should do it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to this assembly at this time that the Tokyo round of the GATT negotiations, which began in 1973, is now substantially concluded.

We were informed this morning that Ambassador Grey is signing a series of agreements on non-tariff barriers and other matters and that he will be submitting these texts to the Canadian government for consideration. With the exception of some minor last minute changes, these texts are virtually complete and the participating governments are expected to formally sign them later in the year. [2:30]

We cannot, at this point, comment on the details of the trade pact because these have still not yet been made available to us. However, we can outline the main thrust of the emerging facts.

On tariffs, Canada's industrial exports to the United States, the European community and Japan will be stimulated by an average reduction on tariffs of nearly 40 per cent. Significantly, more than 90 per cent of Canada's current exports to the United States, our major market, will face tariffs of only five per cent or less after the tariff cuts have been fully implemented, and close to 80 per cent of all our exports will enter duty-free. Market access to the United States, therefore, will be particularly beneficial to Ontario companies.

Mr. S. Smith: They're mostly natural resources.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On Canada's side, the average tariff rate on industrial imports will fall from, roughly, 15 per cent to nine per cent, with high rates remaining in place for a number of products. Most industrial raw materials will continue to enter tariff-free.

As a result of the reductions in tariffs domestically, it is expected that Canada's industries will be facing greater competition from abroad. However, reduced cost, coupled with improved opportunities abroad, should provide a needed stimulus for Canadian industry to adjust to these new competitive realities.

Appropriate adjustment systems programs, as we have pointed out earlier, will be critical to industry's efforts to adapt. We must

be aware, of course, of some of the benefits to Canadian consumers of being able to purchase some goods, including some of those domestically manufactured, at lower prices.

On non-tariff barriers, agreements have been reached on many areas singled out by Ontario as being of vital importance to the province in order for us to achieve the required degree of reciprocity under the new gas deal. Although we don't have all the details of the agreements, we understand that the United States has agreed to accept the principle that injury must be found before countervailing duties can be applied.

In addition, the anti-dumping code will be revised and this, combined with the likely new safeguard arrangements, will improve Canada's capacity to deal quickly with unfair trade practices and injurious imports.

In the government procurement field—and I would like to emphasize that Ontario is highly competitive in the public goods market—our export ability in the past has been constrained by the practices of foreign governments. The MTN agreement will result in a marked improvement, at least as to the transparency of various practices of these other governments. The upgrading of international surveillance and dispute settlement provides the assurance that these essential gains in liberalizing non-tariff barriers will not be eroded.

Canada has agreed to comply with the new code on customs valuation. This will establish rules for determining the value of imported goods for customs purposes, but only on the understanding that we may offset any significant loss of protection that may result.

This possible loss of protection was a concern to Ontario. But Canada's conditional acceptance of the code seems to indicate that the concessions attained, with our compliance, will reduce the potential hardship.

Because we have very limited information at this point on the details of tariff and non-tariff arrangements, it would be premature to assess their impact on Ontario's industry. It would not be premature, however, to say that Canada's negotiations have broadened the opportunities for Canadian exports. On the other hand, Canadian business will inevitably be faced with much greater competition here, although I am gratified that import-sensitive sectors—particularly textiles, clothing and footwear—receive minimal tariff cuts only.

Mr. Laughren: We had no barriers on manufactured goods.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would, however, once again urge the federal government to ensure that appropriate transitional assist-

ance be available. Ontario has already submitted its views that Canada should implement a comprehensive federal adjustment assistance program to guarantee that this country, post the Tokyo round, is a strong, internationally competitive nation.

Of course, as details unfold over the next months, we will have more complete statements to make to the House. We will forward a copy of this statement, as soon as possible, to the opposition. I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Your point of privilege?

LIGHTING IN CHAMBER

Mr. Roy: In view of the statement that was made earlier, it's a good day to raise this.

In our attempt to film a program on provincial affairs here in the chamber this morning, it came to our attention that the lighting in this chamber is unfairly distributed; that the lighting on that side of the House is 64 foot-candles while it's only 32 foot-candles on this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's the same ratio as the election.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It's a fair comparison.

An hon. member: They still don't look very bright.

An hon. member: You're still awfully dim.

Mr. McClellan: You are so dim over there.

Mr. Roy: Apart from the fact that the crew over there requires more light to shine, Mr. Speaker, could you explain why there is this unfair distribution of light in the chamber?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It's the quality.

Mr. B. Newman: Discrimination.

Mr. Speaker: If you notice, the Ministry of Government Services is conducting an experiment on this chandelier—

Mr. Breithaupt: Has the minister been climbing up there too?

Mr. Speaker:—on the light levels to facilitate the operation of television cameras. It's strictly an experimental thing.

Mr. Roy: I see.

Mrs. Campbell: It just might be partisan.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister of Government Services or his staff will indicate that while perhaps it's not the ideal setup and should be more evenly distributed, it's strictly on an experimental basis.

Hon. Mr. Walker: We are just more illuminated over here.

Mr. J. Reed: We are just treated like mushrooms.

Mr. Foulds: May I move my seat, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Wildman: The minister saw the light.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HEALTH CARE FINANCING

Mr. S. Smith: I would like to address a question to the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Can he explain how it is that while the increase in the budget of the Ministry of Health this year—about \$213,000,000—would probably be about 75 per cent for insured health services—and, therefore, the increase for insured health services is about \$160,000,000—the federal government calculates that, over and above the tax points which it gave up, its cash contribution to Ontario for insured health services has increased this year by \$210,000,000? Could the Treasurer explain what he has done with the other \$50,000,000 he has received for that purpose?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the federal government, to which the member was obviously talking today—

Mr. Breithaupt: Somebody has to talk to them.

Mrs. Campbell: You don't.

Mr. S. Smith: Where did you get the GATT stuff from?

Hon. F. S. Miller: —is quite quick to use figures to suit itself. What it tends to forget is that it withdrew the revenue guarantees at the same time as it brought in that fund and removed \$455,000,000 from Ontario's revenue.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the Treasurer prepared to accept that when they withdrew the guarantee and, in point of fact, gave up tax room to Ontario, the value of the tax points they gave up plus the cash contribution as earmarked for insured health services, together comes to about \$280,000,000? In fact, the whole health budget only went up this year by \$213,000,000.

Given the fact that the extra money was there and earmarked from the federal government—

Hon. F. S. Miller: It was not earmarked.

Mr. S. Smith: Well, not earmarked, but indicated for that particular purpose, although naturally Ontario has the right to divert it from that purpose if it wishes. The question

is: Why did the government decide to divert that money from insured health services and then go ahead and raise Ontario Health Insurance Plan premiums and cut services in those areas?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would love to read some of the Honourable Marc Lalonde's comments in advance of going to the established program funding—

Mr. Eakins: No, let's hear yours.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —where he made a whole bunch of threats to the provinces in the year 1975. The member may not remember those threats but I was Minister of Health at that time. They said the provinces had runaway health care costs and that if the provinces didn't step in and take some action to constrain the growth in health care costs, the federal government would unilaterally—and they gave notice as required—withdraw from the Health Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Mr. Roy: Yes, you were irresponsible then.

Mr. Sweeney: What did you do with the money?

Hon. F. S. Miller: They said they would do a whole series of things. Then they said that of all the provinces only Ontario was intelligently handling its health care costs. Of course, I was minister.

Mr. Ruston: And you didn't do very well.

Mr. Breithaupt: We want to know what has happened since then. That's the problem.

Mr. Roy: We know about 1975. You tried to close the hospitals.

Mr. Eakins: Who was the minister then?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I point it out. The fact remains that they recognized what Ontario and Quebec had been telling them, that the cost-sharing program wasn't working because it was directing moneys right into high-cost services in place of the better use of the system.

We worked very hard for this. They have given us a formula which they have tried, again unilaterally, to withdraw from. All 10 provinces have said it was negotiated, put into a statute and agreed upon, and they are sticking to it. It comes to 50 per cent in round figures of the combined costs of post-secondary education and health care costs. That was roughly the original cost-sharing agreement.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, surely the Treasurer will admit that the amount of premium income has increased in the last three years by more than 24 per cent, while the amount going from the more progressive

general revenue fund of the province has declined by almost 27 per cent.

How does the Treasurer explain why he completely ignored the unanimous recommendations of the select committee on health-care financing and costs which would have reduced the impact of Ontario Health Insurance Plan premiums on about 500,000 low-income people in Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the second part is really part of the original question, unless I am wrong. I am quite willing to address it; I do not mean I am not. I just feel the health premium was not the issue in the original question.

The whole purpose of any government dealing with any other inferior level, such as the federal government was doing with the provinces, in moving out of cost-shared programs—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: What do you mean by "inferior"?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Only in the sense that we are inferior in the law.

The purpose was to give them inducements to accept their own priorities and do well.

Mr. Kerrio: It could be worse; you could be a PC in BC.

Laughter.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Somebody must have said something intelligent over there.

Ontario was far ahead of some of the other provinces, but we actually had a lower percentage cost-shared formula basis before we went to established program funding. I know my friend knows that too. I am simply saying that we have done the very things Mr. Lalonde said had to be done within the system. We in Ontario will continue to spend the money needed for high-quality health care. We have the resources; we need the assistance of the members opposite to help us get good value for our money.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, given that the former situation was one in which this government matched the federal contribution—it was a 50-50 deal, and we know what was wrong with that—can the Treasurer explain why it is now that this government is not only not matching the federal contribution, but also it is not even using the entire federal contribution for health purposes? Where is the rest of the money going, and why has he made that decision?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely and totally incorrect. The total transfer of federal money under the EFP amounts to half of the money we spent in Ontario for the programs. So obviously we

are spending \$1 of Ontario tax money as well as—

Mr. S. Smith: But the increase is \$280,000,000; your increase is \$213,000,000.

Hon. F. S. Miller: When my colleague transfers funds to the municipalities in Ontario on an unconditional basis, I am sure he feels they should be left to make their decisions, and that is why we support them.

The federal government has admitted that its estimations of future rates of growth of inflation et cetera were richer than it meant them to be. All the sound and fury one is hearing out of Ottawa these days, claiming we are not providing the services, is simply because last November all 10 provinces, of all political stripes, united to say: "A deal is a deal; you are stuck with it, and we are living with it until 1981."

Mr. Roy: What the Treasurer is saying is that this government is not spending all the federal health money—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sweeney: They are not spending post-secondary money on post-secondary education either—\$37,000,000.

EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have an unrelated question for the Treasurer, if I might, on his Ontario Employment Development Fund, which I call Grantario or the Cheaper in Tennessee fund.

Can the Treasurer tell us whether it is his intention to bring in an act to this Legislature with regard to the criteria which will apply for these grants and loans, the reporting procedure of the people who will be operating this particular fund and the responsibilities of the committee of ministers which will be administering this \$200,000,000 fund?

Will he bring an act of the Legislature forward so the matter can be regularized?

[2:45]

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding—and I stand to be corrected if the lawyers in either my ministry or the Ministry of Industry and Tourism tell me otherwise—that the statutory authority for the Employment Development Fund, in the main exists in existing statutes and there will be no need to bring a new one before you.

The attempt always to define in words and in regulation, I should think all the requirements and requests and ways to do things, is just the opposite of what you've been preaching steadily. This is a group of ministers who are able to judge—

Mr. Peterson: You don't believe in the rule of law, do you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I believe in the rule of law. In this House if I break the law, the law has every right to come after me or any other member of this House—

Mr. Roy: But if there's no law, you can't break it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —because the provincial auditor will tell the House in a second if any moneys are spent improperly. I can tell the member of the staffs of the ministries would be the first to recommend to a minister not to break a law.

Mr. Peterson: That's why you don't want any law.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You will be voting this money in my estimates—

Mr. Peterson: Don't threaten us.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would never threaten the member for London Centre.

In any case we understand that the present statutes and the process of estimates cover the requirements of the House and I will be delighted to share with this House the decisions that are made as they come along. But one of the advantages of winning in this business is that you get to make the decisions.

Mr. S. Smith: Since a number of places in Ontario felt when they sent their representatives here that they would have some say in some of these decisions, could we have the minister explain why he is unwilling to have the rules and regulations, the criteria, the subject of legislative debate and scrutiny rather than setting up a kind of slush fund to be administered by the private criteria of three ministers of the crown in any way they see fit, with no check upon them except down the road when the public accounts committee may have a chance to look at it some time later? Why not deal with this large fund in an intelligent and democratic manner by having an act before the Legislature outlining the way in which the money is to be used?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered the question.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can I ask the minister whether I am right in concluding from his answer that because he was elected to power and is part of the executive branch he feels he can spend money, with no guidelines, at his absolute discretion, and not be accountable to the public through this Legislature? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. Ruston: That's what he said. That's what he's saying.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My honourable friend is suffering from his normal disease of not understanding what I said.

Mr. Ashe: He is not here often enough.

JOB CREATION

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Treasurer. In view of the fact there is no mention in his budget of the number of jobs to be created in government programs, except for summer jobs for students—and we've done a few calculations, I should tell the Treasurer—and on the experience at Ford, the Employment Development Fund will create at the most 7,600 direct jobs, does the Treasurer think this is an adequate target for our government job-creation program, given the fact there are 319,000 people unemployed in Ontario at this time?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I guess one of the differences between the member and me is that I look upon the positive side of life and he looks upon the negative.

Mr. Swart: Oh come on, you're not unemployed.

Mr. Laughren: I'm concerned about the unemployed.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm keenly aware of the problems of the unemployed. I stated we will be working hard to help those in the critical groups: the adult women—I think 68,000 of them came on to the job market last year in addition to the numbers that were already there—

Mr. Cassidy: That wasn't in the budget.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —and the youths between 15 and 25 who make up the other half of the unemployed in that category. But I've said many times that the job-creation record in Ontario is very good. It isn't good enough as long as we have more people entering than jobs created, but within the government's ability to do so, we will be trying to stimulate job creation.

Mr. Laughren: You've done nothing.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't know where the member got the 7,600 figure. I am not going to be tied down to telling him it's 10,000, 1,000 or 100,000 jobs because I don't know. If I stood up here and told him I did, I would be lying. I simply say we will do our utmost to protect the most jobs and to create the most jobs and we are innovating in a new area. We will find out only through our efforts how successful we have been.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, is the Treasurer refusing to discuss any numbers or any specific numbers about the job-creation pro-

gram through the Employment Development Fund because he intends to use it as a slush fund to maintain jobs as a result of adjustments resulting from the GATT negotiations announced by his colleague?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what kind of a job is the most important—one that is protected or one that is created. I would suggest we have highly skilled people in towns like Iroquois Falls and towns like Dryden and towns like St. Catharines and in the Thorold area. I am thinking of the pulp and paper area in Thorold. They would be delighted to have those highly skilled jobs maintained in Canada, and I hope we will see a goodly number of them protected and at the same time a vibrant, clean industry continue.

I will never get any marks for that. The members opposite will always feel they can come back to me and say, "Hey, in the Iroquois Falls plant; now you have modernized it, there are 75 fewer men than were there before." They will be right. All I can tell them is there are probably 950 more than there would have been if we hadn't helped them.

Mr. Peterson: In view of the increase in the work force of 133,000 last year, why is the Treasurer lowering his sights by 33,000 jobs this year to 100,000 when clearly the work force is expanding at this time? Why has the Treasurer given us those very pessimistic numbers and why isn't he doing something about it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the estimation of the growth in the labour force this year is lower than it was last year. I have the figures here somewhere. I don't recall them but I think 132,000 people will be entering the work force this year compared to about 158,000 last year. Does that sound correct in round figures in that order?

Mr. Wildman: Are you asking us now?

Hon. F. S. Miller: In any case, there's a decrease in the projected increase in the size of the work force. Secondly, in my budget I used the words, "a consensus of growth." I said in excess of 100,000. I didn't say 100,000. Our estimation will probably be in the range of 118,000 to 130,000 average new jobs in the coming year. It will be in that kind of ballpark, so we will be coming for the first time very close to the level of the growth in the labour force and have a chance of either equalling it or exceeding it.

If we exceed it, of course there will be a net reduction in unemployment during the year. I would hope that's the case. I would

hope a combination of a more buoyant year than forecast two months ago when the budget was being structured, and the efforts of this government through a number of techniques such as the Employment Development Fund, will permit us at the end of the year to say we exceeded those figures.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, it's an interesting admission that there may not be any new jobs created by the Treasurer's programs at all. Supplementary: Will the minister guarantee us an employment impact study will be done on all applications to the Employment Development Fund?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, we certainly are going to be assessing every one of the applications on a number of bases. For example; can we see Canadian procurement; can we see how many jobs are going to be created? Those kinds of things are a vital part of the assessment.

Mr. Peterson: Would it be fair then for the Treasurer to characterize his program as always aiming so low that no matter how he does, he will never be disappointed?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just coming into the House each day does that for me.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Treasurer have an answer?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I have been restraining them. I think I will pass.

INCREASE IN OHIP PREMIUMS

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of provoking a profane response, because my question is related to egalitarianism, my second question to the \$45,000-a-year Treasurer is: Would he explain why he chose to raise a very regressive tax, namely the OHIP premiums, at a time when access to the health-care system is already being eroded, and can he tell the House how he can justify such an increase when, for a family earning \$15,000 a year, the combination of provincial taxes and health premiums works out to a rate of 79 per cent of the federal tax, the highest combined rate in the entire country?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, members saw the white paper attached to the budget, one that we hope to have a good discussion on in the course of the year, to tackle some of the problems for low-income people. Apart from that, I have great confidence that most people in this province do not want to be fooled by governments. They recog-

nize that if the cost of any commodity they are buying on a daily basis goes up, sooner or later they pay the price for it; if it is the cost of peas, then they pay more, if it is the cost of oranges they pay more.

I think they are also keenly aware that when governments pretend, as governments often do, that because they are spending more on a service they don't have to collect more for that service, such as OHIP, then they recognize that somehow, somewhere, they are going to be paying for it in a different way. One of those ways can be other forms of taxation, and the member may have chosen that.

I would say to him that since only 30 per cent, roughly, of the insured services of OHIP are paid for by OHIP premiums, if the arithmetic is right, then the 70 per cent on the other tax base fairly represents the variable amount. The 30 per cent is something most people accept as an understandable direct charge. About 85 per cent of the subscribers in Ontario, if I am not wrong, are on group plans—the member is aware of that—and of that 85 per cent a goodly number will have some or all of the premium paid for by their employers.

Mr. S. Smith: The worker pays; that is very interesting. What about pollution cleanup?

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Could the Treasurer tell us why in his budget he did nothing about property tax reform, why he failed to enrich the sales tax credit and why he ignored the promise last year to enrich the property tax credit for senior citizens?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am considering those but, unlike some people, I admit it takes me some time to learn. It has taken me a good part of this learning period to get ready for a budget. There are other problems, like property tax reform, that certainly deserve a lot of attention.

Members have seen some action taken by my colleagues, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Maeck) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Wells), to start helping to solve the problems of Ontario's municipal taxpayers; the fact that we are unfreezing the equalization factors and the fact that we made certain transitional or ad hoc grants this year to assist municipalities like Windsor, Sarnia and Sudbury, if I am not wrong. Did Sudbury not get a fairly substantial one?

They are hardly what one would call dens of Conservative support, so we can't be accused of having given this kind of

assistance to our own ridings. We did that as a first step towards solving some of the structural problems of the provincial distribution of money. Members have seen municipalities opt for and request section 86 parts of the Revenue Act.

Mr. di Santo: That is not the question. Sit down.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Those were aimed at the local option to solve certain problems.

Mr. Cassidy: You couldn't learn about senior citizens, but you learned about the needs of people who are very wealthy.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: In regard to insured services, the Ontario people put about \$1,000,000,000 a year into OHIP at the rate of \$20 a month, or \$240 a year, each. If one put that \$240 in the bank, one would expect to be able to collect that money at the bank when one goes to get it. But this government is not delivering to people the services they are paying for. When is the government going to realize that people have a right to demand that service and not be on a stretcher in the hospital emergency room for five days at a time? They are not delivering the service.

[3:00]

Mr. Warner: The system is being destroyed.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, while the honourable member for Grey-Bruce sounds angry at me, I owe my life to him. He is probably the one guy I can say that to in this whole House.

Mr. Peterson: The single biggest mistake he has ever made.

Hon. F. S. Miller: His single biggest mistake, his colleagues say. Nevertheless, I do. If it had not been for him, I never would have made it to an emergency room; and he knows they looked after me when I got there.

Mr. Foulds: How long ago was that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Three years ago.

Mr. Foulds: Before you started the vicious cutbacks.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, it was well after I had started that and the member knows it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Even if it is only a husband and wife in OHIP today, without children, they pay \$480 a year. Correct? The cost of the insurance services, if my arithmetic is right, is \$1,000, so they are getting back a two-for-one basis even if there are no children. Add \$500 more benefits for

every other man, woman and child in the family, and you will see just how well off the Ontario taxpayer is compared to our friends in the United States who envy our system.

Mr. Laughren: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the Treasurer be very candid with us and tell us if, when he was preparing his budget, the decision was made to raise the OHIP premiums, in total, by an amount sufficient to cover the abolishment of the succession duty taxes?

Further, does he really think that the top three per cent of beneficiaries of estates in this province need tax relief more than lower-income people who are paying premiums in Ontario today?

Mr. Warner: Sheriff of Nottingham; rob the poor, give to the rich.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just let me refer for a moment to my budget statement, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

"In spite of the fact that less than three per cent of estates in Ontario are subject to tax, there is widespread opinion that the successors of the average citizen will be subject to the tax," et cetera.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I like those words in that section so well I read them once and I said to myself whoever wrote those words had a gift, they certainly had thought it through and they emphasized my thinking. Do you know where I got them? From the Saskatchewan budget.

Mr. Conway: Final supplementary to the Treasurer on the mooted tax credit system in his budget paper: Can the Treasurer indicate, given the evidence presented to the select committee, what kind of priority his government gives to proceeding with removal of the quite ineffectual premium assistance program and replacing it with a meaningful tax credit system to relieve those 600,000 eligible people who at the present time are simply not being addressed under the premium system mechanism?

Hon. F. S. Miller: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the honourable member has been an extremely valuable member of that committee. I don't very often say that kind of thing, but he has been. I think he has been looking at those problems with us very well.

Mr. Foulds: And you are wrong again.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In putting that paper forward we suggested some changes that we hoped flowed from parts of the select committee's deliberations. We would be delighted if the present formula really got the money

back to the people who deserve it. There is no desire on our part to see them not get a benefit to which they are entitled. Obviously they are not getting it, so obviously we need to change the system. This is one suggestion I would like the government to look at, and I would say we have given it high priority.

KAWARTHA LAKES SCHOOL

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Community and Social Services: In view of the unfortunate disturbance at the Kawartha Lakes School in Lindsay, in which the night shift supervisor was injured and hospitalized; can the minister tell me if it will be the policy in future to have two people on duty in this area during the night hours? And why was there no panic alarm hookup to the local police unit, since the staff has occasion to deal with some very dangerous situations?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I must say that if the honourable member is referring to a recent incident I have not yet been fully advised on the matter by my staff. I will respond to him as soon as I have been.

Mr. Eakins: I am surprised the minister is not aware of it since it happened at 2 a.m. last Sunday morning. I thought that, by this time, we might have an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Eakins: I would also like to ask the minister if he will be acknowledging the heroic stand taken by one of the supervisors, Mr. Ralph Tfoh, the night supervisor, whose bravery undoubtedly prevented injury to other staff and residents?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will respond to the honourable member on all of these matters as soon as I have a full report.

Mr. S. Smith: As soon as I have heard of it.

Mr. Cunningham: Betrayed by your staff again.

MINI-SKOOLES LIMITED

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Minister of Community and Social Services, arising from a meeting I had this morning with five day-care workers at Kingsview II Mini-Skool day-care centre. The five workers quit their jobs last Friday.

I want to ask the minister if he is aware of the following violations of the Day Nurseries Act at the Kingsview II centre reported to me by these five workers? Specifically, that one day-care worker was alone in a room with 10 children under two; a second worker was alone with 19 children under

five; a third worker was alone with 11 babies under nine months; a fourth worker was alone with 23 children ages three and four; and a fifth worker was alone with 14 babies under eight months?

Is the minister aware there was insufficient food for the children, unsanitary conditions and a history of serious injury to those children at that centre? Is he ready now to undertake the kind of investigation into Mini-Skools operations in this province that I requested of him a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question the honourable member raised earlier about that particular school, the matter is under investigation by the staff. I cannot at this point confirm whether the allegations made by the individuals to whom he has spoken are, in fact, accurate. I will respond again when I have the reports.

Mr. Swart: One year later.

Mr. McClellan: By way of supplementary: I was told this morning, Mr. Speaker, that within the past three years a child had died at the Kingsview II day-care centre. I want to ask the minister if he is aware of that, and if it has been reported to him? Secondly, is he aware that on February 6, 1979, a five-month-old baby was found dead at the Mini-Skools day-care centre in Bramalea? Were either of these deaths reported to his ministry and is the minister aware of them?

Hon. Mr. Norton: To the best of my recollection, I know of no such incidents. I shall check with staff and see if they were aware of any such allegations. I am sure if those allegations were at all true they would have been reported to me as a matter of course; if not directly and immediately by staff, as the instructions are, then surely by those persons engaged in the investigation of the cause of death.

Mr. McClellan: I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: You have had five questions now.

Mr. McClellan: This is an important issue, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact I verified the second death—the one that took place in February 1979—with the coroner today, I want to repeat my request as urgently as I can for a full and special investigation of the standard of care in Mini-Skools day-care centres across this province.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Until I have the advantage of a copy of the coroner's report, I am obviously not in a position to make a snap decision on such a matter.

BELL CANADA CASE

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General now in a position to confirm or deny the fact of evidence being adduced in a serious criminal case recently, or within the year, where the accused posed as the husband of one of his victims and as a result prevailed upon the Bell Telephone Company to connect his phone in his office with that of the female person involved? Has he been able to get any further information about that?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the member for St. George first brought this matter to my attention last week, on Tuesday. She was kind enough to provide me with further particulars which would enable me to identify the specific case. Immediately upon receiving that information, on Tuesday afternoon the day before yesterday, I've asked my staff to obtain a full report. I'm not yet in receipt of a report; but as soon as I am I will immediately advise the honourable member and the members of the Legislature.

ST. LAWRENCE STARCH DISPUTE

Mr. Mackenzie: I have a question of the Attorney General. Is the minister aware of the police involvement at St. Lawrence Starch on Lakeshore Road last Friday, a full 48 hours before the strike commenced at midnight Sunday last? Sergeant M. Simpson of the Peel police met in company offices with the chairman of the unit, who was brought in by management personnel of the company. He proceeded to lecture him on the charges that could result in the event of a strike at the plant and any problems on the picket line, and to read to him appropriate sections of the Criminal Code.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I'm not aware of that incident, but I will inquire into it—

Mr. Warner: Sounds like Fleck all over again.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —and report back to the honourable member and to the House.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary: Was there no directive from the Attorney General's office to police forces around the province following the Fleck situation? It was clearly indicated there, even by the OPP, that their actions prior to the strike would not be taken if they had to do it over again. Was there no directive from the minister's office to the police forces; and why was this kind of pressure exerted on the union in advance? That's clearly how it's seen in this situation.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: There may well have been some form of directive following the issues that arose during the Fleck strike. I'm not specifically aware of the nature or character of that directive at the present time.

Mr. Cassidy: That's not good enough.

Mr. Laughren: It's in your name.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The directive did not come from me.

Mr. Laughren: You didn't do it? You didn't send one out?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —it would have come from my predecessor. Again, I will make inquiries and report back to the Legislature.

TRENT-SEVERN LOCKS

Mr. G. Taylor: A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Is the minister aware there is some indication from the federal government there will be a reduction of the lock hours and the employees on the locks on the Trent-Severn system this summer? This is a very vital part of the tourist trade of the Simcoe Centre riding. Is the minister aware of that and what is he going to do about it? Is he going to take any action?

Mr. Bradley: Same answer you gave him this morning, Larry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the situation. The federal government made a decision, for budgetary reasons, after analysing the traffic for the last few years, that the move they've taken was a sensible one. We've already written our federal counterparts—soon to be colleagues—indicating to them we would ask that they reconsider it because we are quite aware of the essential part that system plays in the tourism trade in that part of the province. We have written as recently as this morning, or yesterday.

GRIEVANCE ARBITRATION

Mr. McKessock: I have a question of the Deputy Premier. In view of the fact a grievance settlement board ruled that a man fired by the Ministry of Labour be reinstated even though he had forged 55 reports and expense claims, can this minister tell me who appoints these board members? What qualifications do they have to have to be a board member; and how does the government go about replacing these board members if they find out later they are irresponsible?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take this question as notice, to be

responded to by the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. McCague).

[3:15]

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Breaugh: I have a question of the Minister of Health regarding the agreement he announced on March 29 to provide physicians' services at opted-in rates.

It has been brought to my attention that, in one of our largest hospitals, the Toronto General Hospital, a woman was seeking the services of a gynaecologist. After calling the OMA hotline, the OHIP office, the Ministry of Health, the chief of gynaecology at the Toronto General Hospital, the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and several general practitioners at a clinic, she tried our office. After all this, no one was able to obtain services for this woman. It is apparent that no lists are kept by the OMA.

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Breaugh: I ask if the minister is aware of this?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the honourable member would send me over the name of the individual, and dates, then I will see that it is followed up as per our agreement with the medical association.

Mr. Cassidy: So if we raise it in the House then we will get an answer.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I ask the member to send the name because I think it is quite improper to start trooping people's names through the media, especially when we're talking about something as sensitive and personal as gynaecological procedures.

Mr. Wildman: The minister is forcing it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the member sends it to me, I'll see that it is followed up.

Mr. Breaugh: A supplementary: I would like to point out to the House that I did not use anyone's name. This matter has already been in the minister's office. Is he aware that the OMA does not keep a list of specialists in any of the cases that have come before us? In fact the OMA is simply referring them either to their own family doctors or back to the hospitals; so in practice, no assistance is being offered by the hotline.

Mr. MacDonald: That's a red herring. Those are the inadequacies of the new system.

Mr. Breaugh: It's questionable whether the hotline is in existence anymore.

Mr. Cassidy: There is no hotline.

Mr. Laughren: What a system the government has.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member knows that the procedure in the interim will be to look at individual instances. I don't recognize the circumstances he described. My staff has been keeping me informed of people who have contacted my office. When the member says the woman contacted my office, maybe she contacted someone in the ministry, but if the member will send me the details I will be glad to follow it up, because I think the agreement we arrived at is one which will work very well.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is naive.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In fact, I think the situation here can best be described by this—I'd like to quote for the members from the Premier's statement, who best described this when he said:

"Physicians are allowed to bill direct"—I think that's the member's concern—"on the basis that their particular practices warrant more than the commission pays. This could be for cases where more specialized care of the patient is required or where the physician chooses to take more time in treatment. There may be instances where doctors practice medicine differently, then it would be appropriate for doctors to bill their patients directly and the patients could recover the cost and pay the difference."

That, I think, describes the system and is reinforced by our recent agreement.

Mr. Wildman: The member for Oshawa's description is more accurate.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That description, Mr. Speaker, is the description of the Saskatchewan system by the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Honourable Alan Blakeney.

Mr. Wildman: It may work out there but it doesn't work here.

Mr. Cassidy: If the minister thinks Saskatchewan is good, then take away the health premiums in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I didn't say they were good. I am saying that when you are in power it sometimes makes a difference, doesn't it?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Armourdale.

FIRE DETECTORS

Mr. McCaffrey: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

A gentleman, a Mr. Gibson, the fire chief in the city of North York, recently expressed some very real concern about the Ontario Building Code. Specifically, his concern was why fire detectors were not mandatory in

new apartment construction. Given the fact that fire detectors work and have been very well received, could the minister comment on an amendment, if it's required, to the Ontario Building Code that would change that legislation?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, right now the building code requires combustion detectors in new housing less than 6,000 square feet in area and three storeys in height.

Mr. Haggerty: The first three floors.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The member across the floor is quite correct, but not in larger residential buildings.

At the time the building code was drafted the available fire statistics clearly indicated that lower density houses were a much greater fire hazard than apartments. Additionally, apartment buildings are built as compartments. They do have detector and alarm systems, and in storage areas they have sprinklers. These are all features, obviously, that minimize the hazards associated with fire. That was the reason for the original demarcation of under three storeys and over.

Notwithstanding the fact that I think statistically that position is still justified—statistically—our concern, of course, is for the maximum safety of every citizen. For some time there has been some serious thought about single-station detectors—which is a fancy phrase for individualized smoke detectors, in the unit—in new apartment suites. There would be in addition to the existing Ontario Building Code requirements for sprinklers and so forth.

We have come to the conclusion—and I will do it in this session—that such a mandatory detector within every unit is justified in terms of safety, notwithstanding the statistical evidence. I will bring in amendments to the building code, hopefully in this session, to have it done. In the meantime, we are circulating my conclusion, or the conclusion of the building code branch, to every builder in Ontario so that they can't say when we bring in the legislation that they were not aware of it, or that they cannot find a supply of these detectors.

Mr. McCaffrey: Supplementary: That would speak, then, to new apartment construction. May I ask about existing high-rise buildings in this province?

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the fire code, which really concerns existing buildings, is now in the process of review. The conclusions of a task force that studied this and did make recommendations

about a fire code for existing buildings were published in the Ontario Gazette in January. It received the widest circulation across the province. At this time, fire departments, municipalities, regional governments and what have you are studying that. They are commenting upon the recommendations made.

I would be less than candid if I were not to point out that within the recommendations there appeared to be somewhat of a dichotomy involving the single-station detector. When there is a resolution of the fire code, I am quite sure that there will also be a resolution of the issue of the single-station detector, and indeed, some fire alarms.

One of the things I caution the House and the member who asked the question about is that we have to be practical in terms of a fire code when dealing with existing buildings. There are some cases where the construction of the building would not allow certain things. It is a little bit different situation and one must be much more flexible than when one is laying down conditions prior to a structure being built.

At the time the fire code comes in, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you—if this ministry still maintains control over the fire code, because there are suggestions by that task force that it be transferred to the Solicitor General in order to be in concert with the office of the fire marshal which is under his ministry—if it is with my ministry when the recommendations are translated into legislation, there will be priority thinking and priority recommendations, not only for alarm systems but for the single-station detector, or the smoke detector, as we know it.

HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. Bradley: A question for the Minister of Health: In view of the fact that the joint role study conducted last year by a consultant for the three hospitals in St. Catharines indicated that there is an ample work load to justify ultra-sound imaging equipment in the Niagara Peninsula, and that such equipment should be located at St. Catharines General Hospital, would the minister indicate to the House if an early decision can be expected on this proposal?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having had notice of the question from the member. I can indicate that this is one of a number of things which are under consideration for funding in 1979-80 under our new and expanded programs allocation. Also, in the process we have been developing

a policy for the distribution of ultra-sound equipment. It's another of the new, high-cost and innovative technologies. Yes, I can assure the member reasonably safely that within a month there should be an answer.

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Minister of Health. Why has he reneged on his commitment to small hospitals that they would receive a minimum increase of 5.3 per cent in budgets if they had less than 50 beds last year?

Specifically, why have Anson General in Iroquois Falls, Bingham Memorial in Matheson and Mattawa General all been offered only zero increase, and Red Lake's Margaret Couchenour Memorial only 0.87 per cent and St. Joseph's General in Little Current only 1.27 per cent, when all of them had less than 50 beds last year?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member knows that in the determination of budgets for 1979-80 in those areas we took into account a surplus active-treatment bed position. Also, in all of those areas the health councils—I think I am correct in this—are actively looking at their chronic-bed needs; and, as with most other communities, I think what one will find is that, in the process of trying to treat the system equally as far as distribution of acute-care beds is concerned, we will see more chronic-care beds opened. That certainly has been the case in every community whose representatives I have met.

The other day I met with the members for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) and Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) and groups from their constituencies. In the process of examining what they perceived to be a budgetary problem we identified that in fact they needed more chronic-care beds; we agreed that we would set about recognizing that and adjusting budgets accordingly. In those communities that work is already under way through their health councils, and I am hopeful that we can resolve their problems in the next little while.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain why these hospital boards and administrators and the health councils have to make this pilgrimage down here to meet with him to discuss chronic-care beds and to maintain their budgets?

Why does he not maintain the budgets while the adjustment is going on? These hospitals do not have the flexibility that other larger hospitals have to cut out the services.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, they certainly do not have to come to Toronto.

Mr. Wildman: A lot of them are.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Well, that is their option.

Mr. Swart: They just get a "no" answer if they don't.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The area teams of the ministry have been travelling extensively. In fact, the very day I met with the two delegations I referred to, namely, Tuesday—and that is why I was not here for question period that day—I was informed that the area team had met with representatives of five other hospitals in the southwestern Ontario area and sorted out their problems, specifically with regard to the identification of additional chronic-bed needs and the re-allocation.

Mr. Nixon: How about Brantford?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: As my friend knows, Brantford is well on its way, with the co-operation of the health council, the local hospitals and the—

Mr. Nixon: The members?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —the members, the ministry and the minister, and the incentive I outlined in my letter to the health council—

Mr. Nixon: Half a million dollars will make anybody co-operate.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Well, sometimes. My honourable colleague the Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) referred earlier to statements made in 1975 by the then Minister of National Health and Welfare. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote to you from a speech he gave to the Richelieu Club in Montreal on September 15, 1975, wherein he was talking about what he was looking for in all the provinces. This just reinforces what the Treasurer said. He was looking for us to "rationalize the system and make it more effective, shift the emphasis from high-cost services to the increased development of such less costly alternatives as extended and nursing home care facilities and ambulatory care services, and aim at an integrated system."

That is the point of all our policies: to identify chronic-care needs and to see them recognized out of re-allocation of the system; to identify extended-care or nursing home needs and, where they are needed, to increase them; and, for that matter, where additional active-treatment beds are needed to come up to the standards, such as in Newmarket a few weeks ago and in other areas, to identify those too.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. J. Reed: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Has the minister, as of yesterday, disbanded or simply relocated the energy management team which has been perhaps the most singularly successful part of his ministry when it comes to the management of energy; and if this disbandment has taken place, are there any plans for the operation that was performed by that team to be taken up in other ministries?

[3:30]

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I'll test my cough and cold once again in reply.

Mr. Conway: How are you going to give away that \$200,000,000 if you haven't got the fortitude to stand up to questions?

Mr. S. Smith: That's not money to be sneezed at.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It happened in Chicago yesterday.

Mr. Eakins: I'll take the hockey tickets tonight.

Mr. Peterson: Give him some chicken soup.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not during Passover. The member is quite right in referring to the success of our energy program. What occurred was that we had two energy buses running for a period of a couple of months. The first energy bus came in about 1975. It belonged to Mohawk College and we leased it from them. Because of the success of the program, as that bus got old and deteriorated, which it has, we were successful in getting the federal government to purchase a bus and allow us to operate it on a shared-cost basis starting last September or October. For the last few months while the old bus was being phased out there were two, but in essence the one new bus which is an excellent bus, serves the purpose. The program is continuing and is a very successful one.

Mr. Conway: Enough. He needs the help of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Peterson: You had better sit down and not tax yourself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There have been three persons in my ministry on contract working on some further energy programs. As a result of their efforts, they have been put on one-year contracts to suggest further and different ways in which our energy-saving programs might be developed. As a result of the success of their work, we've now been able to implement some new pro-

grams. These will operate through the aegis of the Ontario Research Foundation through a funding of something like \$150,000.

Mr. Conway: Has your doctor opted in now?

Mr. J. Reed: If these people have been so effective and if they have been such a boon to manufacturers and industry in Ontario, where reports seem to be very positive about the work that has been done by these people, why did the ministry fire them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We didn't fire anyone; we hired three people—

Mr. J. Reed: Are they working today?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —as consultants on a one-year contract to analyse the potential and study what programs might be implemented. As a result of their recommendations and their work, we developed some programs—

An hon. member: They were fired.

Mr. Laughren: You de-employ them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —through the Ontario Research Foundation which will be established. As I say, the funding will be something like \$150,000.

Mr. J. Reed: It's only one of their functions and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that's not so. It is as a result of their work and the study we commissioned for one year that the new programs have been undertaken by ORF. Certainly some of their recommendations were not accepted, there's no question about that; but they were not hired originally to do work, which only the Ontario Research Foundation is equipped to do now, but which came about as a result of their studies.

SALE OF BEER AT BASEBALL STADIUM

Mr. Samis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations on regional incentives. Could the minister tell us what it is about the sporting public of Metro Toronto that makes him feel that they can't be trusted to act maturely and responsibly if they are given the same right as any other sporting fans in any other franchise in North America, namely to have a beer at the ball game?

Mr. Conway: Give them your temperance speech.

Hon. Mr. Drea: First of all, I'm sure it comes as a grave disappointment to the member who asked this question and the

newspaper that carried the item this morning that the cameras are turned off.

Mr. Roy: The lighting is not so good anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: Give your answer tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Quite frankly, I don't need that 60-foot power light or whatever the member for Ottawa East was suggesting it was.

An hon. member: You glow in the dark.

Mr. Peterson: When your nose is lit up nobody needs a light.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It is not a question of trust. I would hope the member was misquoted in the paper this morning when he called me a temperance man, because I'd like an apology on that one.

Mr. Conway: We were just quoting the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Hon. Mr. Drea: It is not a question of that. Would you allow me just a moment, Mr. Speaker, because I think we should put this matter to rest today.

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Industry and Tourism should stay here. He can't run out on this.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The policy on alcohol consumption in stadia in the province is not mine. It was enacted in 1977 by the cabinet and it was reaffirmed in 1978.

Mr. Cassidy: That's a copout. Do you support it or not?

Mr. Roy: It's not like you to skate around.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I want to put this on the record. It's cabinet policy. I've made these remarks publicly before. This year, Mr. Speaker, I can say as the minister responsible that there has not been an application, there has not even been one letter to me or to the Liquor Licence Board. To date, there has not been one to either, not one. I don't know why the member didn't even write.

Mr. Samis: You know why there hasn't been one, Frank.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there was no application before the board. I want to go into one other thing because I wonder how brave the member for Cornwall is going to be.

Mr. Samis: You know why there hasn't been one.

Hon. Mr. Drea: I refer this to the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Ms. Bryden) so she can watch this one.

Mr. di Santo: That's not the question.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The policy regarding liquor licences at the moment, and I think most of the honourable members agree with the policy I brought in last October, is the municipality must have input into the licensing procedure. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record that the city of Toronto does not want alcohol served in the CNE stadium.

An hon. member: They voted on it.

Mr. Nixon: Oh baloney. How did you get it in Ontario Place? You've got it right across the road in Ontario Place.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, were an application to come and were I to ask the cabinet to change policy, I would be repudiating my word and my commitment on what has happened in the Beaches.

An hon. member: Shuffle off to Buffalo.

Hon. Mr. Drea: It would be the same thing for the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Ziemba). Mr. Speaker, I am not a friend of Mayor Sewell. I am sure the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) is much closer to him. I barely co-exist. If he wants to allow somebody to make an application that will not run counter to the wishes of his colleagues, I humbly suggest he go and see Mayor Sewell and have Mayor Sewell say he wants beer in the ball park.

Mr. Cassidy: This is so sanctimonious. It isn't true.

Mr. Laughren: It is hard coming from you, Frank.

Mr. Cassidy: What a copout.

MOTIONS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO HYDRO AFFAIRS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the select committee on Hydro affairs be allowed to sit concurrent with the House, April 19, 20, 25, 26 and 27.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that notwithstanding the orders of the House, private members' public business be considered in the evening of Thursday, April 19, 1979.

Motion agreed to.

ORDER OF BALLOT ITEMS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that notwithstanding the orders of the House, the order of precedence for private members' public business be changed so that Mr. Watson's

ballot item be listed and called for debate May 10 and Mr. Handleman's ballot item be listed and called for debate June 21.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, just before calling the orders of the day, pursuant to standing order 13, I wish to indicate the business of the House for next week.

On Tuesday, April 17, the official opposition will reply to the budget in the afternoon, and in the evening, the House will resolve itself into committee of supply to commence consideration of the Ministry of Government Services estimates.

On Wednesday, April 18, the House will not meet in the chamber. However, the resources development, general government and administration of justice committees may meet in the morning.

On Thursday, April 19, in the afternoon, there will be a budget reply from the New Democratic Party, and in the evening, ballot items five and six.

On Friday, April 20, the House will be in committee of supply to continue its consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS FAMILY BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Peterson moved second reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I understand I have 20 minutes—is that correct?—and I would like to reserve three or four at the end, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member is quite right; he has up to 20 minutes to use as he sees fit, and may reserve some time at the end.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you. If you would be so kind as to notify me when there are three or four minutes left, I would be grateful.

I am glad the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) is in the House. I have waited a considerable length of time to have an opportunity to chat about this particular bill, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple bill; all it does is entitle, under the Family Benefits Act, a male head of a single-parent family to the same rights as a female would have in similar circumstances.

I know the minister is quite familiar with all of this, and I have tracked the history of

this particular issue through this House for a considerable length of time. I can say without fear of contradiction I have never seen an issue discussed more dishonestly; I have never seen more obscure rationalization to prevent the coming into law of a principle that is clearly right; I have never seen so much fooling around and intellectual dishonesty on any particular issue that has faced this House.

It is an issue that every one of us knows; there isn't one member of this House who doesn't know the law as it stands at present is wrong.

Mr. Nixon: "Is a ass."

Mr. Peterson: The law, to quote my friend, "Anatole" Nixon, is an ass in these particular circumstances. We all know that.

What we need is just a tiny bit of courage to break out of this cycle of justifying the inequities and inequalities in the Family Benefits Act by saying we can't prioritize them, that we don't know which is more inequitous, by blaming it on the federal government or saying we can't afford it, yet at the same time not supplying the appropriate figures to the House so we can have any kind of scrutiny of the government's position on this matter.

I am going to read several quotations from past exchanges on this issue in the House. The minister is familiar with them, but I think they are important enough to state some of them.

I am glad the minister is here, and I hope he is going to listen because I want to introduce to him three people who are here in the House and who represent typical cases of the kind of inequity and injustice he is perpetrating on a daily basis. All of these gentlemen are sitting under the Speaker's gallery to my left.

The first one I want to introduce—and I would like the minister to look at them because he is going to have to respond to these people, not to me—is Terry Pembleton. I want him to meet these people. I want him to know what he is doing to these people.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will respond; I will respond. Just carry on with the debate. What does this have to do with the principle of the bill? Stop grandstanding and tell me what has this to do with the principle of the bill? It has nothing to do with the principle whatsoever. Get on with the debate.

Mr. Peterson: I want the minister to know the kind of inequities he is perpetrating.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Get on with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Peterson: I wish he would get angry just once about an important issue rather than about a nonsense thing as he is doing right now. If he showed just a little bit of commitment, if he would stretch himself just once to try to show his cabinet colleagues that he has a little bit of clout we would be an awful lot happier.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Stop taking advantage of people and get on with the principle.

Mr. Peterson: He is turning out to be a disappointment; a case of promise unfulfilled. I was one of those people who said, when he was appointed to the ministry, "There is a bright young person who represents the new wave in Ontario." He has let us down, been a caretaker, he has not been innovative—

Hon. Mr. Norton: I don't see what that has to do with the bill.

Mr. Peterson: —and here is one particular case where he can do something worthwhile. Meet Terry Pembleton. He has three children.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is baloney, baloney. If you were better informed on what is happening in the area of social services you would not be so preoccupied with the fiscal matters.

Mr. Peterson: They are 12, 11 and eight.

Mr. Gregory: What is this?

Mr. Peterson: He was deserted by his wife in March 1977. He worked to July 1977 when he was laid off. He was on unemployment insurance for a while and he decided at that time to be a full-time father. A fundamental part of my presentation today is that it is my profound belief that a father in those circumstances should have the right to become a full-time parent. I think there is no finer service one can render to the community, to society or mankind.

I would take you back to the throne speech of 1978, a year ago, when the government devoted six or seven pages to the strengthening of the family. Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker? Do you remember that marvellous diatribe about how important the family is, then the government conscientiously, legislatively wrecked that institution we all agree is so important

[3:45]

So Mr. Pembleton decided that he wanted to look after his children. He was on unemployment insurance, and he is on general welfare assistance at this point. That means he goes out every day to look for a job with all the attendant problems. He is still on general welfare assistance with all of the insecurity attendant thereto, because as you

are aware, he can be cut off anytime, particularly after six months.

We have gone through every single review procedure available to Mr. Pembleton. I have even written to the minister. He responded to my letter after two or three months. He refused to take the case—or maybe he did take it—to cabinet. In any event, there was no order in council forthcoming for Mr. Pembleton.

Mr. Roy: You have no weight in cabinet.

Mr. Peterson: He is still in the same situation today he was in six months ago. We have had no help.

Mr. Ron Burrows wanted to be here today. He has children of five, seven, and nine—three little boys. He has been on general welfare assistance for a couple of years. He would have been here today but he could not get a babysitter because it is kind of expensive to get a babysitter for little people that age.

I want to introduce Bill Confiss. Here is another interesting case. He is sitting in the gallery. Mr. Confiss is the father of six children. There are three at home right now, one 17 and twins 11 years old. He was separated in 1967. At that point he was responsible for six little children—not five. He struggled along; he worked full time; he was a letter carrier, and he became a salesman after that.

His mother assisted in the raising of those little children. Go back 12 years and you will understand those were small, small children at that time. He and his mother, struggled on as best they could. His mother became ill and he then had no alternative but to become a full-time father.

In August 1978, he finally applied for family benefits because he was on general welfare assistance. He put in his application on September 6 of that year. In December, some three months later, a social worker came, talked to him, talked to his children, and then nothing was heard back.

He had no idea where to go. There were no forms to fill out; there was no notice from the ministry; there was no response whatsoever. Finally, he got in touch with the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman got in touch with the minister's office somehow and the word at this point according to the Ombudsman's office is that Mr. Confiss' case has been approved and he will get family benefits by way of order in council.

In the process, he has not gone through the same review procedures, he has not done all the same things other people in similar cases have to do. There is no rhyme nor reason. There are time delays, there are harassments and there is no regularity what-

soever to the process going on. He was not turned down by the welfare review board or any other agency that we can determine at this particular time.

I want to introduce one other gentleman, John Morrison. John Morrison is from Toronto and he has been carrying his case most intelligently for a considerable number of years. I think in some respects this is a very tragic case. I want to tell you a real situation: He has three children, 11, 12 and 14; three little boys. He has had custody of those kids for seven years since he was deserted by his wife.

He spent the first five and a half years as a mechanic, making \$8 an hour. Today, he would probably be making \$10, \$11 or \$12 an hour. He is not a poor man. He has other options. He has his class A mechanic's licence. He decided in November 1977 that the best service he could do was to become a full-time father to his three little boys. He was not happy about what was going on to influence them and he felt he could best serve them by being there.

He went through a litany of confusion and disaster and waiting and disruption that is almost a sad story. He had to go on welfare assistance. He applied for family benefits; they told him to get a doctor's letter; the doctor said it would be easier on his nerves if he could receive family benefits.

On January 18, he received notice his notice of intent was turned down. On February 10, his appeal was turned down. On March 6, the ministry wrote back acknowledging receipt of form 1 on the request for a hearing. On March 15, they gave a date for a hearing. On April 5, they reviewed the whole situation.

Mr. McMaster at that time said very complimentary things to Mr. Morrison about what a wonderful fellow he was, how he was doing the right thing, and that he was taking a conscientious role in the situation. On May 24, the decision came: he was turned down. On May 26, he went to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman advised him there was still one other procedure he could go through. On June 16, he went back and filled in form 2 for a reconsideration on section 12 of the Family Benefits Act.

On July 18, he got a letter from a law firm, Campbell, Jarvis, McKenzie and Fulton, presumably acting for the ministry. If they had given him the legal fees in the first place they could have saved all the money they were probably charged. It is the most ridiculous system. The letter gave him notice that the application was turned down

—a most ludicrous situation—and that they were going to close the file.

At that point he went to the media. He talked to the *Globe and Mail*, the Ombudsman, the CBC Ombudsman, the Ontario Human Rights Commission and everyone else he could think of, because he was desperate and frustrated in the circumstances. On August 24, he got an order in council to get \$412 under the Family Benefits Act.

Mr. Speaker, you can see the different kinds of stories I am telling. I think it is important to explain, and that people understand, that there is no regularity. I think it is also important that people understand the frustration and the lack of hope. Most of these people are on general welfare assistance. They don't have the money to make the phone calls, or hire the lawyers; they don't know where to go. All of the uncertainty and inhumanity that is attendant thereto makes it a cruel situation.

I know these three gentlemen, and frankly I have had cases before this where I have been turned down. These are not welfare ripoff artists; these aren't the kind of people that Gord Walker would like to stand up and make speeches about. These are decent people making conscientious, conscious decisions to do what they feel is right in life. I admire them for it, I think it is correct, and I support their decisions.

I have a little time left and I want to go through some of the quotations. It is staggering, and I could go on at great length. This has been treated in such a cold, political way, with so many weaselly dishonest rationalizations to get out of it, that I am most disappointed.

Let me quote from the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Baetz). He was discussing this in the Legislature one time. There's a case. We thought there was a person who would bring some humanity to this Legislature. He said: "I am convinced that the financial implications would not be formidable." That is a quote from Hansard, December 15, 1977. That was his opinion. Of course, using a convoluted sort of logic that only he can understand and no one else, he felt he would be expediting this bill. He voted against it. Obviously, he was told by cabinet to stand up and block the bill, which I deplore and which I hope the government will not do today. If they do, they should have shame on their faces.

Mr. Warner: They have done it before, and they'll do it again.

Mr. Peterson: Even the member for Ottawa West recognized, before the whips got to him, the inequality and the inequity here.

The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) is sitting there and, I know she agrees with me on every single word I am saying today. I just hope she has the courage to use her influence as policy secretary to stand up today and do what is right in these circumstances. It will be an interesting test.

I have asked a considerable number of questions in this House on this matter in the last little while. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie), who administers the human rights bill, admits it is inequitable, discriminatory and everything else, but says that he can't touch it. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development has yet to table the studies, as far as I can see, but she has admitted that it is inequitable, it is inhumane, it is unjust.

The Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) said, on March 15, 1979: "First of all, the procedure that is at present being used by way of order in council does, I admit, leave something to be desired." He also makes a fundamental error of judgement. I also point out that a substantial majority of the male single parents who apply, do apply under circumstances which render them eligible for assistance. The government expects them to be blind, halt, lame or otherwise handicapped in order to receive any kind of fair benefits under this situation. I think it is a humiliating process to have to put people through. It is costly for the minister, it wastes his time and everybody else's time.

The constant response, of course, is: "It is going to cost \$28,000,000 and we're not sure if that is our priority. If we attack this whole discrimination business we may have to worry about disabled spouses more than single fathers."

One of the things I have learned in this House in my brief period here is that we can't do everything at once, but sometimes we do have an opportunity to do something. To quote my friend, Anatole Nixon: "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." We have a chance here to clean up one piece of discrimination. The government does not have to, at this time, get so global in its outlook to rationalize doing nothing. That is what I fear they are going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have several other quotations, and I guess I have a little bit of time left.

Mr. Acting Speaker: You have four of your 20 minutes left.

Mr. Peterson: One of the most disturbing articles I've read on this subject was called, "Lone Dad, Poor Dad." It was in Weekend Magazine. I'm quoting a former Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. J. A. Taylor) talking about a particular case. He said the only reason he responded to this particular case was that it was before an election and he didn't want to end up in the election taking on motherless children. It was only the political considerations that made him change his mind.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Is that in the article?

Mr. Peterson: It's in this article. I'll find the particular quote and send it over. I'll give it to the minister in the windup.

These are the kinds of situations that previous ministers and future ministers have forced on themselves. The minister has an opportunity now to do something about it. I wish he would. I wish he would support this bill. If he stands up and blocks it, as I fear he may, not only will he be making a mockery of the entire private members' rules in this House, but he will also be doing himself, his government and every member of this Parliament, in my judgement, a considerable disservice, and that would make one more reason why none of us should be particularly proud of some of the inequities we're perpetrating on people.

When the minister speaks, I hope he speaks directly to those three gentlemen over there.

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill because it's a very simple and straightforward bill, which reflects in a way a bill that was introduced last year by my colleague, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), but which unfortunately was blocked by members of the Conservative Party.

As I said and as the member for London Centre said, it's a very simple, straightforward bill which attempts to remove a discrimination that exists at this point in the Family Benefits Act.

The bill wants to remove a discrimination in the act. It would enable either parent to qualify for family benefits. It lists the case of a parent who should qualify for a series of reasons, not only because he or she has been deserted but, as the bill says, because the spouse is a patient in an institution or the spouse has deserted the person for three months or more or the spouse is imprisoned in a penal institution or is divorced and not remarried or is living separately and apart from the other spouse and has been living separately and apart for a continuous period of five years or more.

There is a series of circumstances where single parents who choose to raise their children find themselves—in a situation where, unless they get support from the government, they cannot raise their children. Since the act excludes males from getting family benefits, we are faced with serious discrimination.

I think the rationale behind this discrimination is unacceptable as well. In fact, what many backbenchers are asserting is that perhaps if we remove this discrimination from the act, all single parents would like to stay at home and raise children. As a matter of fact, that was the very interjection the former Minister of Community and Social Services made during the speech the member for Sudbury East or the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) made. His interjection was: Do you want all of them to stay at home?

[4:00]

I respect those men who choose to raise their children and who prefer to make a personal sacrifice by staying at home rather than sending their children to a foster home and having them educated by outside people in an environment that they may think is not fit for their children. I think those parents deserve our respect. I do not think for a moment that all male single parents would like to stay at home and raise their children.

As a matter of fact, I should add that this government has been acting quite dishonestly in dealing with cases of male single parents. Last year, the minister said that orders in council had been passed and family benefits allowed in 25 cases. I do not think that is the way to deal with this problem; if we do recognize that there is a problem there, then we should correct it by passing an amendment to the bill.

The fact is that the government acts only when public opinion is alerted because the issue is raised—by the media, by the Ombudsman, or by a member in the House. In that case, in typical Tory fashion, in order to silence the male single parent, the government passes an order in council and grants benefits.

The excuse used in the past was that we should wait for the reform of the family law. We now have a new family law. We also have had judgements passed by several judges who have recognized allowances to the husband in cases of separation or divorce. Why not realize that values and needs have changed in our society today and, when we are faced with situations where males choose to perform what was considered in the past the role of women—specifically, to raise children—give them the same rights on the

same basis as we give them to women? It is a basic right that should be recognized.

I hope the government does not again block this bill. It is a minor discrimination, but there are many people who suffer because of this discrimination. I do not think, as perhaps many people on the other side think, that all male single parents will take advantage of the amendment and stay at home, because it is a sacrifice to stay at home and raise children.

I believe the minister is going to speak on this bill; I hope he agrees with the principle of the bill and supports it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on this private member's bill. At the outset I would say that I regret very much that in situations like this often there are allegations made which I hope are not honestly believed—allegations of dishonesty and, on other occasions, of having misled people. I think that is an unfair accusation to level at any member on this side of the House on this particular issue.

I would point out to the members opposite that being in a situation where one has to make, and is responsible for making, certain decisions with respect to changes and reform in the law as it relates to social services in this province can create the very difficult situation of establishing priorities. As the honourable member opposite has indicated, it's not possible to do all things at one time. It does mean that one has to establish priorities.

If this bill were in the form of a resolution, the principle of which related to eliminating any discrimination on the basis of sex, on that principle he would get little or no argument from this side of the House.

The point I would emphasize is that—although this is not the primary consideration, it is a consideration—there are costs involved. If a private member's bill at any point is going to be seen as legitimately dealing with expenditure matters it seems to me that there is also an onus upon the sponsor of the bill to indicate what the source of that revenue ought to be, because priority establishing clearly involves those kinds of issues.

I'm not going to allege that there is dishonesty, but I would just point out to the honourable members who moved and seconded this bill that there is something else that ought to be taken into consideration in terms of asking that question of themselves, as to whether they are being consistent. It's one thing to champion an issue such as this, on which we agree with them, that those distinctions have to be eliminated as soon as

possible. At the same time, their honourable leader spoke on September 27 at a \$100-a-plate fund-raising dinner in Frontenac-Addington, adjacent to my riding, he was quoted in the media at that time. The headline was: "Ontario Must Slash Spending, Warns Smith." The report goes as follows: "The Ontario government must make drastic spending cuts in every ministry." That has not taken place in my ministry. I can assure members of that. I don't agree with what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) was advocating.

This is what troubles me. When the honourable members opposite have their leader, on the one hand, saying one thing and they in fact are saying the other, I'm not sure what the policy is.

Mr. Foulds: In that party the leader says two different things anywhere he is.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The Leader of the Opposition went on to say, in claiming that there was a need for balancing the budgets in the provinces of this country, that we are in the greatest financial crisis since the great depression. That was the groundwork. Then he went on and he became more specific. He said: "There should be no new social programs until we get an awful lot richer." I'm not sure I would agree with his assessment entirely, but they can't have it both ways.

Mr. Foulds: I wouldn't agree with it at all.

Hon. Mr. Norton: They can't have it both ways, introducing money-spending bills and at the same time telling us we should be spending less money. I am very pleased with the achievements of my ministry.

Mr. M. N. Davison: Why don't you deal with the real problem? They are always doing that kind of thing. Deal with the real issue.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'm coming to that. I think this bill, although it identifies one specific area of bias in the legislation which I have indicated I do wish to eliminate—

Mr. Peterson: Why don't you?

Hon. Mr. Norton: It's a question of priorities. It ignores a number of other, perhaps even more serious, areas.

Mr. Peterson: Like what?

Hon. Mr. Norton: For example, disabled wives.

Mr. Peterson: You always use that one.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I use that example because, yes, it's an important example.

Mr. Peterson: Why don't you bring in legislation on that one and deal with them one at a time?

Hon. Mr. Norton: There is at the present time, however less than desirable it might be, available to single fathers the assistance that is available through the General Welfare Assistance Act, albeit on an average of about eight per cent less than they would be receiving on family benefits.

Disabled wives, at the present time, probably would not be eligible for that assistance. One has to take those things into consideration in terms of trying to determine what is the most effective way to approach the reform in the law that we recognize is necessary.

The other thing this bill does, which I don't believe it was intended to do, is create a very complicated situation with respect to creating a bias in favour of common law relationships as opposed to legal marriages. That I could explain in detail, but I don't wish to take the time doing that. It would create a very strong bias in favour of much earlier and more generous assistance.

It creates an other problem: we haven't got an answer yet from the federal government to our communication in the early part of this month asking whether a change in this bill would render certain programs under the Family Benefits Act ineligible for federal assistance. It is our belief this change would result in that—not in the case of sole-support parents, but other programs under family benefit which would probably be rendered ineligible for cost-sharing as a result of the passage of this bill, if it were to pass.

Ms. Gigantes: Why?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Because of the problem created by definitions. As I say, I would rather not take up all the time on this bill by getting into technicalities which, I suppose, if they were going to be dealt with at all, ought to be dealt with in committee. But I will send the member, if she wishes, an explanation of that and also let her know what the reply is when we receive it from the federal government.

As we approach reform in the area of social services, it is important that we ask some very basic questions. As we look towards equality and the elimination of sexual bias, I think we also have to ask what is the most appropriate basis to move to. For example, is the current circumstance of single mothers precisely the one that should be appropriate across the whole board, or ought there to be some modifications in the system as we reform it?

I have indicated a number of times, in response to questions in the House and in statements, that there have been ongoing dis-

cussions with the federal government. Discussions started with the provinces last September, began in earnest with the federal government about November, December, and in fact have been continuing since January, regarding some changes under the Canada Assistance Plan. These would allow us more flexibility in terms of making changes in social assistance, particularly in income support legislation.

I must apologize; I was in a rather enraged state the day I responded in the House to a question and mentioned that, but I am very disappointed at the response we have just recently received saying no. I hope that is not the end of it, but it appears for the time being it will be. I intend to pursue it further both with the federal government and, if necessary, with my own colleagues to see if it is not possible that we can find some money to go it alone with these reforms. I think they are fundamentally important. But it is clear at this time we are not going to get the co-operation of the federal government, even though it looked hopeful as recently as a couple of months ago.

As long as we have to live with a less than desirable situation—that is the order in council route—if there is anything we can do to improve that procedure I would be delighted to do it. Obviously I am not familiar with every detail the member read out prior to the debate this afternoon, but if we can do anything to improve that procedure to avoid those frustrations I would be delighted to do that.

I still think that until such time as we are able to move forward with meaningful reform across this piece of legislation, we will be stuck with living with the order in council route.

In the meantime, if I can work with the honourable members to improve that process, I would be delighted to. I hope that will continue to be a reasonably equitable way to deal with it. It is not going to be perfect, but we cannot view this family benefits legislation as a substitute for unemployment insurance. I am not suggesting it is or that others have viewed it that way, but it is not intended for that. Therefore one has to take into consideration, surely, the needs of the children. And surely there have to be some indications, especially when you are living in a society where you must bear in mind there are many, many families—

[4:15]

Mr. Acting Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —where both parents are working and are out of the home during the comparable periods of time.

Mr. Peterson: They don't have any choice.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Yes, they have choice. But also, I think, in a situation like this, when we're dealing with single parents, it's important that the needs of the children be the priority consideration.

Mr. di Santo: Very disappointing.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, it may seem strange to the minister that I am indeed in support of this bill and its philosophy, because, while on many occasions I have debated with him the inequities under the act as they apply to women, I think there's been a major step forward as a result of the introduction of the bill. When we discussed the inequities to women, the minister considered those to be anomalies; now he has moved over a little more to recognize bias and discrimination. This is a step forward.

Perhaps, though, I could bring a different dimension to this debate. We are today and this year involved in the International Year of the Child. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development sent out suggestions as to what we could do for the child. I must respond to her that I really can't be a block parent.

I believe that the perspective of this entire bill is to give to the child in our community the same support, whether that child has a single mother or a single father. I cannot understand—believe me I would like to understand—how one can distinguish, simply by trying to balance the male/female equation in this kind of a debate. The children are in need.

Why is it—and I wish the minister would listen to what I'm saying.

Mr. Roy: Yes, if he wasn't always disturbed by the member for Thunder Bay.

Mrs. Campbell: How can we justify that one family of children should have less income provided, because they have a father, than a family which has a mother? It doesn't make any sense. I'm sure these boys of whom we've heard—

Hon. Mr. Norton: You see, I didn't argue that that should be the case. You are distorting.

Mrs. Campbell: —grow the same as any other children. Their requirements for shoes alone are no different from those of any other children. They eat the same, or would like to. Surely they are entitled, by reason of being disadvantaged in not having both parents in the home, to equal consideration.

I cannot believe that this principle has been put to the federal government in this way and that a child would be denied. I don't believe that this kind of thrust has been put to the federal government.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it has.

Mrs. Campbell: I do not for one moment say that I would doubt some of the things that have been said about the federal government; that is not the point. But, I certainly can't see that any government could accept the fact that we can discriminate against children who have absolutely nothing to do with whose custody they are in and allow them less than others.

I trust that we at least could take this bill to a committee. If there are flaws in the bill that cause concern I know that we are all prepared to look at them. It can't hurt this government to approve its going to committee, and with such a desire on the part of this government to gain equity, surely it is a very strong position that this bill should carry at this time to be referred to committee. That is a great argument for Ottawa.

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Bill 11. I think it represents a move in the right direction. Even the minister admits that. To add to the discussion that is going on here this afternoon, I would like to provide the members of the Legislature with information which the minister himself provided to me in November of last year. This was information he sent me following discussions of the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services in October last year.

What this information indicates is that the total cost of eliminating sexual discrimination from the existing social service programs in Ontario would be \$27,100,000. Of that total cost it is fascinating to see that only \$3,000,000 would be the sum required to eliminate discrimination against men in three programs.

The program that discriminates against sole-support fathers would have to be modified with new funding of \$1,500,000 net from the province. The addition of single men between the ages of 60 to 64 to the benefits program would add an additional net cost of \$1,400,000, and the addition of funding for the husband of an old age security recipient would cost \$10,000, for a total of \$3,000,000 that the province would have to add to its funding of provincial support programs in order to eliminate discrimination against men.

If, however, we turn to two programs that would have to be modified to eliminate discrimination against women—namely, the

support for separated mothers, which would require \$4,600,000 additional money from the province in order to allow the sexual discrimination to be removed, and the second program, funding for a disabled or permanently unemployable spouse of a non-disabled husband—it would require an additional \$19,600,000 from the province so there would be no sexual discrimination in the treatment of women as opposed to men.

What we find if we look at the total cost of changing the social service programs, the funding programs, of the provincial government to eliminate sexual discrimination, is that a total of \$27,100,000 would be required to remove sexual discrimination and \$24,200,000 of that \$27,100,000 would have to go to the elimination of discrimination against women.

In the slow progress of our society towards the equality of the sexes, I am always glad to approach that goal in any way that seems to make life easier. If by adopting this bill we begin the process of eliminating sexual discrimination in all our support programs in the social services system of Ontario, and if this small step forward in eliminating discrimination against men will lead us to take a bigger step forward—the necessary and logical bigger step forward—to eliminate sexual discrimination against women, so be it. If we have to take a roundabout route to overcome the larger discrimination which exists against women under our social services programs, let's go the roundabout route. I will take any way I can to get there.

We have heard the words—the defensive kind of stance—put forward by the Minister of Community and Social Services. We have heard the suggestion his heart was breaking because he could not get federal agreement to eliminate sexual discrimination in the social service programs of Ontario. I think it is important to note that by his own estimates, if the province were forced to kick in \$27,100,000 to provide for a cost-shared elimination of sexual discrimination in the social services programs of Ontario, the most the provincial government could hope to get on a cost-shared basis for the elimination of sexual discrimination would be \$9,200,000. If the province had to pay the full shot of reforming the programs in the ways I have suggested, according to the ministry the cost of that full shot would be \$36,200,000.

Now, really, is it just impossible for us to consider going ahead in this province, if we have to go ahead with the addition of \$9,200,000 and carry our own burden? If

the feds are not ready to kick in the \$9,200,000—

Hon. Mr. Norton: That overlooks the problems created at the federal level that will render other programs—

Ms. Gigantes: —I think it is about time that we in this province said it is worth paying \$36,200,000 and we will pay the whole shot to eliminate all sexual discrimination in all the social support programs of this government. I think the time is now.

This bill provides us with a kind of round-about way of beginning to tackle the problem in real terms. It provides, as always I suppose, an approach for making sure men are not discriminated against before it makes sure women are not discriminated against. Fortunately, it would only cost us \$3,000,000 to avoid discrimination against men, so let us begin and do that and move on and eliminate sexual discrimination in each and every one of the support programs of this government.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to say a few words in reference to the bill proposed by the member for London Centre. As was mentioned by the member for Downsview, the bill does reflect many of the sentiments of Bill 54, from the member for Sudbury East. If I understand it correctly, I think the difference between Bill 54 and this bill before us today is primarily the extension of the family benefit eligibility of males between 60 and 64 years of age who are either single, widowed, deserted, divorced, et cetera.

I see with interest too, that Bill 11 attempts to supply the necessary changes to definitions. In particular, the definitions of parent and spouse have been adopted, it would seem, from the Family Law Reform Act, 1978. In any event, it is difficult to oppose the objectives of the current bill before us today, and I am certainly not going to attempt to argue against the philosophical intent of the present proposed amendment.

[4:30]

The movement toward equality of the sexes and away from the traditional sense of discrimination by sex is both enormously positive—we have heard comments on it today—and, of course, it is a very necessary value in today's society. No one can argue that.

Often, though, in legislation that we must deal with in our day-to-day lives in Parliament, whether in Legislatures within the provinces or indeed in Ottawa, the legislation has been in force for long periods of time, and parts of it must be updated to reflect the changing needs and values of contemporary society.

Unlike some, I do not believe that the particular act we are concerned with today is intentionally discriminatory; many of the provisions contained within it simply have been carried forward from former acts. In this case, I would think it was carried forward from the previous mother's allowance; indeed, the Family Benefits Act is also a carry-forward from the disabled persons programs.

But, intentions aside, I will agree with the mover that the existing act, without doubt, contains discrimination. Not only should all citizens, regardless of their sex, have equal rights before the law; they should also have equal access to programs and benefits that are administered by the government. We see that consensus in the debate today.

My main concern with the bill is not with its intention, but rather with the means whereby the honourable member hopes to effect the change he desires. The legislation which preceded the drafting of the Family Benefits Act was, as I have said, born out of a time when men were primarily the sole supporters of their families. Times have indeed changed and, therefore, the legislation itself should be examined for alternatives which will properly reflect the current situation.

This is precisely the reason for measures taken in the last two years to comprehensively reform the family law and draft the Family Law Reform Act. I certainly felt at that time—and still do—that the Ministry of Community and Social Services and, specifically, the Ministry of the Attorney General were the proper vehicles for the examination and drafting of that act. The ministries have the resources and the expertise to assess the appropriate and most effective legislative guidelines dealing with the complex set of concerns that surround such issues as property and support obligations.

I am not saying that the Family Benefits Act is complicated in that way; although I do feel that if Bill 11 were passed, family benefits would be greatly dependent on provisions within the Family Law Reform Act. However, it is the ministries that I think can do the most proficient job of changing more than just sections of the current act dealing with single parents and those between the ages of 60 and 64; there is a need to examine the amending bill as a whole, both to detect unwanted or inadvertent side effects and to see if any sections other than those of immediate concern could be updated.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the proposal made by the member in his bill today. But there are three areas which are prob-

lematic and with which this amendment to the Family Benefits Act have to be reviewed.

First, the amendment does not eliminate all the sexist elements of the family benefits programs, albeit I agree they are trivial. For instance, one that I am sure is unintentional is that section 7(1)(d) appears to refer to "mother of a child born out of wedlock."

More important is the fact that, in order to address all aspects of sex discrimination, the regulations pertaining to the act would have to be changed, as the minister alluded to. These regulations contain certain specific sexist provisions which warrant consideration. The eligibility of disabled female spouses and of husbands of old age security wives are two examples I would think of inconsistencies as they exist.

The member for St. George in her remarks referred to the minister and said he might be surprised by her comments today. I think not. The remark I have just made is not original, because I do recall the member for St. George was quick to point out that fact during the debate on Bill 54.

It was my understanding that other provinces which have apparently attempted to eliminate sexist elements from family benefit programs continue to use regulations as work availability testing.

Secondly, I suspect, Bill 11 suffers a problem which Bill 54 did not; and that is due in part to the recent family law reform legislation. Regulation 287 provides no time limits on the period of cohabitation of common law spouses; whereas Bill 11, as I read it, proposes that where there are no children the couple must live together for five years.

The minister has mentioned some of the effects this change will have upon the equality of benefit dispensations and he shared with us some of the very real potential problems the government is working on with the federal level of government.

Personally, I would be concerned for some of the same reasons that he has expressed. Namely, that under the amendments, the common law spouse income assets it might very well not be considered for benefit discrimination.

Thirdly, there are a couple of categories of persons who are now eligible for family benefits but would appear to become ineligible if this amendment were passed. These are mothers who are deserted by dependent husbands, and those over 65 who have dependent children but are permanently unemployed or disabled.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, these are probably not insurmountable, nor will they affect large numbers. However, I do feel it is

important to make the point that any change in our social or welfare programming must be very carefully considered for its total effect and all of its side effects, no matter how seemingly trivial.

I remain strong in my conviction that such changes as the one being proposed here this afternoon are more properly the responsibility of the ministries that are concerned. An equally important point to be made is simply this: From the dollar point of view, the inclusion of males in the terms of the Family Benefits Act, particularly the extension of the eligibility to the 60-64 age bracket, would, as the minister has already said, increase costs to government. We can't ignore that. That does bring it into the purview of a money bill.

I do feel I'm not able to support the bill today, although I have made my thoughts known very clearly in support of the principle. I feel it is a contravention of the rules governing our private members' hour.

Mr. M. N. Davison: Will you ask the Speaker for a ruling on that?

Mr. Jones: These ministries have a budget within which they must work, and they must make adjustments in order to find those amounts.

Mr. Peterson: You guys have made this thing a joke.

Mr. Jones: We just heard the member for Carleton East referring to figures in the \$24,000,000-\$36,000,000 range, and that has to take place in the context of—

Mr. Peterson: It is not \$24,000,000. Evelyn was right.

Mr. Jones:—those budgets through social development, through the ministries that have been mentioned in the debate. I would suggest that the question at hand is more correctly the responsibility of the government, because I feel a more comprehensive bill can come from the government.

Ms. Gigantes: We'll do it. We couldn't get a commitment from the minister on that. Are you promising us to do it?

Mr. Jones: Because this clearly is a money bill, as we mentioned, I see no way of avoiding, in this private members' hour, opposing it, even though it is equally as clear from the debate today that some action must be taken in the near future.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Ottawa East, for three and a half minutes.

Mr. Roy: That's just about what I wanted. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Are you going to say we should vote on money bills?

Mr. Roy: I've listened to the debate by my colleague, the member for London Centre, and the member for Carleton East, and I've just listened to the apologia from the member for Mississauga North, and I frankly thought—

Hon. Mr. Norton: We don't need an apologia, but I would like to hear an apologia from the member when he goes down to eastern Ontario. I would like to hear your justification.

Mr. Roy: You should just keep quiet and listen, because you're another one of those ministers who says one thing and does something else.

Hon. Mr. Norton: When have I ever done that?

Mr. Roy: You've got to realize that you're the government now and that you can do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That's an unfair accusation.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time is limited. Will the minister stop interrupting?

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that.

The reason my colleague has brought this bill forward is because the government, and the minister, who keeps talking about how he's sympathetic to that problem, is not doing anything about it. That's why my colleague is bringing the bill forward, and as he said, he's prepared to accept amendments.

What we are not prepared to accept is to listen to a member who's trying to give some reason why he's going to stand up later to block the bill. That is a front and that is just an excuse for doing nothing.

Hon. Mr. Norton: It is a money bill.

Mr. Roy: When we take the initiative like that, the move is made in sincerity because the government is not doing it. If the minister really feels strongly, as he does and as other members do, about this issue, why doesn't he do something about it? This issue has been raised on a number of occasions by my colleague, by other people, and the minister keeps sitting there saying, "We're sympathetic to it. We think it's a good issue. We think that people should get equal justice before the law."

Hon. Mr. Norton: It would help if you spoke to your federal friends about my proposals.

Mr. Roy: His colleague from Mississauga North has just reiterated this.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Why don't you speak to your federal friends and get their support for my proposals? Your federal friends say, "No, no, no." Put your support where it really counts. Talk to your federal friends about it.

Mr. Roy: He gets up and gives the whole excuse of why the bill is going to be blocked. We think it's phony, and we think the minister should accept his responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Norton: No, really. Talk to your federal friends. Tell them I need their support.

Mr. Roy: Listen to him. He never really stops. Maybe that's one of his problems as a minister. He should listen for awhile and stop talking—try to listen to what other people have to say. He's not infallible.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Don't you just talk. You go and get their support.

Mr. Roy: When a minister is not prepared to accept his responsibility, if he doesn't have the guts to do it—

Hon. Mr. Norton: I accept my responsibilities.

Mr. Roy: —why doesn't he piggyback on this bill and say, "We'll accept my friend's proposition. We'll accept his initiative," instead of using the—

Hon. Mr. Norton: I will accept it if he will go and get the federal government to change the regulations so we can go ahead.

Mr. Roy: —excuse that the bill has some technical fault and that he is going to get up to block it? We think that is unacceptable.

Hon. Mr. Norton: All I ask is that the member for London Centre gets the support of his federal friends so that I can do what I asked them to do.

Mr. Roy: The evidence that he is sincere and he wants to do something about it is for him to get up here this afternoon and support the bill.

Will he answer this question? Is he going to support this bill?

Hon. Mr. Norton: I'll support it if you ask Madame Begin if I am not sincere.

Mr. Roy: Oh, don't equivocate. Is he going to support the bill?

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Roy: Has it expired? The proof is going to be in the pudding. We'll see what his position is when the vote comes along.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I need the regulation changed before I can do it.

Mr. Roy: I suggest that it's going to be as phony as it's been in the past.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The one that will make the difference will be the May 22 vote.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a minister so exercised.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for London Centre for three minutes.

Mr. Peterson: He is in the classic position of knowing what he is doing is wrong and he's trying to render the whole process nugatory. He's saying to us, "Bring in a regulation." That's a worse waste of time than what we're doing here.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I didn't say, "Bring in a regulation."

Mr. Peterson: He said, "Bring in a resolution," I'm sorry. He said, "Bring in a resolution and I'll support it." Like every other resolution in this House, it's a bloody waste of time. The government has made a mockery of the private members' hour. It's a mockery. We might as well go back and waste our time on the throne speech or budget debate. The minister knows it's wrong and he frankly hasn't got the clout. If he lets the thing go to committee the House will speak in entirety on the issue. I will go with him because they do like us and respect us a heck of a lot better now than they respect him.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Don't just talk about it, do it.

Mr. Peterson: We will go to Ottawa with the minister and talk to Monique Begin and Pierre Trudeau. They're going to be there after May 22.

Let me read a quotation to show how he has handled this issue. It's important. This was in Weekend Magazine: "I asked the social service minister why some welfare fathers could qualify for family benefits while others in—"

Hon. Mr. Norton: I took 10 provincial ministers with me the last time and she agreed for three months and then she said no.

Mr. Peterson: —the same circumstances could not. Taylor remembers the Currie case all too well. He calls it the cause célèbre.

"It was an us-versus-them situation, us being the Tory government only weeks away from election and not wanting to look like skinflint tightwads, especially to a family of motherless kids, and them being the Toronto family services association." That's the way they run this government.

Hon. Mr. Norton: That is the case today. There is a clear policy today.

Mr. Peterson: That's why it was important that I draw attention to the case of these

three gentlemen, and the minister didn't look them in the eye once.

Hon. Mr. Norton: He is not the minister.

Mr. Peterson: Shut up and listen. He didn't look at them once in the eye when he was making his little diatribe written by some grade B lawyer in his department. The same goes for the member for Mississauga North. For an insurance agent he is not a bad lawyer.

But he didn't look at them once because he knows it's wrong. He knows he is forcing them through an inhumane, unjust procedure. Each of those people was treated differently, even though the cases were similar.

It's quite clear the minister is going to stand up and block this vote. We know that. But I would ask the minister as a man, as a human being, as a compassionate person hopefully, would he meet with these gentlemen outside in the hall right after this debate right now and talk about it?

[4:45]

Hon. Mr. Norton: I have another meeting with another member of the Legislature which I'm late for now.

Mr. Peterson: I would like the minister to meet with them and explain it to them.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Carry on with the debate. I am not able to meet with them this afternoon.

Mr. Peterson: It's so easy for the minister. He's going to escape. He can take five minutes to meet with these gentlemen out in the hall.

Mr. Roy: He is dodging the issue.

Mr. Peterson: The minister is dodging it because he is embarrassed and knows he's wrong. He hasn't even looked at them. Frankly, if I were him, I couldn't look at them either.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The time for debating ballot item three has expired.

Mr. Peterson: I am disappointed. This is a classic case where we all know what is right and don't have the guts to do it. That is one of the things that makes politics so disillusioning to idealistic young people. The minister is doing his bit to turn a generation off politics.

Hon. Mr. Norton: If you will deliver support from Monique Begin, then we will do it.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That was an abuse of the private members' hour. I'm really disappointed in the member.

EASE OF ACCESS BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Renwick moved resolution 6:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should adopt policies and introduce legislation to require that the needs of physically handicapped persons be considered in the design and construction of residential housing, commercial development, transportation systems and, generally, all buildings and places to which the public is intended to be allowed access and that, in particular, the government should enact regulations amending part V of the Ontario Building Code to incorporate the recommendations of the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Proceed, if you will. Do you wish to reserve any time for the round-up?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that I will have some time and, if I do, I would like to reserve that time, if I may.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I shall so do.

Mr. Renwick: My purpose in debating this resolution is to speak against the discrimination we practise against the people in our society who are physically disabled. We distinguish unfavourably the physically disabled from the able-bodied in ways which are hurtful, detrimental and injurious.

My task is made much more difficult because I do not anticipate that anyone will speak against the resolution. Therefore, it will be my task to make certain that I bring to the attention of the House what information is available at the present time on this ongoing problem with respect to the access of disabled people to all sorts of buildings, be they privately or publicly owned.

My proposition speaks to one of the many ways in which we discriminate against the physically handicapped. My topic is basically access. Access is the precondition of equality of opportunity, let alone of equality of conditions. Without access we perpetuate inequality. Without access we imprison in isolation and alienation. Without access we segregate. Above all, without access we destroy dignity piecemeal.

Let me ask all of those in the assembly who are interested in this particular form of discrimination to read the report of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, *Life Together*, published some two years ago—or almost two years ago. Let them read also the mayor of Toronto's task force report on disabled and elderly people and the provincial-metropolitan task force report on elderly

persons' centres, which affects directly not only the elderly but also the disabled. Then let them contrast that with the—if I may use the term—niggardly and very modest way in which the government of this province has alluded to the need for assistance to physically handicapped people, as set out in the throne speech of March 6 last.

They refer to the five pilot projects with respect to public transportation which have been introduced. Then they go on to say that they intend the introduction of a gradual expansion to other communities of this opportunity to provide assistance for the transportation of physically disabled people. They also go on to say that they will make a modest expansion of several pilot projects which were launched recently to provide special accommodation and necessary attendant care for the young physically disabled.

There are some other remarks in the throne debate but they do not relate specifically to this whole question of access to facilities, access to the public facilities in the province, and the use of those facilities by disabled people.

I have received—and I am certain other members of the assembly have received—the resolution passed by the city of Toronto council, and the resolution passed by the city of Chatham council and endorsed by very many municipalities, both relating to these two problems: that is, access to public transportation and access to buildings, be they private and institutional or public and institutional; and a wide range of amendments required to the Ontario Building Code. The resolution of the city of Toronto was passed in January of this year.

The Chatham resolution relating to the extension of the public transportation system for physically handicapped people was passed early in 1978 by the city of Chatham and by the city of Toronto in November of last year.

I am not going to take up the time of the assembly, in the time allotted to me, to discuss the actual mechanics or procedures to be followed with respect to this extension of transportation systems which were pilot projects in five municipalities outside of Ontario. But all of us can obtain *Transportation for the Physically Disabled*, the 1979 summary published by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. It spells out both the history of those five pilot projects and the intended expansion of those projects, on an equal sharing basis, with those municipalities which may wish to participate.

I do, however, want to make this point. It does seem to me and I suggest to this assembly that this is an area which should not be left on an entirely voluntary basis of co-operation between the municipalities and the government of Ontario. Surely the basic rights of handicapped people should be enshrined in the Ontario Human Rights Code, as recommended in the report of the commission—the two should be linked together.

Surely, then, on the basis of that statutory protection against discrimination which should be part of the law of this province—surely on that basis then there should be the kind of legislation which would provide the resources and require a mutual co-operation and a mutual sharing by the municipalities and by the province. Or, in the case of those municipalities which for various exceptional reasons cannot afford that kind of assistance, then the obligation for that transportation should be taken on by the province itself.

My second point with respect to public transportation is that it appears to be the policy of the government at the present time to opt for the so-called parallel system of transportation for handicapped persons, rather than to make presently existing public transit systems accessible to them.

In the United States, as many of us are aware, a federal statute provides the funds, the urging and the prompting to municipalities to provide for access to the existing public transit systems, even though it is a long-term project and even though it does require significant expenditure of public funds to provide the kinds of equipment which would permit readily available access.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It doesn't work.

Mr. Renwick: Parallel systems are not really equal systems. Parallel systems also separate. It reminds us of the saying not so very long ago, "separate but equal." You cannot say that today about either the pilot projects which were instituted or about the intended expansion of the pilot projects to other municipalities on a shared basis.

The separate but equal doctrine is one I do not subscribe to nor do the people in my caucus. We should be moving towards, as the mayor's task force for the city of Toronto indicated, the accessibility of public transit systems—bus, subway and otherwise—to the physically handicapped.

I may say, because I see some sort of movement on the government benches, that that's my understanding of what the government's policies are at this time. The Minister of Transportation and Communications on November 22 last, in a letter to Mr. Dale Shuttleworth, the president of the Social Planning

Council of Metropolitan Toronto, stated: "We in Ontario have studied seriously the implications of providing an accessible system versus a specialized parallel system for transporting the physically disabled and are satisfied that our prime objective of providing mobility would be most nearly satisfied by a parallel system and that this approach offers a higher level of service to the physically disabled at a substantially lower cost. Our thrust at this time, therefore, is directed towards specialized parallel services."

Mr. Shuttleworth and the minister exchanged some documents that were available from the United States or comment available with respect to the relative merits of the two methods of providing for this assistance.

I want to move from that aspect of the public transportation question. I've touched upon it; I have referred to the documentation involved; and I have made the specific points in that area I wish to make in this debate. I do, however, want to touch upon now and turn to those questions relating to access of buildings. Very briefly, this has been going on for a long time because we have part V, the addendum to the National Building Code, **which is only a document of advice and is required to be implemented** by those jurisdictions having authority, did provide for those changes in the building code which would provide for access to public buildings.

That has been assessed by the mayor's task force, to which I have referred earlier. They have adopted it and requested the government of Ontario to pass those particular requirements into the Ontario Building Code and have, in addition, supplemented it by various recommendations of their own.

For example, the mayor's task force made some 88 recommendations, many of which did not deal particularly with the access question. But of those relating to the access question to transportation, there are some 16 recommendations and, for access to public or institutionalized buildings and public buildings of varying types, with the widest possible scope to the term "public buildings", there are another 16 specific recommendations as well as the many other recommendations with respect to use of those facilities by handicapped people.

For example, the main thrust of the building requirements for handicapped people, is set out in the report of the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped, which was published in August 1978. It proposed amendments to part V of the building code which would enlarge the type of buildings which we can call the institutional type of buildings, for example, by adding to those

types of buildings, the present 14 categories which are listed, another 37 categories of institutional public buildings. I'm not going to take the time, but I want to indicate that the present existing 14 categories of institutionalized buildings require to be supplemented by those additional 37 categories of public access buildings to which physically handicapped people should be entitled to access.

For the other classifications—government and office buildings, retail and commercial buildings and residential buildings—there are suggested enlargements of the area of ambit of those categories. For example, it specifically provides that all government-owned office buildings, not just government-occupied buildings, used for public purposes, should be so adapted to provide access.

There are several other extensions of the kinds of buildings which are to have access provided for. Throughout the report of the advisory council there are the specific recommendations as to the nature and quality of the access provisions, both to the buildings themselves and to the facilities within the buildings which should be made available to physically handicapped people.

[5:00]

All of those matters, particularly the basic recommendations that not only new buildings but, to the extent that it is possible for us to arrange to do so, existing buildings, should be adapted to provide access. The other additional recommendations set out in the mayor's task force form an almost complete addendum to the advisory council's recommendations which, if implemented, would permit us to make Ontario a province of all the people.

I want to say we must have not just a commitment of money; we must have a commitment of will and a commitment of resources other than money, in order to make that kind of Ontario a recognizable place for all of us.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot help but think at this particular time of the preface to the report of the human rights commission of Mr. Tom Symons, who was then the chairman of that commission. It deserves a reference to underline the points which I have tried to make in this debate:

"It is now essential that the human rights of the people of this province be redefined and extended in the light of these changes, that is, the changes which have taken place over the last 15 or 16 years since the code was first enacted, so that life together in Ontario may continue to be marked by an

atmosphere of mutual understanding and by respect for the dignity of every person."

Further on, in the preface to that report it says:

"It is vital that the province give a high priority to human rights and that the province review at regular intervals its commitment to this area of its life to ensure that the needs are met." I underline this next statement: "This is particularly true in the current economic climate when the need for financial restraint is often matched by increasing incidence of discrimination."

In the body of the report, in the very first chapter, apart altogether from that section of the report beginning at page 72 which deals with the physical disabilities of people in relation to human rights in specific terms, there is the reference in the first chapter of the report that:

"The physically disabled are no longer content to stay in institutions or in somebody's back bedroom. On their emergence they are finding that their communities have been designed with somebody else in mind. Steps and curbs and telephone booths prevent them from participating in the common life and prejudice regularly prevents them from being considered for jobs within their competence."

As the mayor's task force has said, for physically disabled people, life is very much an obstacle course. I know I have the vocal support of members of the assembly for the purport and the implicit force of the resolutions which are brought forward, but I am saying to the government, which appears to be less than anxious to revise the Ontario Human Rights Code, let us at least start now to select those areas which touch upon so many ministries of the government. We can end, by the turn of the century at the very latest if we start now, that kind of discrimination which we have lived with for too long against those persons who are physically disabled.

I urge the House to support the resolution.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member has two minutes remaining. Does he wish to reserve that?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as the minister responsible for the building code, I would like to make a few comments on this resolution today, particularly in regard to getting on with the job. The job isn't necessarily money; I agree with that. There has to be an allocation of resources. I presume that really means intellectual and thinking

resources, as well as financial ones and, I agree with that. I want to put the facts of the matter on the record.

Both the building code branch of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations and the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development have been working on this, in concert with the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped, ever since that blue-covered book was published last August. Indeed, in my view, we have achieved some significant progress.

Before I go into it, I do wish to commend the member for Riverdale for putting this resolution forward so that it does get an airing in the House and so not only that the handicapped portion of our population can be made aware of the fact that people are moving towards some of the remedies which, quite frankly, are long overdue, but also that a good deal of thought and consultation is taking place.

I often wish that, someone would raise a question on a matter like this in the question period, so that it would not be necessary for a member to bring it up in private members' hour via a resolution in order that there could be commentary and dialogue upon it. But I suppose I am not exactly the kind of minister they would want to ask questions about the Ontario building code. They seem to prefer some other items.

I want to state the position of the government and the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations—I want to do that first—and then I will come to the consultation and the positions adopted, in concert with us, by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch).

In response to the recommendations of the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Disabled—and we have additional recommendations from other groups besides that—for amendments to the building code to assist handicapped persons, the building code branch requested that the newly organized Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped undertake the role of reviewing these recommendations and reporting on them.

I think it is obvious from the number of reports and so forth, which the mover of the motion either read partially or alluded to in his remarks, that there is a great body of information, suggestions, and recommendations and data out there. The first thing we want to do is co-ordinate it and bring it all together.

As a result of this initiative, the advisory council has prepared the set of recommendations that the member for Riverdale has referred to. At the same time, those recommen-

dations were forwarded to us by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development and have been under review for some time by the building code branch. Part of the review included obtaining comments from other affected interests, particularly the study group on part V of the building code.

I will give you an idea of the particular affected interests, Mr. Speaker. I will do that in a moment, because I think one of the concerns we must have, notwithstanding the urge to get on with the job, is to be practical, not only in regard to new construction but also in terms of doing something in existing buildings. In the case of existing buildings, we are talking about 95 per cent—perhaps not in floor space—95 per cent of what is there. Certainly in Canada and Ontario we have changed in the past few years; buildings just do not last only 20 years any more and then go down under. Many of them are renovated and so on and last a considerable time.

Quite frankly, in the building code branch of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, we are now proceeding with the preparation of appropriate amendments to the building code in this regard. Since the work has just started, and there is continual dialogue on those recommendations, I am not going to go into them in individual detail. I would just like to point out some of the implications.

For instance, in one senior citizens' apartment—I think it is in Burlington or Hamilton—there is an elevating device, a lift, specifically designed for the handicapped which is working fine. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention that that type of lift would not work in a commercial building. It's fine for that particular type of building, but it couldn't be brought out immediately as a design for a commercial building where there is a mixed usage. Those are some of the things we are looking at.

Ontario has been in the forefront in requiring new buildings to be designed and constructed to incorporate the features to make access and the use of buildings possible by the physically handicapped. With this review, I would like to tell the member we have a three-fold action program within the ministry in consultation with the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

First, the preparation of the draft amendments on the proposals by the advisory council on which there is general agreement. These cover the majority of the recommendations made by the council.

Second, to undertake to resolve the recommendations that are sensible—I under-

line that—but about which there are implications. What implications? Are there available alternatives that achieve the recommendation without adding to the cost of a building? One of the things is improved wheel-chairs that are collapsible. Is that a better alternative than widening the door for the conventional one? These are things that still have to be decided.

Then there are the implications for small business of access by the handicapped, the implications of the recommendations pertaining to residential accommodation and the cost of marketing implications. I don't mean to imply that these are deterrents. But we have to know where we're going or otherwise we're going to have a program that doesn't work. Then it has to be changed around again and we really have not achieved very much.

Finally, we want to inform the advisory council on anything on which we cannot proceed, because they're not building code matters. For example, the width of parking spaces, the height of electrical outlets, telephones, drinking fountains, elevator requirements and so on and so forth. There are a number of very specific and detailed dimensional requirements. We want those to go out to the architects, to the handicapped organizations, to builders, designers, et cetera.

I think that outlines the considerable amount of work that is being done by the ministries. Ontario has led the way. For instance, all new public buildings have had to have these for some time. We're not just talking about primary access. We're talking about real access, floor by floor, so the handicapped person is just as much at home within that structure as are you and I, the non-handicapped. There is Wintario money available for the conversion of public buildings that were built before these requirements.

Some of the designs being incorporated in Government Services projects, such as the Wentworth Regional Detention Centre, will play a very important role in the future. I know a jail is the last place you would want to look at the improvements that can be made in life for the handicapped. But bear in mind that this is a six-storey jail without a single stair, with absolute access to every floor by means of very skilfully designed ramps.

Already a very large number of designers are taking a look at that building. Nowhere else has that type of thing been done. The reason it was done was for security. But, by the same token, it is a very practical

example of what can be done in a highrise building that does have a considerable population and a considerable mobility of population.

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario, for which I report to the House—

Mr. Haggerty: They're all on ground level, aren't they?

Hon. Mr. Drea: —is studying design changes and so forth because of the program that was instituted after I became the minister that there was to be a thrust to employ the handicapped. Part of the problem in existing liquor stores is stairs. We're talking there about employment and not just about the ability to get into the structure.

I raise these examples not because I think they are the outstanding things in the programs of the government but because as minister in two portfolios—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Hon. Mr. Drea: The other thing I would like to say in closing is that the other day I opened up a senior citizens' residence that was built by Metropolitan Toronto. For the first time the first floor instead of being wasted space had seven units for the handicapped. One of the people who was there was in a motorized unit. He was not a senior citizen but a relatively young man. His previous residence, the best the government could find for him, was on the 12th floor of a public housing building.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, the honourable member's time has expired.

[5:15]

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the member for Riverdale for his thoughtful introduction of the resolution we are debating here today and to let him know that I completely support the resolution. I have been fortunate in the past to have been on several government committees that have studied this problem, but really peripherally. It makes one wonder, when one listens to others speak, why we, in society, have taken until 1979—and I am not necessarily referring to this government, I am referring to society—to decide that the handicapped should not be discriminated against. They have an awful lot to contribute to our society but we don't give them the opportunity. We throw up, or have thrown up in the past, all types of road blocks to prevent them from taking the active role they would like to take and make the contribution they can make to society.

We are losing a valuable resource in not providing accessibility to many who are so

unfortunate to be afflicted with various types of disabilities that prevent them from being as mobile as you and I, Mr. Speaker. Maybe not me today.

It was back in 1963 that a select committee was set up by the government to look into the problems of youth and, in the study of the youth problems, one of the things that was brought very forcefully to our attention was the fact that handicapped youth wanted to partake but were denied that privilege because of the physical makeup of various types of municipal, provincial and general institutions and/or buildings.

That committee did not make direct recommendations as far as the physical structure of buildings was concerned, but they made other recommendations and, to the best of my knowledge, it was the first time that we in government started to pay attention in some tangible way to the people who are disadvantaged for one reason or another, mobility-wise.

We have gone a fairly long way since then. I know we have attempted to accommodate them, when it comes to expressing their physical abilities, by games for the handicapped and I think that is a real forward step. Now, the handicapped can walk proudly down and say they are able, not only to compete with one another, but also compete and even excel when it comes to certain types of athletic endeavours. I commend the government for implementing that type of program. I think it is nice we now look on the handicapped in a different light.

One of the problems, as far as accessibility is concerned, is that in the past we haven't paid attention to the handicapped, or maybe the handicapped have not been vocal enough. Now they are finding if they become vocal, we listen and try to respond to their requests.

When travelling, as I have opportunities to do, I find out what other jurisdictions are doing, then come back home and see we haven't adopted some of them, and even though some may be very minor as far as we are concerned, they are very important to the handicapped. I cannot understand why on highway 401 we will not reserve special parking locations for those who are handicapped.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Every service station along highway 401 has reserved parking space for the handicapped.

Mr. Nixon: Cabinet ministers' cars are in them all the time.

Mr. B. Newman: They are available now? I am very pleased to hear that. I raised that issue in the estimates of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications last year

because several handicapped people had mentioned to me that they have a fairly long distance to walk to get into the service centre.

Another thing I would suggest, so those who don't have a physical handicap don't come in and take the parking location, is to provide those who wish, either through an association for the handicapped or through government, with a sticker that can be put on the car for that one use and then taken away from the windshield, so that only those who have that sticker can park there. I know there is a disadvantage in that because some handicapped people may not remember to ask for a sticker, and as a result they would park there and, as I have seen happen in some cities, their car would be seen parked in the area and the penalty is extremely high. It's up to \$100 for parking in a spot reserved for handicapped persons' vehicles.

I think we have to look into some of these minor things that can convenience the handicapped. I mention the window decal so that you can identify the vehicle. I spoke with the Minister of Transportation and Communications and suggested special licence plates with the handicapped symbol on them. One of my constituents who is a paraplegic drives his own vehicle, but he finds himself at a disadvantage when it comes to parking the vehicle. We could provide him with—and he suggested this—licence plates with the decal on them. I know some people wouldn't like to have that, and that is why I suggest a sticker which can be removed when it's not being used by the handicapped individual.

Another thing is the use of ramps. We are going into the use of ramps more and more, but there are still a lot of municipalities that hesitate to make those curb cuts so that the wheelchair patient can be easily moved about.

We have completely neglected them when it comes to accessibility of voting privileges. The minister may say that there is a location in the community to which the handicapped can drive and be moved in by wheelchair, but some of these voting polls are quite removed from the curb. As a result, there is a long way to push the wheelchair and/or other means of transportation that is being used to move the individual. I would suggest that to accommodate them the ballot box be brought to them. I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It can be. That's already available.

Mr. B. Newman: I was talking to an individual who was involved in that and he mentioned it wasn't allowed.

Mr. Haggerty: Where are they?

Mr. B. Newman: If it is allowed, that's wonderful; that's the thing we certainly should be doing.

My own community is specially fortunate, because we happen to have an individual by the name of Jack Longman who is a real activist. He has a walking handicap, but in spite of all that he is extremely concerned and has been able to convince the government, and I would think it was probably through the minister. As a result of his conversing with government and convincing others, we now have in the city of Windsor an ALPHA program, apartment living for the physically handicapped. It is, I think, either the first or one of the first in the province of Ontario. I was there for the ground-breaking, but I wasn't able to be there for the official opening. Let me tell you, when speaking with the people, smiles light up on their faces because of the fact that now they have accommodation where they don't have to depend on others to bring them into the building. They are either able to use their own wheelchairs or get in in a difficult fashion using some type of crutches, be they underarm or forearm support.

There are many other things one could say concerning this. Time limits one. There was a study by the select committee on the utilization of educational facilities. It made recommendations concerning section five of the building code. I know some of these recommendations do take time.

In conclusion I commend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) for bringing in this resolution and I know he will have the full support of everyone in this Legislature.

Mr. McClellan: I am pleased and very delighted to rise in support of the resolution of my colleague from Riverdale. I want to speak a little about what I would see as the implications of a phrase in the resolution that I quote: "The House should adopt policies and introduce legislation to require that the needs of physically-handicapped persons be considered in the design and construction of residential housing."

I want to remind the House that in 1974 there was developed a program which was referred to as the care package program. It would have permitted funding on a program basis for the development of the physical housing for the handicapped—specially designed apartment facilities. Secondly, it would have provided on a program basis the requisite personal support services and attendant care to be built into that kind of accommodation. Then people with severe physical handicaps would have the opportunity,

through a program systematically and regularly funded, of obtaining independent community living accommodation in apartments throughout the communities of this province which would have built into them personal support services.

The care package proposal received approval at a number of levels within the social policy field, but it was one of the first victims of the social service cutback in 1975. It was one of the first things Jim Taylor cut.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That is not true.

Mr. Nixon: It wasn't subverted by his employees then.

Mr. McClellan: No, it wasn't subverted by his employees; it was done in by the man himself. This was one of his first neanderthal acts.

He made some promises at the time he killed the care package. He said we weren't going to be moving into a program of funding independent community living for the physically handicapped but he made a pledge. He said every project that came forward to the ministry would be assessed, and if it was a viable project it would be funded. He made a promise that in exchange for a regular program, there was a commitment to project-by-project funding. That promise wasn't kept either.

There has been a number of excellent project proposals come forward over the past three and a half years for independent community living for the physically handicapped which have not been funded. As a matter of fact—I don't have my file with me but I believe there have only been four pilot projects funded in the province since the care package proposal was scrapped and the original promise of additional funding was made.

That is the tragedy in this province. We know, through the success of projects like the Clarendon Foundation, it is possible to build independent community living accommodation for the physically handicapped that gives them the kind of independence, with support, that permits them to continue their studies, and indeed to hold down full-time jobs.

[5:30]

You can't do that from an institution. People don't want to live in institutions. Nobody wants to live in institutions. People want to live as independently as possible in normal living accommodations, normal apartments within the community. This government has so far been unwilling to provide sufficient resources, even on a pilot project basis, to make this possibility a reality, despite the fact we know how to do it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That's not true.

Mr. McClellan: The Provincial Secretary for Social Development is saying that's not true, but she wasn't in the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services last fall when I brought to the minister's attention the project proposal of the Clarendon Foundation for an expansion. The minister was not willing to fund that. There are people who are physically disabled who are living in chronic-care hospitals, and the only reason they are in chronic-care hospitals is because there were no independent community living facilities for them to move into.

The proposal from the Clarendon Foundation had been sitting on ministry desks for a long time. So much for Mr. Taylor's commitment and his promise on the part of the government to fund projects as they come forward.

We've had some promises again in the throne speech this year, and one of those promises was there would be funding available for normal community living facilities for the physically handicapped. I hope that promise is kept a little bit better than the promise about the care package proposal in 1974 or the promise to fund all viable pilot projects as they come forward which was made in 1975, because those promises weren't worth the paper they were written on. They simply were dishonoured.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That is not true at all.

Mr. McClellan: It was true and it is true and she knows it's true.

I still think the wise course of action for the government is to bring in legislation that establishes on a program basis, the possibility of providing community living alternatives for the physically handicapped as a matter of right. It should not be on a pilot project basis because we have sufficient experience to know normal community living facilities for the physically handicapped are as easy to design and to build and to run successfully as living accommodation for anybody else. We know we don't have to prove anything, we don't have to discover anything. All we have to discover is whether there is a government in this province with the decency to bring in program funding for community living for the physically handicapped. So far, the answer to that question is no.

The importance of the resolution is it provides once again a way for the government to hear the will of the House with respect to this most important issue. There is absolutely no reason why physically handicapped people cannot just live in communities with their friends and neighbours and families, but they can also work and study in the community. The handicapped, not even the most severely

disabled have to be incarcerated in institutions. In 1979, we know how to help the physically handicapped to live normal and productive lives that involve working as well.

The second importance of this resolution is that it addresses itself to making the kinds of adaptations of commercial development that will make it possible for the physically handicapped to gain access to places of employment as a matter of course and as a matter of right.

I think it is a great tragedy this government has not seen fit to put together a major program for the physically handicapped. I'd like to suggest to the minister, as a very worthwhile government initiative, that he set aside a year, possibly next year, as the year of the handicapped and initiate a major government program on a whole series of levels, not just on one or two levels. Make it a major priority of the government in terms of program—not in terms of platitudes or rhetoric, but in terms of program—to move into the field on a programmed basis of providing sufficient community living accommodation to house all of the handicapped who need such accommodation; and that includes many people who are now in chronic-care hospitals or in places like Lyndhurst Hospital because these facilities do not exist.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. McClellan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is a great opportunity for the government to move in providing services to the handicapped. I hope, on the strength of this very excellent resolution, that they will find the will and determination to do just that.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, and I would like to thank you for the opportunity, to speak in this debate this afternoon.

Knowing that the minister responsible for administering the building code would be speaking today, I chose particularly to speak on the first part of the resolution. Specifically, I would like to discuss transportation and housing in terms of what the government is doing to alleviate some of the problems of those who, unfortunately, experience physical handicaps.

As far as transportation for the handicapped goes, I should say that some immediate problems become apparent when considering the introduction of legislation requiring the needs of the disabled to be considered in all design and construction of transit systems. I am assuming, of course,

that the resolution by its wording calls for accessibility to all classes of transportation.

Before I address one of the problems in particular, I would like to indicate my feeling that this government has already done much in the way of fulfilling the first proposal carried in the resolution.

We have, in fact, adopted policies which strongly encourage the inclusion of the needs of the handicapped in the design of transportation systems. While the government does not demand that absolutely every transportation system cater to these special and very important needs, it does provide many advisory services and monetary incentives that promote and support active planning on the part of communities and interested citizens who are in a position to best analyse the specific requirements of the handicapped in particular areas.

This brings me back to the major concern I share with the government concerning legislated transportation recommendations; in fact, present government initiatives have grown out of this concern. The study commissioned in 1974 by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, dealing with transportation services for the physically handicapped, concluded that construction or modifying all public transportation to accommodate the disabled would necessitate enormous expenditures and in many cases was not at all realistic because it could never be totally effective.

By the same token, recognition that many marginally disabled persons have been using conventional transportation systems with some difficulty has led the government to include the cost of extra grab rails, stanchions, preferential seating arrangements and stair markings within its municipal transit funding program.

It seems that while we must do everything possible to integrate the disabled into our transportation systems, as well as other aspects of society, we must be realistic. Realistically speaking, more mobility and quicker implementation of transit services can be achieved by providing parallel service for the disabled. If greater mobility can in this way be ensured, then I think the handicapped will become more easily integrated into society.

The study to which I referred mentioned problems encountered with existing transportation alternatives for the disabled. These included such things as the high cost of services, over-reliance on friends and relatives for continued support, and the difficulties of obtaining taxi service during peak periods.

The 1976 pilot project for the provision of systems overcoming these difficulties began in five municipalities. The project utilized modified mini-buses, special vans, passenger cars and taxis and was available to any member of those communities who was not able to board conventional transit.

Within a few days of the throne speech, the Minister of Transportation and Communications outlined the new program to the House in some detail. He announced then that, due to its initial success, service for the disabled has now been approved on a provincial basis. The 50 per cent funding of both capital and operating expense of the service was based on the knowledge that there are numerous effective methods of operating such services, most of which, however, are more expensive than conventional systems. I can, therefore, assure the members of this House, in much the same manner as did the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, that as of July 1, when this program becomes effective, there will be no need for any disabled citizen in any city to pay a transit fare exceeding those charged on regular transit systems.

I am of the strongest belief that the kind of service developing out of this kind of program will, in the long run, prove effective in answering the needs of this important group of individuals in society.

Ontario's program on transportation for the physically disabled is perhaps appropriate as we enter a time when this government and the opposition parties are preaching municipal autonomy and community responsibility. Surely we are in a period too when local involvement and the spirit of volunteerism are all-important in the consideration of supplying social services.

In this day and age, with demands on the government to assume a larger role in the delivery of social programs, we must be careful not to lose sight of the fact that our service structures as well as our institutions are most relevant and responsive to individual needs when we solicit community initiative and individual involvement.

Concerned citizen groups, non-profit organizations and municipal authorities should remain the key to determining the best means of operating and co-ordinating transportation services for the disabled.

Development of suitable accommodation for the handicapped poses particular problems. There are still many issues which I think we all realize need to be addressed. Perhaps most importantly, we know the alternatives available to the handicapped, either to total independent living in the

community or to total care in an institution, are too few at the present time. I think we also realize that a shortage of adequate personnel for the provision of support services to the handicapped exist.

Both these concerns are mentioned in the second annual report of the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped. It was this report which formed part of the basis of the government's approval of four demonstration projects for handicapped adult accommodation in Toronto, Windsor, Ottawa and Thunder Bay. The aim of these projects was to encourage the financial independence of the handicapped while integrating them into the community. Support services such as homemaker aids, attendants and cooks are an important aspect of this program. Without these it is felt that little justification for the overall expenditures could be provided.

[5:45]

From the statement made in the throne speech, and because of their initial success, we can expect some expansion of these pilot programs for youth accommodation. A point I wish to make is that care certainly must be taken in moving towards provision of suitable housing for the handicapped. Perhaps St. James Town, where special modified units were constructed at considerable cost and left vacant because support service and location were unsuitable, can be seen as an example of this need.

It simply is not enough to legislate regulations encompassing all residential housing design and construction, when the particular requirements of the handicapped are so varied. I am pleased, therefore, with the recent initiatives taken towards establishing the framework for comprehensive housing and support services that retain a high degree of flexibility.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Belanger: I would like to finish off by adding that the intent of this resolution is to be heartily commended, since there is certainly great need for efforts to improve the integration and mobility of handicapped persons within communities, across this province, and in society as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East has about a minute and a half.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to join with my colleagues in supporting the resolution of the member for Riverdale. I had the pleasure of participating in the planning of a senior citizens' home in my riding. As the Minister of Consumer and

Commercial Relations was saying, I found that ministry extremely co-operative in planning facilities on the bottom floor of that building for physically handicapped individuals in the riding. I don't compliment the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) all that often but, in this particular situation, he certainly acquiesced to the initiative taken by the handicapped in the Ottawa East and Vanier area in providing these facilities.

Mr. Nixon: He was a good minister. You don't get so much co-operation now.

Mr. Roy: It was extremely heartwarming to participate in the opening and see the handicapped. By that time they had integrated into this small community that builds up in these senior citizens' units. I really appreciated that.

Je veux dire juste en finissant brièvement, monsieur l'Orateur, à mon collègue de Prescott-Russell—que cela fait deux fois qu'il fait un discours en deux semaines. C'est extraordinaire.

Mr. Nixon: Deux fois?

Mr. Roy: Deux fois. Est-ce qu'il y a une course à la chefferie? Is there a leadership race going on out there?

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Roy: Les gens vont être fiers de toi, à Prescott-Russell, Albert.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the participation in the debate by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, by the member for Windsor-Walkerville, by my friend from Prescott and Russell, by the member for Ottawa East and, of course, by my colleague, the member for Bellwoods.

Two or three very brief points: I want to emphasize, of course, what should not need emphasizing: that I was only speaking to one aspect of one kind of discrimination. I do not want anyone to think, simply by dealing solely with physical access to premises that that will deal with all the kinds of discrimination which affects handicapped people, or other minorities.

I say to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that what prompted me to deal with it, in the time available to me as a private member on public business, was the apparent disregard by the government of the report of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, *Life Together*. I tend to think that the best way to prove commitment in this field and, therefore, provide the correlative resources required, would be for the government to implement recommendation 78 of the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Under that umbrella, that kind of programmatic approach, which my colleague, the member for Bellwoods, indicated was the proper and appropriate way to deal with it, could be the method by which this severe problem of discrimination could be urgently attacked and eliminated.

Mr. Speaker: The time for this item has expired.

Mr. Renwick: In closing, I want to say I appreciate the support of members and I also want to be certain that the government restraint program does not limit the commitment of the government to the elimination of this aspect of this form of discrimination.

FAMILY BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Sufficient members having objected by rising, a vote was not taken on Bill 11.

EASE OF ACCESS BY PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Renwick has moved resolution 6.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Could you tell me which is the greater honour: to have the vote refused or to have the motion carried?

Mrs. Campbell: To have it refused.

Mr. Speaker: I will leave that to the judgment of the honourable member.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Welch, the House adjourned at 5:53 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 12, 1979

Point of privilege re member's book of poetry, Mr. Lawlor	935
Niagara Escarpment pits and quarries, statement by Mr. Brunelle	935
Water pollution, statement by Mr. Parrott	936
Point of privilege re report on nuclear plant safety, Mr. Sargent	937
Sales tax on telecommunications services, statement by Mr. Maeck	938
Payments to municipalities, statement by Mr. Wells	939
Tourism, statement by Mr. Grossman	940
GATT negotiations, statement by Mr. Grossman	940
Point of privilege re lighting in chamber, Mr. Roy	941
Health care financing, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Laughren	942
Employment development fund, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Roy	943
Job creation, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Peterson	944
Increase in OHIP premiums, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Conway	945
Kawartha Lakes School, question of Mr. Norton: Mr. Eakins	947
Mini-Skools Limited, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. McClellan	947
Bell Canada case, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell	948
St. Lawrence Starch dispute, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Mackenzie	948
Trent-Severn locks, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. G. Taylor	949
Grievance arbitration, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. McKessock:	949
Health services, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breaugh	949
Fire detectors, questions of Mr. Drea: Mr. McCaffrey	950
Hospital equipment, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Bradley	951
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Wildman	951
Energy management program, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. J. Reed	952
Sale of beer at baseball stadium, question of Mr. Drea: Mr. Samis	953
Motion re select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs, Mr. Welch, agreed to	954
Motion re private members' public business, Mr. Welch, agreed to	954
Motion re order of ballot items, Mr. Welch, agreed to	954
Business of the House, Mr. Welch	954
Private members' public business on second reading, Family Benefits Amendment Act: Mr. Peterson, Mr. di Santo, Mr. Norton, Mrs. Campbell, Ms. Gigantes, Mr. Jones, Mr. Roy	954

On resolution re ease of access by physically handicapped: Mr. Renwick, Mr. Drea, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Belanger, Mr. Roy	966
Resolution concurred in	976
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to	976

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
 Belanger, J. A. (Prescott and Russell PC)
 Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breagh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Brunelle, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Cochrane North PC)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
 Davison, M. N. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
 Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
 Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 McCaffrey, B. (Armourdale PC)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McKessock, R. (Grey L)
 McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Taylor, G. (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)

Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)



No. 23

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC



CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.



LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: Pauline M. McGibbon, the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1980, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, April 17, 1979.

VISITOR

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of minor privilege: I want to call the attention of the members of the House to the presence in the gallery of a good friend and former colleague of all the members here, Mr. Ed Good, the former member for Waterloo North.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk had received, and laid upon the table, certificates of by-elections in the electoral districts of Scarborough West and Wentworth.

Electoral district of Scarborough West: R. F. Johnston.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

This is to certify that in view of a writ of election dated February 19, 1979, issued by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Ontario and addressed to Mrs. Muriel Neundorf, returning officer for the electoral district of Scarborough West, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Scarborough West in the Legislative Assembly of this province, in the room of Stephen Lewis, Esquire, who, since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Scarborough West, has resigned his seat, Richard F. Johnston, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated April 14, 1979, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(Signed) Roderick Lewis, Chief Election Officer; Toronto, April 17, 1979.

Richard F. Johnston, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Scarborough West, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Electoral district of Wentworth: C. Isaacs.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

This is to certify that in view of a writ of election dated February 19, 1979, issued by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Ontario and addressed to Mrs. Mary Wiebe, returning officer for the electoral district of Wentworth, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Wentworth in the Legislative Assembly of this province, in the room of Ian Deans, Esquire, who, since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Wentworth, has resigned his seat, Colin Isaacs, Esquire, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated April 14, 1979, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(Signed) Roderick Lewis, Chief Election Officer; Toronto, April 17, 1979.

Colin Isaacs, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Wentworth, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

BAPTISTE LAKE RESCUE

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of informing the members of still another act of bravery and resourcefulness by another member of our staff, Frank Hicks.

Mr. Hicks was instrumental in the rescue of one of five men when their snowmobile went through the ice on Baptiste Lake, in the Bancroft district, on March 31. Mr. Hicks, who is a fisheries biologist in the Algonquin Park district, was off duty and spending the weekend at his cottage by Baptiste Lake, northwest of Bancroft. Later that Friday evening, after the 11 o'clock news, Mr. Hicks retired. He had earlier heard two snowmobiles cross the lake and stop at a neighbouring cottage. It was near midnight and he heard the two machines start up for the

return trip across the lake. Moments later he heard a third machine starting at his neighbour's, and, suspecting something might be wrong, got out of bed and watched his neighbour's machine go out on the lake. When the tail light dipped suddenly and disappeared he knew the machine had gone through the ice. As it happened, the third machine had been going to the aid of the two men with the first two machines, which had also broken through the ice. In all, three snow machines and five men were in the frigid water of Baptiste Lake.

Mr. Hicks dressed hurriedly, grabbed a flashlight and part of a wooden extension ladder, and made his way out on the ice to the shouting victims who were about 200 yards from shore. By the time he arrived one man had got onto the ice and was making his way back to the cottage, and two other men were out of the water and trying to rescue a fourth.

Mr. Hicks fell through the rotting ice in the darkness and the fog, but managed to reach the pair and help pull the fourth man out. He told him to make for the cottage and set about to rescue the remaining fifth man who was some distance away and separated by open water. Mr. Hicks returned to shore to get his canoe and could not locate the paddle. He launched the canoe and used the ladder to paddle kayak-style to where he had last seen the remaining man in the water. As he was trying to rescue him the canoe capsized and Mr. Hicks was thrown into the water. Using the ladder he clambered onto safe ice, emptied his canoe and launched it again. Using the ladder to steady the canoe, Mr. Hicks managed to pull the fifth man into the canoe.

The unfortunate victim had been in the water for almost half an hour and was nearly exhausted. To reach safe ice, Mr. Hicks had to make several attempts to force his canoe to override the edge of the shore before succeeding. Once on firm ice he used the canoe as a sled and dragged the man to shore.

Frank Hicks is 33 years of age, married, with three small daughters. He acted without hesitation in going to the help of the victims of a potentially tragic accident in which he might well have lost his life. Indeed, others close to the scene have commented that Mr. Hicks could have lost his life during his rescue attempts.

I am sure that honourable members will share the pride I feel that in the Ontario government service we have such splendid and selfless people as Frank Hicks of Whitney

and pilot Bob Grant of Kenora whom I commended in the Legislature on March 29.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have another brief statement in connection with flooding in southwestern Ontario.

The Easter long weekend brought more flooding problems to southwestern Ontario. I would like to bring honourable members up to date on what has happened, and also what we expect will happen in the next 24 hours.

Mr. S. Smith: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I am having trouble hearing the member and I haven't a copy of his statement.

Oh, here is the copy, thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, this was compiled just after lunch.

Based on information from the staff of the Lower Thames Valley Conservation Authority, I can say I am cautiously optimistic that the flood crest which is passing through Thamesville now will not cause serious flooding in the Chatham area later today. I am also cautiously optimistic that the dikes along the lower Thames, including the sections where we experienced problems last month, will hold.

I would like to mention that the people of south Chatham have already experienced serious flooding this weekend. We understand that more than 200 homes have suffered water damage as a result of heavy runoff from McGregor and Indian Creeks. The flooding in this area was as serious as it was in 1968—the worst flood year in south Chatham. We fully sympathize with residents in the south Chatham area who we understand suffer damp basements almost every spring.

Let me review quickly what happened and what we expect. Between 1 p.m. Friday and 1 a.m. Saturday at least 50 millimetres—that is about two inches—of rainfall were recorded in some parts of southwestern Ontario. The soil in that area was already saturated. Any additional moisture simply runs off. The effect of that runoff from small creeks and feeder streams was felt in the main waterways on Saturday and Sunday. During this time the Ministry of Natural Resources advised the following conservation authorities that they might experience some trouble: St. Clair, Ausable-Bayfield, Kettle, Catfish, Upper Thames, Lower Thames, Saugeen Valley, Maitland Valley, Grand and Nottawasaga.

[2:15]

Water levels in the smaller watersheds peaked on Saturday morning. Water levels in the lower reaches of the Grand peaked on

Monday. Some flooding had already occurred at Galt (Cambridge), Brantford and New Hamburg on Saturday and Sunday. There was also some flooding at Dresden and Wallaceburg.

We are paying particular attention today to the Lower Thames area. There is now a crest of high water passing through Thamesville. This crest is flowing at a rate of 27,000 cubic feet per second. The rate of flow during last month's flooding was 30,000 cubic feet per second. Conservation authority flood forecasters here in Toronto tell me that this particular crest has flattened out. They expect this flattened crest to reach Chatham at approximately 10 o'clock tonight and Dover township 12 hours later. I repeat, we are cautiously optimistic that no serious flooding will occur in these areas.

Elsewhere in the province, in the Sudbury area 55 millimetres of rain have fallen, but as yet we haven't received any reports of flooding. Lesser amounts of rain have fallen throughout central and eastern Ontario, but we do not expect problems in those areas.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE

Mr. S. Smith: If I may, I would direct a question to the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, following the information which the Minister of Natural Resources was kind enough to give us on the recent flood situation.

Is the Treasurer prepared now to accept some of the suggestions that have come from this side of the House and elsewhere to set up a proper disaster relief fund in Ontario, and not one that depends on the government's being able to match the contribution within a local municipality, given that flooding has become a rather regular and widespread occurrence and given that not every municipality has the same capability of fund-raising within its own local area? Does the Treasurer not think that a disaster relief fund which did not depend on the matching grant formula would be a fairer and more reasonable and equitable way to do things?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I thought for a moment the member was raising funds for his party.

Mr. J. Reed: You really don't take it seriously, do you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am sure the government would be glad to review the kinds of relief we have for disasters in the province. Yet, generally speaking, I feel that the form

of assistance has been fair in the cases where it has been required. The member made the comment that we are having floods more frequently or on a regular basis. I think he used words to that effect.

Mr. S. Smith: It was more regularly than frequently.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was going to say that certainly the experience with the various conservation authorities would show that with minor exceptions the efforts that have been taken, particularly in southwestern Ontario, have been very useful. I have had some exposure to that, as the member knows.

While we lack them in several areas, the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, I believe, is studying the Glen Gowan dam proposal at this point and a few others of that nature. Generally speaking, these efforts have really minimized insofar as possible the overall risks in those parts of the province subject to flooding.

The Chatham-Kent area, and I am sure parts of Essex, are particularly subject to flooding. In fact, if one used flood-plain criteria such as we use in other parts of the province, my recollection is that they would all fall below the requirements of the flood-plain criteria. Therefore, we have a particularly difficult situation in those parts of the province.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary: in addition to changing the disaster relief fund from a matching grant formula to a more direct grant basis, would the minister consider a government-run flood insurance scheme, in which part of the premium would be paid by the government on the equivalent basis of what it now pays for disaster relief, while the remaining part of the premium would be paid by the people who would be receiving the insurance?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would never reject out of hand any useful proposal. I don't know whether that has been considered before or not. Rather than simply saying yes or no, I'd be glad to check into it.

Mr. Yakabuski: Supplementary: If the Treasurer is considering a change in the formula insofar as disaster funds in this province are concerned, would he also give consideration to changing the formula that might apply to Renfrew county with regard to the snow damage that destroyed so many farm buildings this past winter?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That was not only in Renfrew county. I would suspect that my own constituency had a good deal of snow damage. I learned, much to my surprise, that that now appears to be an insurable risk in certain

policies. Therefore, if it is, I would think it is best to let the individual make the decision.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary: If the Treasurer is going to look into aspects of these disaster funds, I wonder if he would consider making available low-interest loans to some municipalities which feel that matching dollar for dollar in a disaster-type fund might not be adequate, but a low-interest loan from the government of Ontario might be more adequate. Would he also look into that area?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would have to check the details of the two kinds of relief we have. It seemed to me that the fundamental part of shoreline protection was that approach, where the interest rates were either lower or very low. Again, I'm not saying anything will happen. I'm simply saying I would be pleased to look at these kinds of programs to determine if they're adequate, and if they are—

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the Treasurer able to recall the situation where the government was able to send aid to the victims of the fire in Cobalt, without using the normal procedure of meeting dollar for dollar the funds raised locally? Would he not appreciate that in certain natural disasters the dollar-for-dollar formula serves the government, but does not serve the people who must either rebuild or replace the property they have lost and that, therefore, it is necessary to have a program that meets the actual needs of the community?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I think I answered the suggestion earlier when I said I'd be glad to look at it.

Mr. S. Smith: Have a flood before an election.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't recall exactly how the moneys to Cobalt were handled. I recall the fire very well. I think it was in June 1977.

Mr. Bolan: It was during an election campaign. That's why you gave the money.

Mr. Nixon: You are prepared to play politics with anything.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Or anyone.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: At that point I believe we diverted all of our fire bombers—

Mr. Warner: You are going to study it. You would send Al Capone to study the banks.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —from a very bad fire in the Cobalt area—in fact, it got out of control as a result of that action—to save what parts of the community we could. In the case of

that kind of action, that was a terrible fire at a very hot and windy time, if I recall.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the Treasurer referring to the election campaign? It was a hot and windy time.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: It was hot and windy because the Leader of the Opposition was there.

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Energy? I guess this is a kind of supplementary question to the discussion we had a few days ago about the Babcock and Wilcox boilers which were returned.

Can the minister provide further details, which he said he didn't have at the time, concerning how the inspection was done, an inspection which apparently allowed these boilers to be installed and only later discovered the problems in the tubing? Can the minister tell us what are the costs involved in this regard that might have to be picked up by Hydro?

How could the inspector, on behalf of Hydro, have missed the error in the first place? Is this not a serious oversight from a technological point of view? Will we be getting further details from the minister?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, answering the last part of the question first, yes, we will. I have not seen the interior of one of those boilers, but I can send the Leader of the Opposition a sketch. It's a very complex and large mechanism. Certain tests are done, I assume, at the factory. Certain other tests are done by Hydro when the unit reaches the site and further testing has been going on of specific boilers because of various anomalies that may have been detected, or the fact that the testing process by Hydro, as I mentioned, is a very lengthy and cautious and careful process.

It actually took several months to get to the point which Hydro did—I guess it was mid-December when it suggested that manufacturing on the remaining numbers cease until further and more detailed testing was done, which I believe eventually involved the taking apart one of the units to check the inside.

I will send the Leader of the Opposition a sketch showing this, and I will attempt to get the detailed information for him as to the methodology as soon as I can, although I am not sure that all the tests have been completed.

Mr. Warner: Right; the minister should study the boiler from the inside.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As far as the matter of cost is concerned, as I mentioned, this is a matter of discussion between Hydro and the supplier, and apparently Atomic Energy of Canada Limited which is also involved and was involved in the design. It may take some time to resolve this matter. I will not speculate, but I think there are a number of costs involved and some of these may be expected by Hydro to be borne by the manufacturer and, conversely, expected by the manufacturer to be the cost of Hydro or Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

Mr. Warner: This is nothing, wait until supplementary time.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister repeat that answer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: After I've seen Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is in Hansard.

Mr. Grande: Does the minister mean that Hansard picked it up?

Mr. S. Smith: It's with the greatest of trepidation that I hazard a supplementary question.

The minister will appreciate that bent, pinched or narrow tubes seem rather fundamental to a boiler. Could the minister therefore explain how it is that these tubes could have escaped the notice of Hydro until the installation had taken place and that only then, at that point, did it realize that this very fundamental deficiency existed? The whole thing had to be disassembled, taken out; and now there is a dispute, I take it, regarding tens of millions of dollars of cost as to who pays for the taking out and re-installation of the boilers. How could Hydro have missed in the inspection the fundamental problem with the tubes right from the beginning?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was going to say unfortunately, perhaps I should say fortunately, I don't have the details. I have the wrong book for the details today.

Mr. Nixon: The minister left the details book at home today, did he?

Hon. Mr. Auld: A possible, very simple explanation which I understand—

Mr. McClellan: Possibly an explanation?

Hon. Mr. Auld: —is that previously the tubes, of which there are several hundred and which are inside a thing called the moderator, were heat treated, and the rest of the structure was heat treated, and then the tubes were welded into the other structure. It may be that in these ones—as I mentioned it's a different metal too—when they were assembled and then heat treated it was in the method of heat treating.

Mr. Laughren: Are you Tory backbenchers following this?

Mr. Turner: Are you?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Would the Leader of the Opposition like me to continue?

Mr. Nixon: I'm sure the minister could.

Mr. S. Smith: Did they meet Hydro specifications when they left the plant?

Mr. Turner: Listen to this, Floyd.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'm sure the specifications didn't change. It's what happened inside the boiler that may have changed.

Mr. M. Davidson: A supplementary: Can the minister confirm that the damage to the tubes resulted primarily from a change in method of process, a method of process that was being carried out by Babcock and Wilcox, and on instructions from either Atomic Energy of Canada Limited or Ontario Hydro to Babcock and Wilcox the method of process be changed?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can't confirm that, because I have read that Babcock and Wilcox indicated there had been some change in the specifications, not put forward by B and W, but recommended by either the customer or Atomic Energy of Canada Limited.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary, the member for Halton-Burlington.

Mr. J. Reed: When the minister is apprising himself of the facts surrounding the inspection and standards expected by Ontario Hydro, would he also do a comparison as to the method of approval used by Hydro right now, as opposed to the way it was seven or eight years ago when Hydro inspectors actually went into the processing plants? At that time they took for testing samples of the castings that were being poured and their related ingots. Would the minister find out if in fact they still do that kind of thing; or are they now relying more on what is being told them from a distance?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It would seem to me there is a great opportunity for honourable members to get the technical details first hand, because, I believe Hydro will shortly be appearing before the select committee to answer questions about its safety program. If there are questions unanswered at that time, I will be delighted to try to get the answers and relay them to the House; although I do think it would be more effective to get them directly from the technical people involved.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question for the Minister of Health arising out of questions I

put to the Premier (Mr. Davis) last week. The Premier said last week that the minister would endeavour to find a solution to the problems facing people in Windsor, where the only two neurosurgeons have both opted out of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. One of these neurosurgeons is now charging rates that are almost double the OHIP rate.

Can the minister say what the government intends to do to ensure that patients needing office care by such opted-out physicians can get that care at the OHIP rate, without paying a surcharge? And how is this covered by the government's recent agreement with the Ontario Medical Association that was meant to guarantee universal accessibility to health-care services?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think the principles as outlined in my statement of March 29 are very clear. With respect to in-hospital care, the principle that applies is that the services will be available at the OHIP rates. As regards other aspects, where the patient has not agreed beforehand he does not pay. I have not had any report back on that particular situation.

The member might be interested to know that just about a year ago right now the concern being expressed in the city of Windsor was that it was not going to have any neurosurgeons at all. The concern a year ago was that the elder of the two gentlemen was going to retire and leave the practice of medicine completely, and that the younger one was going to leave the city. There was very real concern that in emergencies people would have to go to Detroit.

It was with that in mind, being very much concerned about providing incentive to keep neurosurgeons there, that I approved putting a CAT scanner in Windsor as an inducement to retaining their neurosurgical expertise in the area, or to recruit others if in fact either of those gentlemen, for whatever reason, did leave their practices in that community.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister hasn't answered the question at all. He says his agreement only covers in-hospital care and he hasn't said how it relates to care in the offices. Since one of the doctors in question, Dr. Kleider, the elder of the two, has said that he has doubled his rates in an effort to force the Ontario government to put doctors on salary—

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Oh, come on; you've got to be kidding, you really have to be kidding.

Mr. Cassidy: —can the minister explain why the government is not providing this alternative for doctors who wish to practise medicine this way; and why the government in-

stead is sticking so rigidly, and only, to the fee-for-service system?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, we do have salary arrangements through the hospitals, for instance for emergency services; there are a number of hospitals in the province where the emergency departments are operated by groups of physicians on a contractual basis. I would not be opposed at all to considering that kind of arrangement, if the doctor wants to propose that through the hospital in which he has privileges and if they want to put it forward to us.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: I was going to ask exactly the same question the member asked of the minister. I wonder if the minister would consider having him put on staff at one of the hospitals and put on salary?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, each physician of course deals with individual hospitals on the question of hospital privileges. It so happens the Hotel Dieu of St. Joseph is the centre for neurosurgical services in that community; that is where the new CAT scanner is going to be located. All I am saying is, if those physicians want to put together a proposal through that hospital, I am quite prepared to entertain it.

Mr. Cooke: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that both these neurosurgeons in Windsor have sent out letters to all general practitioners in the Windsor-Essex area telling them that if there is any hardship on the patients they are to contact the doctors and more or less plead their case for charity medicine in the city of Windsor? Does the minister approve of that kind of process?

Instead of giving us all this waffling, as he has done today, what is the minister prepared to do? The facts are clear. What is the minister prepared to do to guarantee neurosurgical service in offices and hospitals in Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, one possibility would be to introduce what has been proposed by the Ontario Medical Association, namely patient streaming and balanced billing. If the honourable member is saying his party now believes in patient streaming and balanced billing, that is an interesting revelation.

Mr. Warner: What are you going to do?

Mr. Breagh: Is that your answer?

Mr. Cooke: You are a disgrace.

Mr. Martel: You are digging yourself in.

Mr. Cassidy: Every day we lose a bit more of the health system in Ontario, and it

is because of that minister and that government.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Balderdash! The only people who are destroying the health-care system are the NDP.

Mr. Martel: Oh, yes. We are in power!

FOOD PRICES

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier and Provincial Secretary of Justice.

Since the price of beef has gone up by 24 per cent in the three and a half months since the government promised action to monitor the outrageous food prices we are having today, and since food prices are now running at 21 per cent higher than a year ago, could the Deputy Premier tell us when we can expect some action from the government to protect consumers from the seemingly relentless increase in food prices which is going on week after week and month after month across the province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for the fact that my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Drea) is not here. No doubt he is out giving some thought to that particular question now.

There was, as the honourable member will know, some reference in the speech from the throne with respect to that ministry having some responsibilities to monitor that; and certainly when the minister gets back he will no doubt be able to respond more fully to that question.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the Deputy Premier aware of the existence of the group Women Against Rising Prices, a group which was established in the backyard of the Premier (Mr. Davis) himself because of concern over the inaction of the government in terms of not just monitoring prices but also rolling them back?

Is the Deputy Premier aware that this week the group has called upon consumers across the province to boycott flour because its price has gone up by half in the course of the last three months?

Is the Deputy Premier aware that the group is now calling upon consumers across the province to boycott chicken because the price of chicken has gone up by a third over the course of the past year?

Does the Deputy Premier not think it about time for the government to step in, rather than making ordinary consumers do the work of the government for it by having to step in because of the inaction of this government?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, while the member is looking at his notes for a supple-

mentary question, I should point out that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations did not have to wait for any organization of women to remind the people of this province of the power of the consumer in the marketplace; indeed, his record speaks fairly clearly on that matter.

Mr. Foulds: Give us one concrete action he has taken.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am aware of all of the concerns. I did not have to have an organization of women to tell me; my wife has been telling me that all weekend.

HYDRO TRANSMISSION LINES

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy: Now that the southern three municipalities in the regional municipality of York, namely, Markham, Vaughan and Richmond Hill, have passed a resolution calling for an environmental assessment study of the 550 kilovolt transmission line through their area, would the minister exercise his discretion and grant them this much-sought-after impact study?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the part of the transmission line that is in the parkway belt could not be moved outside the parkway belt without really starting from scratch. However, I will be delighted to look into the honourable member's suggestion, although I think that, legally, it is not possible in part of the route. There would be no point in doing an assessment unless there was going to be a change which could not be achieved otherwise.

As the honourable member is aware, the parkway steering committee has been looking at a section of the line, has been in touch with the municipalities, has had several public information meetings, has been in touch with the members involved, and is expected to report very shortly. When we have seen that report, then we would be, again, in a better position to judge what the next step would be.

GLANBROOK LANDFILL SITE

Mr. Isaacs: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. With regard to the hearings that are going on in Glanbrook under the Environmental Protection Act, could the minister explain why his staff are participating in those hearings in support of the application for a landfill site when it is the responsibility of the board to make a recommendation to the director, and hence to the minister, concerning the disposition of the region's application for a

dump? Does the minister not agree that participation by his staff in support of the application of the application suggests prejudice on the part of the ministry?

Mr. MacDonald: That's what I call a sharp question.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I wonder who prepared it for him.

Mr. Cassidy: How much does the minister's speech writer get?

Mr. MacDonald: That's why he got elected.

Mr. Speaker: The question was fairly direct; it is to be hoped the answer will be equally so.

Mr. Cassidy: Who wrote Gordon Dean's speeches?

Mr. Laughren: What a cheap shot.

Mr. Cassidy: When in doubt, bluster.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: It is an interesting experiment with which the member has started off his career, and I am sure he sees that his party is perhaps more interested in the question than it is in the answer.

Mr. Laughren: What a silly man you are.

Mr. Cassidy: Withdraw your staff from the hearings now if you want to be impartial. Withdraw your staff now, that is what you should do.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, if we should withdraw our staff from the hearing, I am sure the first thing we would hear is that we refused to put forward any information that might help. It is so typical of the position; regardless of what stand this ministry and its staff will take we will be subject to criticism, that is normal for the course.

However, I think we can be at those hearings without showing a bias for or against. We have an obligation to put as much information forward for the environmental assessment hearings as is possible. We want those decisions to be made based on facts, not emotions. That's why we are there, trying to put facts forward that will allow the assessment board to make a valid decision.

[2:45]

Mr. Isaacs: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Given the minister's non-answer, will he assure this House the services of his staff will be made available on an equal basis to those who oppose the landfill site on environmental grounds, as they are being made available to the proponents to the site?

Mr. S. Smith: You wouldn't want them, they wouldn't be much help.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to put as much information forward as we have. It matters not whether it supports the application or is in opposition to it. Our attempt is to put forward the information. We don't have a closed mind on the value of that site like the members opposite have.

Mr. Foulds: You have a closed mind and an open mouth; you are a bad loser.

Mr. Cunningham: I would like to ask the minister, recognizing this proposed site involves 550 acres much of which is very good farm land, if this is not in his view a case for consideration under the Environmental Assessment Act what is?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: No one questions whether or not we should have an environmental assessment; that was our position. I don't understand the question; of course we believe it should have an environmental assessment.

Mr. S. Smith: Under which act?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Well I am not sure it matters.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Sometimes it is wise, I would say to the member for St. George, to wait until the full sentence is completed.

Mr. S. Smith: What is the point of having an Environmental Assessment Act?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I am not sure that in this particular case, given the broad parameters under which the board always hears matters, whether it's under the Environmental Protection Act or the Environmental Assessment Act, that there's any real difference. The board has not limited discussions to the pure technical aspects of the matter. It has heard the broad concept, as it would under the Environmental Assessment Act; therefore it makes very little difference which act it is heard under. There is a difference in the appeal procedures but not in the hearing procedures.

THAMES RIVER FLOODING

Mr. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister of Natural Resources come to order?

Mr. Watson: I guess he is the Minister of Energy at the present moment. I appreciate very much the statements the minister released today on the flood conditions, but I do have a question. There have been, from time to time, proposals for a dam on the Kent system to prevent such floods from happening. It is my understanding about two thirds of the water that goes through Chatham

does not now go through any restraining system. Would the minister consider some type of study or some kind of investigation into a dam, and specifically the Wardsville dam that has been proposed? Could that be looked into again?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Thames River study did recommend the possible construction of two other dams below Glen Gowan. One was to be located at Thamesville or at Wardsville. Apparently the soil conditions at Thamesville were not adequate for a dam, consequently Wardsville would be the choice. However, the Wardsville dam would not be effective, as I understand it, until the Glen Gowan dam is completed. At the moment there is an environmental assessment in progress about the Glen Gowan dam. We expect that to be completed very shortly and then there will be a decision taken about proceeding with the Glen Gowan dam. I will attempt to get for the honourable member the latest information about Wardsville, although my understanding is it would not be effective, as I said at the outset, without the Glen Gowan dam.

FOREIGN PURCHASES OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr. Riddell: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food on the business of foreign investment in land, which doesn't seem to excite him too much. Would it cause the minister concern if I told him that just recently \$45,000,000 in German money has been transferred to banks in Huron county and surrounding areas to be used for the purchase of farm land and that that represents somewhere in the neighbourhood of 30,000 to 40,000 acres?

Hon. W. Newman: I am always concerned about agricultural land and its proper use in this province.

Mr. Martel: That is why you didn't follow up the resolution by the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot).

Hon. W. Newman: I pointed out to the member that we were doing an update on Kent county. We are also doing a study on Huron county, which should be completed before too long, and a study on Huron township and Bruce county. We are looking into that request by his seatmate.

If there is this money in the banks that the member is talking about to buy land in Huron county and in other areas of this province, I would like to know to what use that land is going to be put, if foreign interests are buying it, and if they are going to put people on it.

I wouldn't want to remind the honourable member that in Huron county there is an operation, which I think his seatmate knows very well about. It is a very well-run operation, and representation was made by his own party to release the land transfer tax on that particular property.

I am not criticizing the member, because I think he did the right thing.

Mr. Gaunt: Those people are actively farming the land and are exporting hogs all over the world. That is quite different from absentee foreign ownership.

Hon. W. Newman: Let me say that I am concerned if large tracts of land are being bought. At this point in time, one real estate person writes me a letter or somebody else phones me and tells me they are going to buy a 1,000-acre block here and a 1,000-acre block there and they are taking the going price, whatever price the farmer sets. Until I have some facts and figures in front of me, I want to have a very close look at it and see what those are.

An hon. member: That is too late.

Hon. W. Newman: No, it is not too late at all.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that at least four other provinces in Canada have passed legislation restricting foreign ownership of land? Is he also aware that just recently the United States government sent out a questionnaire to every landowner in the United States requiring them to disclose who the owner of the land is and whether there is foreign capital in that land? If they fail to provide that information the penalty amounts to 25 per cent of the assessed value of the property. If all these other jurisdictions are concerned, what in the world is it going to take to move the minister?

Mr. Mackenzie: Ontario for sale is government policy.

Hon. W. Newman: To deal with the member's specific question regarding the US legislation; yes I have read it, I am fully aware of the fact that foreign owners of land must register with a certain agency in the US to acquire it. I am also aware that some of the provinces do have some legislation. The member may forget that we do have a land transfer tax.

Mr. Riddell: Which means nothing.

Hon. W. Newman: That's the member's opinion. There is a 20 per cent land transfer tax in the province of Ontario on farm land and recreation land.

By the way, I have read the speech the member gave in the House. I would suggest

he check his figures in Hansard, because I think he was misquoted. Outside of that, I would point out that there are a lot of good people buying land and that money is coming from other countries. Many of these foreign citizens are coming here to farm that particular land and many of them are taking out landed immigrant status.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: Would the minister consider making representation to the cabinet for the establishment of an investment review board in the province of Ontario so that we will know what is going on in this gradual takeover of so much agricultural land by foreign interests?

Hon. W. Newman: I just finished saying that we are keeping an eye on the two areas of concern which have been brought to my attention.

Mr. Mackenzie: Branch plant farming as well as branch plant manufacturing.

Hon. W. Newman: We did a study of Kent county when members opposite were making a great deal of noise about the takeover of land in Kent county; it turned out to be about one per cent of the land, and that wasn't necessarily being taken up by foreign owners. They could have been Canadians who were resident somewhere else—in the United States or some other part of the world. The member is making a tremendous hue and cry—

Mr. MacDonald: Answer my question.

Hon. W. Newman: I just point out that the member always likes to make a lot of noise about these things. Let's get the facts and I will make the decisions.

Mr. Foulds: That's what he asked you.

Hon. W. Newman: I said I will get the facts and make a decision.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. He informs the House that his staff is reviewing this problem in many parts of Ontario. Does the minister have a specific plan that he would be prepared to implement if his staff finds that foreign ownership of agricultural land in Ontario is very large? Does he have a plan he is prepared to implement?

Hon. W. Newman: We are always looking at plans and programs in my ministry.

Mr. T. P. Reid: That means no.

Hon. W. Newman: We have looked at the foreign ownership of land. From the last survey we did we do not feel there was any major problem to be concerned about at that time.

Mr. MacDonald: It was all gone by then.

Hon. W. Newman: Oh nuts. What does the member know about farming? I have to give him a lot of credit. I say we are watching it very carefully. We have the capacity of the land here to do what we want to.

Mr. Riddell: The select committee of which you were a member made recommendations that the sale be restricted and you dissented.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Does the minister not recall a select committee on which the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Walker) and a number of his cabinet colleagues served and which called for all land to be sold only to Canadians or landed immigrants, and when does the government intend to move in cabinet to have those recommendations adhered to?

Hon. W. Newman: I believe the member had better read that report again and see what I said at the bottom of that particular page. I think he'd better read that report again.

Mr. Martel: I was there.

AID FOR ELDERLY

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Given that many of the alternative-cure experimental projects that are at present provided in communities to support the elderly around the province are fast approaching the end of their initial funding period, can the minister inform the House as to the date or dates upon which these projects will receive confirmation of their 1979-80 funding status? They are all a little nervous about their ability to continue.

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, in so far as not all of those projects are under the jurisdiction of my ministry, I can only respond for those which are. I cannot give the honourable member a specific date but I can assure him that they will be advised in the very near future as to the future funding that will be available to them.

Mr. McClellan: When is the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Very shortly.

Mr. R. F. Johnston: Supplementary for the minister: The majority of these projects under his ministry have already been evaluated by his ministry officials. I am wondering whether there is any intention either to duplicate or expand the successful projects, whether he plans just to let them all die and just keep on the present ones at their present level of funding, or is he

going to make some sort of major commitment to keeping the elderly in our communities and in their own homes?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident from the conduct and attitude and approach of my ministry over the last several years that we do have a major commitment to assist in maintaining the elderly in their own homes or in the community. That is clearly the direction, as I have indicated numerous times, that we are moving in, and that commitment will be maintained throughout this fiscal year and ensuing fiscal years.

[3:00]

DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) asked a question regarding the hiring practices of the recreation committee of the city of London. The Ontario Human Rights Commission's regional supervisor was in touch with the personnel director of the public utilities commission and the human rights officer was advised that this was not the policy of the public utilities commission.

The personnel director himself had just heard the recreation committee was pursuing such a policy and was looking into the matter. He also stated that currently many of the employees of the public utilities commission live outside the London area and he agreed with the human rights supervisor that such a preferential hiring policy would offend the spirit, if not the word, of the Ontario Human Rights Code.

As a result of these discussions and an apparent misunderstanding, I understand that the personnel director of the public utilities commission has issued a memorandum to all branch directors that hiring is to be done on the basis of qualifications and not on the basis of residence.

Mr. Eaton: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I have in writing a direction from the public utilities commission stating they will not hire people from outside the city. Would the member take that letter, when I deliver it to him, and see it is followed up on and that the situation is fully corrected, not just indicating that that is not their policy?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I have been assured that a memorandum has been sent to all portions of that public utilities commission indicating that is not the policy of the public utilities commission.

Mr. Van Horne: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to clarify the record in respect to this question. As part of the question, the member for Middlesex asked

whether I had anything to do with that policy which is alleged to have been discriminatory. I would submit that the reference to me was for that period of time in which I was the commissioner and also chairman of the public utilities commission.

Mr. Peterson: You did a grand job.

Mr. Van Horne: To support the statement of the minister, and in defence of the commission more than of myself, I would submit that I, personally, have checked with the general manager and I am satisfied there is no discrimination in their policy. I have a copy of his statement to all department heads. Unfortunately the member for Middlesex has in his possession a letter from a constituent of his, a letter which was written by a department head who had not the authority to respond as he did. That department head has been told of his error, and all department heads are now in receipt of a directive from the general manager making it very clear hiring is on competence only and not geography.

Mr. Speaker: That was a statement to correct the record, not a supplementary.

FLOOD RESCUE

Mr. Nixon: I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the report I heard on the news over the weekend true that rescue in the London area of people marooned and endangered by flood waters was by an American coast guard helicopter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't know, Mr. Speaker; I didn't hear that report. I shall inquire.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, it is true. There was a picture in the paper showing "US Coast Guard" right on the side.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Did the honourable member say the London, Ontario, area?

Mr. Nixon: It was Dorchester.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not aware of it. I will inquire.

Mr. Nixon: As a supplementary: Since the veracity, at least, of the report has been confirmed by my colleague, and it was mentioned in a number of news reports, I want to ask the minister if it is not possible the many airplanes and helicopters that come under his jurisdiction could be made available to assist in these flood rescues and flood work?

Does he recall one of the arguments against dynamiting the ice floes in the Grand River that caused flooding was that no helicopter was available except through the OPP and that their helicopter in that area was busy

on police work? Does the minister not think that with the scores of aircraft under his control, these aircraft could at least be made available under some circumstances in these weekend floods?

Surely it is ridiculous that our many millions of dollars worth of equipment just sits there idle under these circumstances, and we have to depend on the Americans, who evidently work weekends.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The Ministry of Natural Resources does not own any helicopters. We have two score and a quarter of mainly pontoon-equipped aircraft. We lease helicopters in the summertime and sometimes in the winter for such things as putting radio transmitters on moose and so on.

Mr. G. I. Miller: What about Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Ontario Hydro have three, I believe, which they use for patrolling the lines. I am not sure they are suitably equipped with windlasses and so on. But I will inquire about the report in the first instance.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The Wright brothers live.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might say that the Canadian Coast Guard have a number of their coast guard vessels equipped with helicopters and perhaps that's the area we should be looking to for liaison.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since there is such concern in these flood communities where neither the conservation authorities nor the Ministry of Natural Resources are doing much but issuing press releases after the flood as to why they can do very little under the circumstances, would he not take the responsibility to see that there is a co-ordination of provincial and federal facilities, municipal and conservation authority facilities so that there is not going to be pressure brought to bear on our citizens who are having to cope with these matters so frequently?

Mr. Breithaupt: Sort of an emergency measures organization.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I expect to be getting recommendations from the committee that I set up about a month ago. I believe their report is in the process of being typed, and we'll certainly look at that. However, the honourable member knows the primary responding agency in the province for disasters of any kind is the OPP, who have the communications network to do it. We would be looking at any scheme with that in mind.

Mrs. Campbell: Maybe they don't work on Sunday either.

MINING TAX

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Could the Treasurer

tell us how he justifies reducing the top marginal tax rate for the mining industry from 40 per cent to 30 per cent, in view of the fact that we already receive only about one half of one per cent of the value of mineral production in Ontario in the form of revenues, a total of about \$40,000,000 out of over \$2,500,000,000 worth of mineral production, and in view of the fact that when Inco Metals Limited appeared before the layoffs committee last year, they indicated to us quite clearly that the problem with exploration and development and so forth was not the tax rate in Ontario but rather, world markets?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member is judging the entire metal industry on the basis of one company's comments. Two things: Last year the federal government, with the help of the 10 provinces, had a sectoral study. That sectoral study specifically looked into the problems of the mining industries in Canada.

One of the recommendations of that sectoral study was that greater uniformity of both taxation and processing allowance criteria be set up within the provinces.

Mr. Laughren: Which you took to mean lower.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In fact, it was requested that there be absolute unanimity across Canada. I think that would be very difficult to achieve in mining taxation as it would in any other form of taxation, whether it be gasoline or income tax, you name it, because individual provinces' needs vary.

Whether the 40 per cent rate did or did not get used I can't be categorically correct, but it was very seldom; I believe once, maybe, on Inco. I once said it had never been used but Inco corrected me and said in 1974 or thereabouts it did apply. The fact remains though, that decisions made by mining corporations are often based upon hearsay and upon perceptions, not necessarily upon fact.

Ontario responded to two things in our current budget—

Ms. Gigantes: Especially if the Premier goes around spreading misconceptions.

Hon. F. S. Miller: (1) the recommendations of the sectoral study; (2) the obvious perception abroad that the 40 per cent rate, coupled with a 36 per cent rate, for corporate tax—

Mr. Laughren: That's nonsense.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —was very high. I know it's nonsense—

Ms. Gigantes: Well, you kept saying it was nonsense.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —in terms of what, in fact, applies. I'm not arguing that. I'm talking about perceptions.

Ms. Gigantes: You have been arguing that for years.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Perceptions are often more important than fact when other people who don't take the time to check them out hold them.

Mr. Cassidy: Boy, you pander to the preconceptions of the corporate sector.

Mr. S. Smith: You've done something meaningless to the tax.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: I have some sympathy for a Treasurer who's whip-sawed in such fashion, but I want to ask him how it is that he explains the fact that Saskatchewan—which has one of the healthiest mining environments in all of Canada—at the same time received 22 per cent of the value of production to the consolidated revenue fund instead of the one and a half per cent we do here in Ontario?

Further, the Treasurer stated in his budget that many northern Ontario communities depend entirely on the mining industry for jobs. Could the Treasurer tell us how he justifies, when he's saying that many northern towns depend on mining industry for jobs, a reduction in the top processing allowance which would encourage further processing and, therefore, more jobs in the north? How can he justify how he encouraged, or let stay on the books, the exemption to section 113 of the Mining Act which says they should process here?

Further, how is it he endorses the whole foreign processing allowance which allows them to write off processing costs against their Ontario operations? How does the Treasurer fit all that into a scheme to create more jobs in the north, given the fact it hasn't worked in the past and the fact we have a 9.4 per cent unemployment rate in northern Ontario at the present time—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. Laughren: —and 12.4 per cent in Sudbury?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that was a very long, involved question

Mr. Mancini: It was a statement.

Hon. F. S. Miller: First of all, the processing allowances have to be in harmony with the tax rates. Therefore, if one changes the tax rates, and we did, one has to change the processing allowances. You could have had processing allowances exceeding the tax rate had we not also brought those down because the maximum processing allowance

rate was 35 per cent, and the maximum tax rate was 40 per cent. We have brought the processing allowance down so it cannot exceed the maximum tax rate. I hope the member will accept that as a reasonable solution.

Ms. Gigantes: The Treasurer is going the wrong way.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The balance is probably better answered by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Foulds: Nothing is better answered by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In his absence, I would point out last year when I was Minister of Natural Resources I dwelt at length upon the need, at certain times, to have processing done elsewhere when, in fact, we are not the only source of the semi-processed materials. There were, as I recall, seven jobs in the mining concentrating end in Canada for every one we lost offshore and, in fact, we were protecting Canadian jobs to the maximum of our capability.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, the minister doesn't believe that?

Mr. Peterson: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A new question.

Mr. Peterson: It is an important question.

I would just like to ask the Treasurer what those two increases in allowances he talked about have to do with his stated intention of bringing new mines into production in this province. How are they related?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Again, Mr. Speaker, when I was Minister of Natural Resources I chatted with a number of companies that had prospective sites for development here, proven or reasonably good ore reserves, who were making economic assessments on incorrect figures or turning down a decision to go forward because they heard our tax rates were prohibitive. The fact is they were reasonably competitive when one allowed for the processing allowances. To listen to my colleague from Nickel Belt, one would say they were overly generous. He tends to dwell upon only mining tax as the only source of revenue from that industry, but I do not. I look upon the creation of wealth, the creation of employment—

Mr. Laughren: No, no, corporation taxes too.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the creation of corporate tax and the creation of a taxable income for the workers.

Mr. Laughren: There are fewer jobs now than there were 10 years ago. What is the minister talking about?

Hon. F. S. Miller: All of those are just as important.

Mr. Laughren: There are fewer jobs.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They're all very important, I'm sure the member would agree, in the process. The mining tax is a direct raw material charge for our share of the wealth.

Mr. Laughren: There are fewer jobs, not more.

Hon. F. S. Miller: With great respect, I'm sure there are other mechanisms that are needed and, I'm sure, we will find ways and means of stimulating more development apart from just this change.

Look at the small business development corporations, I'm sure in the member's speech today he may have something to say about those, and undoubtedly it will be supportive. If he looks at that, mining development is eligible under the SBDCs because we're trying to funnel more money into the exploratory steps. The creation of a good junior market for mines is important.

Mr. Laughren: Stop the giveaways. What nonsense.

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr. T. P. Reid: I really find the remarks of the minister offensive considering it was the government that ruined the junior mining exploration—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the member have a question?

Mr. T. P. Reid: —business in the province.

I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources on the junior mining section of the province that accounted for about two thirds of the active mines in Ontario. The minister indicated that the Hudson Bay lowlands would be made available for mining exploration by way of tendering or lease, is there any guarantee that the smaller, junior mining exploration companies will be able to get a piece of that action, or are they going to be simply at the mercy of the large companies in the tendering process?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I think I indicated in the statement, it is open to everyone. So far I'm not sure who has indicated interest. My expectation is that there would be some interest on the part of some of the smaller companies.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Supplementary: My question to the minister was: is there any formula or guarantee that these smaller, junior ex-

ploration companies will be on a par in being able to bid against the larger companies for the exploration rights.

Secondly, in relation to the Treasurer's statement, when is the minister going to make a definitive study about junior mining exploration in the province? He has all kinds of studies on the role of small enterprises in the Canadian mineral industry with a focus on Ontario which indicate that it was this government, particularly through the Ontario Securities Commission, that destroyed junior mining exploration in Ontario. When is he going to do something about that instead of giving tax breaks, or the perception of same, to the larger companies?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It's certainly agreed by the Ontario Mining Association and the Canadian Mining Association that the security rules in Ontario are not conducive to encouraging exploration by the smaller—

Mr. T. P. Reid: Your own study says that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —by the so-called junior companies. Discussions are going on with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations in connection with some change.

DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

Mr. T. P. Reid: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What part of your privileges have been abrogated?

Mr. T. P. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on April 10 in the Legislature the Minister of Natural Resources, in response to a question from myself and the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) in regard to disposal of hazardous wastes, stated that, and I quote: "This news report was not accurate and has subsequently been corrected. Ontario has not yet approved research drilling near Atikokan, although I understand the Atikokan municipal council supports such drilling, as does the member for Rainy River."

I would like to state that I did meet with members of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. I was under the impression that they would be having public information sessions with the people in the area and that they would not proceed with any drilling until those public information sessions had been carried out. In fact, I asked in the House—obviously, because the minister responded—what Ontario's obligation was in ensuring protection to the people of—

Mr. Speaker: Which of your privileges has been abrogated?

Mr. T. P. Reid: I think I have been misquoted, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, you didn't say so.

REPORT

STANDING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Philip from the standing administration of justice committee reported the following resolution:

That supply in the following amounts to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Correctional Services be granted Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980:

Ministry administration program, \$6,204,-100; institutional program, \$105,365,000; community program, \$19,857,000.

MOTION

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTION

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. Cureatz be substituted for Mr. McNeil on the select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs.

Ms. Gigantes: No more Ronnie McNeil? That's terrible.

Mr. Nixon: We know why you got it, Ronnie.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

FUNERAL SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Foulds moved first reading of Bill 61, An Act to amend the Funeral Services Act, 1976.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to bring some modest reform to the Funeral Services Act in order to provide some consumer protection in this neglected area.

There are seven amendments in the bill. The number of consumer representatives on the board of funeral services is increased. The responsibility for the bill is moved to the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations from the Ministry of Health. Those other than funeral directors may provide removal services, funeral supplies and advice in respect of funeral services. Embalming may take place only by the consent of the purchaser or if the body is to be transported out of Ontario. Finally, the bill makes it mandatory for a funeral director to provide an itemized price list for funeral supplies and services supplied to the purchaser.

ONTARIO HYDRO ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. J. Reed moved first reading of Bill 61, An Act respecting the Public Accountability of Ontario Hydro.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. Reed: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a means of clarifying the functions and duties of Ontario Hydro related to the production, generation, transmission, distribution, supply, sale, use and development of energy resources in Ontario.

The bill requires the Minister of Energy, on behalf of the government of Ontario, to issue a policy directive setting out the policy framework within which Ontario Hydro is to make operational and management decisions.

The Power Corporation Act is amended to clarify that it is a responsibility of the board of Ontario Hydro to ensure that the business of Ontario Hydro is conducted within the limits established by the policy directive issued by the Minister of Energy.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Breaugh moved first reading of Bill 62, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend the application of part XII of the Employment Standards Act, 1974, to employees who are employed for a definite term or task and to persons who are laid off or terminated during or as a result of a strike or lockout at their place of employment.

This unfortunate slippage in the current act was brought to my attention more than a year ago by some employees at a plant called Robson-Lang in Oshawa who even the employment standards people themselves felt were entitled to certain benefits, most notably what is commonly known as severance pay or payment in lieu of notice.

There was a hearing on that, and it was then ruled that they would not be applicable—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Any further comment would certainly be extraneous.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to table the answers to questions 58, 104 and 105 and the interim answer to question 113 standing on the Notice Paper. (See appendix, page 1025.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon. Mr. Welch: I'd like to take this opportunity to indicate our proceedings for today. As members know, we'll call the order for the budget debate and the member for London

Centre (Mr. Peterson) will make his contribution to that debate. There's some reason to believe that might be completed before six. If that were to be the case, we'll then have royal assent. There are two or three bills that require royal assent and Her Honour has to be brought into the House for this assent because of a supply bill.

So, when the member for London Centre is completed, we'll ask Her Honour to come in. We'll have to bring Her Honour into the House for assent, following which we'll then go into committee of supply and start the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services and continue after supper until 10:30 with those estimates.

As members will recall, we reversed the proceedings for Thursday. In the afternoon on Thursday next, we'll have the contribution of the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) on the budget debate and in the evening the private members' public business.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to rise on behalf of my party to contribute to this debate which will go on for some months and which, I gather, will come to some sort of resolution in December next. That, of course, gives us some time to monitor the affairs of the government—the management ability of this government—and we are going to be looking very carefully at that. We are limited today, of course, to confining our remarks to what was presented by the new Treasurer (Mr. F. S. Miller) just last week.

It was an interesting budget by virtue of the fact that the Treasurer was new. The member for Nickel Belt is, of course, an experienced critic by now and has been doing this for years. As a financial critic, he has proved a wonderful school teacher over the years. Of course, I am the eldest one in the whole group, this being my third year; my third opportunity to respond to the Treasurer.

I'm a little bit at a disadvantage because he's not here right now and some of my very best stuff I save for him specifically.

Mr. Nixon: He's washing his hands.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He'll be here to hear it.

Mr. Peterson: Perhaps the House leader would undertake to discuss my response with the Treasurer and tell him of all the good advice I had to provide for him.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Too bad Hansard can't record how well dressed you are today.

Mr. Peterson: If you would like to make an interjection about how well dressed I am, I'm sure Hansard would record it and I would like to show it to my children at some time in the future.

Mr. Nixon: Is that a carnation or a pansy?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Argument weak, fragrance strong.

Mr. Peterson: Like all budget nights, it was an auspicious occasion. It's virtually impossible for any private member to get tickets to this House because the galleries, of course, are packed with the friends of the Treasurer.

Mr. Laughren: No problem to them.

Mr. Peterson: They were all particularly curious, in these circumstances, to see what kind of man the Treasurer is and probably more important, in his case, to see what he would be wearing. That turned out, in retrospect, to be the most interesting part of the entire evening. There was some speculation afterwards, of course, that the Treasurer had got dressed in the dark that particular morning. Why else would anyone—

Mr. T. P. Reid: It was the same way he wrote the budget.

Mr. Peterson: There goes my best line. If the member for Rainy River has to go somewhere else to a committee meeting or maybe even go and do some constituency work for the next two or three weeks, he's certainly welcome; he's certainly free to do that.

Over the years, you know, I've always chosen a text for my remarks. A couple of years ago, it was Darcy McKeough himself who said something to the effect that "government spending is the chief cause of inflation." Then, of course, he went on to rack up the biggest single deficit in the history of this province.

I have chosen a text this year. It's not the Bible but it's as close as I could come; it's the *Toronto Star*, January 20, 1979. It was quoting from an article by the Treasurer. He had been interviewed, I gather, and he said, "I make decisions on intuition and impulse and that is a terrible admission." And the article said, "he says, with a chuckle." I think that's disturbingly accurate.

I hope not to take as long as I have in the past, although, if the House leader from the government party threatens me, I may. So I reserve my right to speak for up to four or five hours, depending on how he behaves and how attentive he is. But I think one will see, in looking at that quote, how that is exactly the way the Treasurer has devised the budget at this time.

[3:30]

I want to present an overall view, if I may, of how the Liberal Party sees the bind we are in today, our thesis about why we got into the troubles we are in today, and then finally the only way we see our way out of some of the present economic difficulties we have created for ourselves.

We have always been constructive in this House. If one looks back over the past two or three or four years, we have tabled in this House a myriad of position papers and constructive suggestions. If members check the speeches of my leader, he has always taken the view we would never criticize unless we had a responsible alternative to present to the people of this province. Without one single deviation from that course, we have always been prepared to stand up and present our alternative.

We gave the Treasurer a very distinct advantage this year. We presented to him in advance our industrial strategy, and of course he had time to work on that. We gave him at least 12 hours' notice. Government members should not say that isn't enough notice; they should remember the famous educational about-face of Tom Wells.

Mr. Foulds: Given that strategy, it is ample notice.

Mr. Peterson: That came two hours before a speech our leader was going to make about two or three years ago.

Mr. Nixon: Intellectual theft.

Mr. Peterson: So one cannot say we have not given the government enough time. I think had the Treasurer taken that document seriously—

Mr. Nixon: If he had only got it right.

Mr. Peterson: —and if he had been able to run down to the printing press, he would have had a far more impressive budget than he had. It is interesting to note that even by his own admission he is not at all sure that one of the principal proposals of his budget is going to work—and of course I share that view. We predicted in 1977 that his VIC proposals would not work. We weren't unduly pessimistic about it, but it's true in retrospect there was not one single registration under that piece of legislation. The Treasurer quite frankly admits it probably won't work. At least he's not at all sure—I don't mean to misquote him—it's going to work this time.

If I were Treasurer, I would probably be darn sure when I brought in things that they would work. I wouldn't put my credibility on the line for things that were questionable. When I had enshrined in legislation something I believed in, I would make

darn sure it worked. It's a different point of view.

Mr. Laughren: Pretty heavy stuff for a Liberal.

Mr. Peterson: You got the ink. You had John Bulloch running around the country saying what a wonderful fellow you were, taking credit of course for drafting that act with a few minor deviations. Two years from now, if there are no registrations under that act, who is really going to know? There will be an innocuous question in the House some time: how many registrations under the SBDC Act. The Treasurer will say: "None, and I am terribly sorry. Gee, I guess we misjudged it." But again they were the beneficiaries of publicity for some modest attempt to be creative.

I will get to this later in my speech; I use this only as an example of the kind of commitment that the government has to basic reform, to structural reform and to changing things. To a large measure, this Treasurer is a victim of, and captive of, the same rhetoric that we have heard from Treasurers in this province for a goodly amount of time. I will prove later, I think, when we examine the deteriorating figures, when we examine the deterioration of manufacturing output, not only in historical context but in a context relative to the other provinces, thoughtful people are saying: "We must change our point of view." The old *laissez-passer*, *laissez-faire* point of view is not at this particular time in history serving Ontario very well.

But given that—and I will come back to some of these things in more detail in a moment—we are fundamentally in an economic strait-jacket today that we have not been in before. We were in it last year but not as bad, and every year it has deteriorated. I am one person who has a great deal of sympathy for anyone charged with responsibility for developing fiscal and economic policies for this province at this time, because we have so little room to move. That is a function essentially of some of the sins of our past, sins of the past decade, principally the Davis-McKeough regime.

Our new Treasurer inherited those things. He is trying to do the best he can in the circumstances and I think in retrospect, and I am looking at it, it wasn't a very creative endeavour.

There is more that could have been done, there are more creative ways to use that money and we have to refocus the concentrations of the power of the government and resources of this government in the province,

and they have to be in the future, on the creation of wealth. We have been so busy spending it, we have been so busy thinking of new ways to tax, but we haven't been thinking of any new ways to develop and create wealth, and that is the basic thrust of the Liberal Party's proposal that I will present, and has been presented in some detail and I want to summarize in the House today. That is our concentration.

The government's concentration is only to increase taxation. It is a very interesting point of view for a free enterprise government. The Treasurer was presented with a shopping list and he said to himself: "My goodness, I am committed now. We were committed to balancing the budget in 1981, now we have to balance it in 1984. I had better generate some more revenue somewhere." So he looked at a big long list of potential tax increases and a few potential decreases and said: "We will steal a little more here and a little more there and give a little back here and a little more there," none of which alters the fundamental structural problems in this province, in my judgement at least, but what they do, and even more insidious, is reveal a mentality that says: "We must go on increasing our taxation," and we see no end to that.

This year, of course, he will generate another \$181,000,000 worth of revenue from so-called new taxation, new taxes or at least new increases on old taxes; all of which are regressive, all of which hit the little guy, the small taxpayer, from a percentage point of view much harder than they hit the wealthy person. I say, as one committed to fiscal responsibility, probably more so than the government, but I say as a Liberal I am one who is committed not to tax the lower stratum in our province from an economic point of view any more than we already are. Any taxation increases have to be done on a progressive basis; we are already choking them to death as it currently stands.

Just let me take you ahead a year, Mr. Speaker, because it is important. Even though the Treasurer says his net cash requirements are going to be about \$1,153,000,000 in fact his deficit is closer to \$1,700,000,000. I will speak more of this later on, but it is important to know that even to finance his decreased cash requirement in his estimate, he is still borrowing over \$1,500,000,000 from his internally-generated pension fund to pay for that net cash requirement which he says is lesser. What it necessarily commits us to next year,

and which is so disturbing, is at least \$130,000,000 more a year in interest, minimum.

I can sit right now and predict what is going to be in the budget next year. It is going to take 9.4 per cent more just to service this year's debt next year. That necessarily means we are talking next year about an additional \$355,000 a day minimum just to carry new debt incurred this year, and rather than an interest bill of \$3,800,000 a day, as we have this year, it will at least be \$4,200,000 next year. That will bring debt servicing, interest payments on past consumption, to in the order of 10 per cent of the budget next year. That is what is so disturbing about it; because if one looks back to the beginning of the decade about 4.9 per cent of our budget was going on debt servicing, this year it is 9.2 per cent, next year it will probably be 10 per cent.

We can see the unending chain, we can see the unending spiral; and the year after that it is going to be worse and the year after that it is going to be worse, and after that and after that and after that. I will prove to you, Mr. Speaker, later when I show some of the debt figures we are going to have to deal with in the future, how terribly disturbing that really is.

Mr. Laughren: It's almost as bad as the federal Liberals.

Mr. Peterson: Collectively, we are experiencing some of the worst crises in our institutions in this province, worse than we have had in a goodly length of time. They are difficult problems for everyone, for the government and the opposition, and we all share them communally from a broad point of view.

There is no question that we differ in many respects on the priorities of this government, but I want to quote a couple of figures to show the kind of crisis we are in.

In 1970, we were spending 29.6 per cent of our budget on health care. In 1979, we are spending 27.7 per cent of our budget on health care. Of course, those health-care institutions and the people involved look at those numbers and say, "Why are you giving us the short end of the stick?"

In 1970, we were spending 31.4 per cent of our budget on education. Today, we are spending 26.1 per cent of our budget on education.

These percentages are declining for a simple reason: Our interest payments are going from 4.9 per cent of the budget to, this year, 9.2 per cent of the budget. Necessarily—without massive tax increases—the government's share in transfers to these various services is going to decline as our interest

burden accelerates as a percentage of our budgetary expenditures. That is probably the most disturbing underlying trend in the budget the Treasurer has presented to us: We are going to have less for programs and more for interest.

The Treasurer has spoken, and of course it has been a fundamental tenet of this government, about balanced budgets. Remember the famous Brampton charter, or Bramalea charter? Everyone is trying to deny responsibility for it; so they are trying to move it to another jurisdiction. Pretty soon it is going to be the Muskoka charter, because everybody is so embarrassed about it and will blame it on this Treasurer.

In any event, remember that charter saying we were going to balance our budget in 1981? That was a foundation principle of the government in the election in 1977. Of course we found very quickly, and I am sure sophisticated observers inside the ministry knew at the time, that it was impossible, given this government's record.

In fact this Treasurer, after he inherited the mantle, was under a considerable amount of pressure. People wanted to find out, who is this man? What does he really believe in? Is he really just a used-car dealer come to the big city? We have had our experience with used-car dealers in politics before, and they do not always command the highest amount of respect in the community. In fairness, I would never equate the two, but I say that at face value there is a presumption against used-car dealers in politics.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have a deal for the member.

Mr. Peterson: I could not afford to deal with the Treasurer; I know he would do it to me somehow. He would change the numbers somehow and I would get fooled in the deal.

The net cash requirements, as I said, are \$1,153,000,000 this year. But in fact, the real budgetary deficit—in our judgement, a deficit means the difference between current revenues and current expenditures, not taking into account all of the non-budgetary transactions which we have seen fiddled dramatically for the last two years to the benefit of the government; and I hope everyone can see through that—the real budgetary deficit has improved by only \$38,000,000 this year. There was no \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000 improvement; it only improved by \$38,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I say this to you: I have had sophisticated trained economists look at this, and what they tell me is, that it is going to take 43 years to balance the budget of this

province at this rate. That is the kind of budget that has been presented to us. That projection does not consider the selling off of the assets. One never knows about this Treasurer; he might run across the street and try to flog off the Robarts Library if he could find a taker. That is the kind of accounting he is involved in. He is flogging off mortgages; he is flogging off Syncrude interest. Who knows what asset is next? It may be your chair, Mr. Speaker; so hang on to it, it is a handsome chair.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If I could sell the member's, I would.

[3:45]

Mr. Peterson: But it is very important that we look at these things in seriousness. What it comes down to is that this government has a vested interest in inflation. The greater inflation is, the less the government has to pay back. That is why we have seen no serious commitment by this government to bring spending and revenues into line to lessen that deficit, to lessen those net cash requirements, all of which have a very profound inflationary influence. That is why one can argue that governments, and this government especially, has such an interest in inflation they will never really address their minds to those problems; because they will be paying back in 10 years in much cheaper dollars than they are right now.

Mr. S. Smith: Why is the Treasurer leaving? Does he not want to hear the criticism? We had to listen to his speech.

Mr. Kerrio: We hung in through yours, Frank.

Mr. Peterson: As I said, our thesis is we must concentrate the power of government, the resources of government, the imagination of government, the ingenuity of government and all of its attendant people, into the creation of new wealth. Principally, in our view, that is manufacturing here in the province.

We have seen the difficulties of relying on the vicissitudes of the resources sector; and today we are paying a price, I think, for an economy that got to be prematurely wealthy. We generated a degree of wealth we didn't genuinely deserve in terms of our real contribution to production of that wealth. Today, with the change in the commodity market, with international competition abroad, we are paying a price for not having invested in the things that are going to carry our children 10, 20, 30 and 40 years from now.

As we see the declining manufacturing base, as we see our economy becoming in-

creasingly untenable in the way we are doing it, that sounds the alarm to serious people and they say, "We must do something specific." I say with pride we have been specific; we have been never afraid to lay our program on the table in this House or anywhere else. If the government wants to steal it, God bless them, because it is probably the best source of ideas they have; in our party we work fairly cheaply.

On Thursday our friend the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) will be responding to the budget. In a sense, I regret I don't have the opportunity of following him. He has the advantage on me. It's not that I really want to switch from official opposition to the third party, I don't want that read into these remarks.

Mr. Foulds: That's going to happen, give us another by-election.

Mr. Peterson: In some respects I wish I had an opportunity to follow him, because I am convinced I probably know in advance what he is going to say. He is a reasonably predictable fellow.

Mr. Laughren: Can I borrow your flower?

Mr. Peterson: In about two days it will look just about right for you. It will be faded and wilted and droopy; just perfect to match your outfit.

Mr. S. Smith: It will be light pink by then.

Mr. Philip: Right now it's rich and thorny, just like your ego.

Mr. Peterson: I suspect my little friend won't address himself to some of the problems, at least the way I see them. I see all of our problems in the overall fiscal framework with which we have been presented. I think any kind of responsible budgetary response or budgetary proposal will have to be done in that particular context. I hope my friend will address himself to those kinds of things. Heretofore I have never seen anyone in his party do that with any degree of precision or commitment. They have been like the transit riders who jump on the bus for any cause that happens to come by and it doesn't really matter very much, because they never ask where the money is going to come from, they only think of new, creative ways to spend it.

Mr. Kerrio: Don't bother us with details.

Mr. Cassidy: No wonder your party is going down the drain in the federal election.

Mr. Peterson: It is very interesting that the leader of the third party says our party is going down the drain. I say with a great deal of pride our party has never been in

better shape in 36 years. It is his party that is going down the drain. In every single by-election we have increased our percentage of the popular vote. We are moving; everywhere in this province we are picking up a new credibility; there are people coming to our party today.

The third party has a distinct advantage: nobody takes anything they say very seriously anyway so it is not subjected to the same kind of scrutiny. People are coming to us today; they are looking at our proposals seriously and looking at our people. I say with pride, I have some of the finest of colleagues in this House sitting within our party; we are in a position to form the government tomorrow.

Mr. Laughren: Name one.

Mr. Peterson: Don't press me; I allow the member a little fanciful rhetoric.

Mr. S. Smith: Does he have time for 34 names? Explain that to him.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk about Ontario's relative position, because I think it is important to put this debate into the proper context. We have found that Ontario has a declining share of production in this country over several years. Capital investment in Ontario is declining as a percentage of the national total, both for total capital investment and for private sector capital investment. For example, we are forecast this year to have about 32 per cent of the total capital investment and 34 per cent of the private sector investment, versus 38.5 per cent of the total gross national product. In 1972 Ontario had 42 per cent of the gross national product. Now it's down 3.5 per cent.

Some of these figures won't be particularly meaningful to those listening today, but if they see them in context it will sound the clarion call for some kind of positive action.

According to the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Ontario at the end of 1977 was doing better than Canada as a whole on eight economic indicators and worse on two. By October 1978 it has slipped to doing better on only four and worse on six, including manufacturers' shipments, retail sales, car sales, non-residential construction and housing starts.

On gross provincial product per capita, Ontario has been the slowest-growing province per capita throughout the 1970s. So it is not just as if we are comparing ourselves to Alberta. We are comparing ourselves to the national average, the good and the bad.

The Conference Board in Canada states that output growth of the manufacturing sector as a whole last year in Ontario is now

estimated at less than five per cent, in contrast to national manufacturing output growth of 6.4 per cent. This estimate is clearly supported by the manufacturing shipments data. These reveal Ontario's rate-of-shipments growth to be the lowest of all 10 provinces in terms of the first 10 months of 1978 over the corresponding period in 1977, with Ontario's manufacturing industries trailing their national counterparts in 14 out of 20 classifications.

According to the Financial Post, Ontario manufacturing shipments grew at 12.9 per cent in the first six months of 1978 while the rest of Canada had a growth rate of 18.3 per cent. Ontario's share of Canadian manufacturing shipments also fell to 49.7 per cent in the first half versus 50.8 per cent a year earlier.

Employment in manufacturing increased marginally, to 783,000 in May 1978 from 781,000 a year earlier; but it's still well below the peak of the summer of 1974.

In the pulp and paper industry Ontario had an increase of eight per cent in the first half of 1978, versus 11 per cent for producers in the rest of the country.

In the electrical products industry, Ontario's increase was six per cent—a small decline in real terms—versus 16 per cent for producers in the rest of the country.

In the machinery industry, Ontario's increase was nine per cent versus 13 per cent for producers in the rest of the country.

Slow growth in Ontario was also experienced by the transportation equipment and non-metallic mineral production sectors.

In terms of employment, the conference board forecasts an unemployment rate for Ontario of 7.8 per cent for 1979, narrowing the gap on its national rate to less than one per cent. The budget forecast is only 7.1 per cent, though the real unemployment rate in March 1979 is 7.6 per cent.

The conference board also forecast the employment growth rate for Ontario would be 1.8 per cent for 1979, which is less than the national rate of 2.1 per cent. The budget forecast is for an increase of 3.3 per cent.

The Conference Board in Canada forecast an increase of 8.9 per cent for 1979 in retail sales, about the same as the national rate of increase. In 1978 Ontario lagged behind the national rate by almost a full percentage point.

In terms of housing, during 1978 urban housing starts for Ontario declined 12 per cent from 1977. The nation as a whole experienced an overall decline of 11 per cent.

During the first two months of 1979, urban Ontario starts fell 41 per cent from

the same period in 1978, while urban Canada had 33 per cent fewer housing starts.

I know it's not all that attractive for the members to listen to a long list of figures like that, but they are important. Without that, I couldn't tell the story as I see it.

Mr. Foulds: That's right; carry on.

Mr. Peterson: Without that, I couldn't explain what, in reality, is happening in this province.

I want to speak very briefly—

Mr. Eaton: We are all listening intently, Dave.

Mr. Peterson: We had a little word from Thelma Eaton over there.

Mr. Eaton: I just said we were listening intently.

Mr. Peterson: Good.

I want to give a little historical perspective on what has happened in this province in the last decade. We have found budgetary expenditures have more than tripled, from \$4,200,000,000 to \$13,900,000,000—an average annual rate of increase of 14.4 per cent. The projection for 1979 is over \$15,000,000,000.

From a budgetary surplus of \$150,000,000, we have now a budgetary deficit totalling over \$8,000,000,000. The projection for 1979 adds another \$1,700,000,000 to that deficit.

The province's funded debt—and there's been a change in the way figures were presented this year—has increased 233 per cent, from \$4,200,000,000 to \$14,000,000,000. The projection for 1979 has the funded debt rising a further 9.3 per cent, to \$15,300,000,000, an increase of 263 per cent over the decade.

Interest payments on the public debt rose 489 per cent, from \$209,000,000 to \$1,200,000,000. Projections for 1979 show a further increase of 12.6 per cent to a total of \$1,400,000,000 in interest payments, that's \$3,800,000 a day in interest on the public debt.

Mr. Nixon: Three million eight hundred thousand a day?

Mr. Peterson: Isn't that terrible? And next year it's going to be \$4,200,000 minimum.

Mr. Nixon: It's time for a change.

Mr. Peterson: The funded debt per capita has increased 200 per cent, from \$551 to \$1,653; and it's projected to rise this year to almost \$1,800, an annual increase of 14 per cent.

All of this has left us in a financial position which has substantially declined since

the beginning of the decade. It has left us with a debt load that is going to be very difficult for our children to carry. We have virtually used up all of the internally-generated sources of capital that were at our disposal.

I spoke last year at great length of the pension funding crisis in this province, but the fact remains that this province has had unlimited access to pension funds in the order of billions and billions of dollars. I have subscribed to the thesis that they've worked on an availability-fed demand thesis, in that they have spent almost every penny available to them. They have said: "The consequences be damned." They are saying: "Somebody else will look after that later." This year, for example, we will borrow over \$1,500,000,000 from these internally-generated funds. All of these funds, or the majority of them, have large unfunded liabilities, for some of which the province is responsible. We are seeing a drying up of that capital and no one, including the Treasurer or his advisers, has any idea how we're going to refund, roll over or repay that debt. They all say, "We will worry about that at some time in the future." It is a known fact that we're going to run into a negative cash flow situation with the Canada Pension Plan early in the 1980s when our interest payments on an annual basis are greater than the amount we can borrow. They're going to start drawing down capital in, probably, the year 1985 or 1986. By the year about 2000 the fund will be bankrupt, so they will have to draw back not only all the interest that we owe them but all the capital that we owe them. Where are we going to get the money?

We will invade the private capital market—it's highly inflationary; we'll compete for capital with the already capital-starved industrial infrastructure, and that's highly inflationary—or we will increase taxes. Any way you cut it, our children are going to pay. We have put our burdens, our debts, onto someone else.

I think one of the worst things history is going to say about these neo-Keynesians is that we have been so involved in these inter-generational transfers of wealth that we have been, in the grand scheme of things at least, irresponsible. We have no right to extract more than our fair share as we go through at any given point in history. We are creating a crisis that is going to be absolutely stupefying.

I want, if I may, to read a few numbers into the record. We have done a considerable amount of work trying to determine

the extent of the liabilities of this province, and we have talked about the public debt that is owed.

Mr. Eaton: Who are you talking to?

Mr. Sterling: He's talking to Bob.

Mr. Nixon: He's sick of talking to you.

Mr. Ruston: There are only four on the Conservative side. It's pretty weak over there.

Mr. Peterson: We've talked about the non-public debt that is owed. We've talked about certain transactions that have been undertaken in Deutschmarks; and I'll talk about that in a moment, but that turned out to be one of the most flagrantly irresponsible things ever done in the history of this province. We've talked about unfunded liabilities, the billions of dollars worth of unfunded liabilities that no one knows how we are going to finance in this province. Then we look at the total amount. If one extends it out to about the year 2018 we find that—excluding Hydro, which has an additional debt on top of this of something in the order of \$9,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000, that I won't get into today but we are going to have to start repaying this debt in the very near future—we will have to repay a total of public, non-public, foreign, unfunded liabilities—as you add all of those things together—in 1979 we must repatriate \$574,000,000 worth of debt; in 1980, \$269,000,000; in 1981, \$251,000,000; in 1982, \$261,000,000; in 1983, \$343,000,000.

From the period 1984 to 1988 it is \$2,539,000,000; an average of about \$507,000,000 a year. From 1989 to 1993 it is about \$3,371,000,000; an average of \$674,000,000 per year. Between 1994 and 1998, \$5,522,000,000; an average of over \$1,104,000,000. In 1999 to 2003, \$2,547,000,000; an average of about \$509,000,000 per year. So it goes out to the year 2000, 2010, 2018, a total debt we are going to have to pay back of \$16,455,000,000.

[4:00]

Mr. Ruston: Shocking, shocking.

Mr. Peterson: And no idea in the world where it is going to come from—not a clue, and no plans therefore.

Even the great, august Darcy McKeough, when asked about these kinds of problems said, "We will worry about it later. No sense getting too excited now. I'm not particularly sure. Growth may take care of that in the future."

Certainly there are different points of view on the growth of this province. According to the Treasurer's formula and the way he is behaving I suspect the growth is going to

be relatively small. Some people have optimistic forecasts, others less optimistic; but in my judgement it is going to run between two and four per cent in the foreseeable future. That is not, by historical standards at least, a great deal of growth which is going to automatically look after some of these problems we have created. We are going to have to look at new sources of financing, new devices, new taxation to handle that debt.

I want to speak briefly about the borrowing this year. As I said earlier, the budgetary deficit is not \$1,153,000,000; it is close to \$1,700,000,000. It is \$1,659,000,000, an improvement of \$38,000,000 over last year; really, by any standard, peanuts in terms of improvement. Frank Miller has not improved the financial health of this community one little bit.

Mr. Laughren: Where is Frank Miller?

Mr. Peterson: What we are doing is interesting. As I said earlier, we are borrowing \$1,554,000,000. We are actually borrowing more this year—I want to make this point very strongly—we are borrowing more this year than we borrowed last year when we had higher net cash requirements and a marginally higher budgetary deficit.

The only reason it is as low as it is, is because again this year the government has fudged the figures. On their non-budgetary deficit, they are selling off \$105,000,000 worth of their Syncrude repatriation. They are taking into current income—or at least, to reduce the deficit with that—they are also taking into account \$100,000,000 worth of mortgages they are going to sell to reduce the net cash requirements.

Mr. Eaton: Didn't they create a requirement the year they were acquired?

Mr. Peterson: They use those figures in many different ways throughout the budget. They say, for example, the Employment Development Fund is really not going to cost anybody any money because they are using that money they are repatriating to finance the Employment Development Fund. Had they not done it, of course, had they not had the Employment Development Fund, they would have taken that into current revenues.

Every single time you look at the budget and a particular presentation of numbers, Mr. Speaker, it is always presented in a most self-serving way; it always distorts, in my judgement, the real picture. That is a major problem.

Mr. Nixon: Then cook the books.

Mr. Peterson: For example, I tell you, the Employment Development Fund is presented on the books this year as an investment in capital assets. That is no more an asset than fly to the moon. That money is not going to be retained in any furniture, fixture, roads, bridges or whatever by this province; it is going to be given away to corporations. How can you possibly call that a capital investment? But they do that to support their old argument that they never borrow more than their capital investment.

It just isn't true. They are borrowing more than they are spending on capital investment. They are borrowing today to finance current consumption. It is that simple. As much as they tried to fudge it in the past, that is the reality of today.

Mr. Nixon: That's what they did with the Syncrude revenue. They sold the farm to buy liquor.

Mr. Kerrio: They are burning the furniture to keep the house warm.

Mr. Nixon: That's a better analogy, I've got to admit.

Mr. Eaton: Didn't they put that money into expenses when they purchased it? Or doesn't that count?

Mr. Laughren: David, do you need this support—the backup you're getting?

Mr. Peterson: I'm very grateful to my caucus, I have a first class caucus.

Mr. Nixon: We'll help you on Thursday too, Floyd.

Mr. Peterson: Beyond dispute, we have the finest interjections in the whole House right here in this caucus.

Mr. Nixon: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peterson: Because they have the finest wits and the quickest brains in this whole House; not only the most profound are they.

Mr. Philip: They know that you can't get many of your ideas out because you've got chapped lips from kissing mirrors.

Mr. Peterson: I want to talk very briefly. There's Ed Philip now he's a quick one isn't he? Are you grumbling about something?

I want to talk briefly about the revenue side of the budget this year. We're seeing taxes increase about 14.1 per cent, which is faster than the growth in—

Mr. Philip: Stay out of the bush in the mosquito season, boy. Your nose will catch them.

Mr. Peterson: —gross domestic product of 10.9 per cent and our expenditures at eight per cent. Clearly the amount the government is spending is inflationary. It's the amount of

government taxes that really hits the little guy and that's what we are seeing in this particular case; they are extracting taxes out of the taxpayer's hide at a faster rate than real wealth is being created.

This gets back to my original point at the beginning of my diatribe today. With this government we are necessarily committed to a course of higher taxation year after year after year. Our Treasurer talks about controlling expenditures; some time in the very near future he's going to have to talk about controlling taxes.

Another interesting point on expenditures, Mr. Speaker. The expenditures are really up eight per cent this year when you include interest. He says, of course, that real spending is only up 6.9 per cent because he doesn't want to look worse than last year. In fact, real spending is up 7.4 per cent this year because he excludes the \$200,000,000 in the Employment Development Fund. You see he wants credit for it on one hand in one part of the budget, but he won't take responsibility for it in the other part of the budget.

That's the kind of dual presentation of various facts that we've had presented to us by the Treasurer. People are going to say, "Look very seriously at Frank Miller." Sophisticated analysts are going to say, "What is this man really up to?" I don't think he has gone any further than he did pre-budget in answering the question, "What is Frank Miller, or what does he really believe in?" Because we have been presented a document absent of philosophy, absent of purpose, absent of vision, totally absent from our point of view.

I talked earlier about the balanced budget, and of course as I said earlier this was a fundamental tenet of this government. This year in the budget they want to ensure the capacity to achieve a balanced budget, or they talk as if the scope exists to balance the budget. There's nowhere contained herein a commitment to so do. It would be interesting to ask the Treasurer what his real commitment is.

The Treasurer says that net cash requirements could be reduced to zero or a surplus position by 1984 if revenues grow by two and a half per cent more on average than expenditures. But it's interesting that that did not take place in his budget. Budgetary revenues grew 9.4 per cent; budgetary expenditures grew to eight per cent, a difference of 1.4 per cent. Even by his admission, we will not be able to balance the budget by 1984, or probably never.

If you include the non-budgetary inflows and outflows—and here is where I was re-

ferring to him selling off the furniture—with non-budgetary revenue it's up 9.6 per cent; with non-budgetary expenditures it's up 7.4 per cent, a difference of 2.2 per cent. Still, including the below-the-line non-budgetary transactions, he is not hitting his own goal of keeping a differential of 2.5 per cent. He has made no progress towards balancing the budget.

One has to assume that he doesn't intend to balance the budget, that it was only a politically expedient thing to say at the time because he felt there was pressure for it, and that there is no more real commitment to it today than in fact there ever was.

It says this in the budget paper: "Efforts will be directed towards holding spending growth below the rate of revenue growth in order that tax increases may not be required." Last year the government increased taxes; this year they increased taxes. They will continue to rise, as I pointed out, because of the large debt load increase this year. The real deficit decline of 2.2 per cent falls away off the projected figures.

Then there are the current figures and the performance this year by which to judge this Treasurer. Let us not forget, also that this government changes its commitments as easily as it changes cabinet ministers. Both its ministers and its principles are highly expendable. But, given the brief look we have had at this new Treasurer, we are seeing that we haven't got a chance of balancing the budget, judging by current performance, before 43 years.

I want to turn to something that has been discussed in this Legislature, namely the entire matter of foreign borrowing. It shows the problems one can get into if one has to borrow and if one has necessarily to borrow abroad. I will start in 1968 after the Treasurer at the time, Charles MacNaughton, had just returned from a trip to Europe. He announced to the Legislature that he was considering borrowing funds in offshore markets. A debate at that time was initiated—not by Morty Shulman, I want you to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because you will be proud to know it, but by our esteemed leader of the time, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon); he was the one who asked the Treasurer at that particular time what he was up to. He was joined by Don Deacon and Jim Bullbrook, other esteemed members.

I want to say Morty Shulman participated with great perception in that debate too, and I will get to some of the remarks. The debate took place on a bill authorizing the raising of money on the consolidated revenue

fund. At that time Morton Shulman put on the record, and it turned out to be prophetic—the following, quoting from Hansard page 5,156: “Mr. Chairman, I would like to sound a warning, if I might, to the provincial Treasurer and to the government. I fear you may be making an error financially in doing your borrowing in the United States and in the European market.” Morty Shulman was talking about revaluation and the dangers attendant therein. The Treasurer (Charles MacNaughton) replied this way: “The possibility of revaluation must always be considered. I would have to say, upon investigating this matter and discussing it at length, not only in Germany but in other markets and in other areas, that it is regarded as a very unlikely possibility.”

Mr. S. Smith: He must have talked to his cabinet colleagues.

Mr. Peterson: I suspect that the present Treasurer is getting the same financial advice as Charlie MacNaughton was getting some 10 years ago. That's the quality of it. Don Deacon, in the same line of attack during the same debate, said at the time: “We may well be paying back—” and they were talking about a \$400,000,000 loan at the time “—in the order of \$450,000,000 for that loan.” It seemed like a staggering amount of money at the time.

The Treasurer, nonetheless, repeatedly told members that he was just considering a loan; that all was well and no commitments had been made, and would not be made until all the matters were properly pursued. In 1969, despite the warnings and the admonitions of the members opposite, he went out and borrowed money in German Deutschmarks, and the results have been incredible. I want to read the results of that into the record because they are important. I know one must appreciate that very much depends on what day one is talking about because of fluctuations in exchange rates that are still constantly going on.

Deutschmarks have been one of the strongest currencies in the world. The first of the loans became due and payable in 1975. Along with this, a portion of the second loan became due and payable on February 1, 1975. The principal amount was \$28,000,000 and change at the time. The face amount had skyrocketed to \$37,000,000 in exchange. It left Ontario with a loss in 1975 of \$9,552,026 due to an upward revaluation of the Deutschmark from the issue date of those debentures.

The province at this time still holds two debentures issued in Deutschmarks. The first of these issues was originally taken out on

February 1, 1969, in the amount of 150,000,000 Deutschmarks, or \$40,100,000 Canadian. From February 1, 1975 to February 1, 1984, an amount of 15,000,000 Deutschmarks—that's a little over \$4,000,000 Canadian—was to be redeemed annually. The second issue, originally taken out on September 1, 1972, for 100,000,000 Deutschmarks, is redeemed on the basis of 12,500,000 Deutschmarks annually from 1980 to 1987. The amounts outstanding for these two issues, as of October 31, 1978, was recorded at \$48,400,000 Canadian.

[4:15]

However, due to the upward movement of the Deutschmark, the Canadian dollar equivalent at that date had risen from \$48,400,000 to an unbelievable—can you imagine it, Mr. Speaker—\$114,000,000, a loss of \$65,600,000 because of one bad loan. That is almost two and a half times the original issue price—2.4 times to be precise.

This is a loss that will not be fully realized if the Canadian dollar recovers, vis-à-vis the Deutschmark, before all those debentures are redeemed. However, since 1975 we have been redeeming a portion of the principal amount, 15,000,000 Deutschmarks on February 1 of every year. That means we have been realizing an actual loss every year on the annual maturity of 15,000,000 Deutschmarks at a face value of about \$4,000,000 Canadian. Last year it took an extra \$3,620,800 to make up our foreign exchange payments.

We are told that \$200,000 of this amount can be attributed to US dollar issues. All of the rest was for the principal repayments in Deutschmarks of \$4,000,000 Canadian. That means in 1978 it took almost twice as many Canadian dollars to pay back the Deutschmark loan as the amount we actually borrowed. Since that time, the Deutschmark has continued its upward climb. This year it took more than twice as many Canadian dollars to meet our principal repayment on the loan. That is still going to cost this province a great deal.

I want at this point to mention Hydro too, because that has been a subject of contention in this Legislature, just to show the kind of exposure we have in this province. Let us not forget that we in this province have responsibility for all of Hydro's loans. Not only did Hydro take out loans in Deutschmarks, it also had the foresight to take out loans in Swiss francs, the only currency in the world that was stronger than the Deutschmark. In fairness, they did not take out any loans in yen. That showed they only missed on two out of three.

As of September 30, 1978, Ontario Hydro had outstanding loans of 380,000,000 Deutschmarks and 330,000,000 Swiss francs. The face value of the Deutschmarks was \$126,600,000 Canadian. The value on December 31 of last year \$245,000,000 Canadian, showing a face loss of \$119,000,000 Canadian for Hydro. The Swiss franc loan was \$114,700,000 Canadian; its face value on December 31 of last year was \$238,000,000 Canadian, a face loss of \$124,000,000 Canadian.

Hydro also held \$4,500,000,000 in US funds at the time. We pointed out last fall from Ontario Hydro's own prospectus that if those loans became due and payable we would realize a real loss in this province of \$924,000,000. That shows the problems of exposing oneself to the foreign currency markets and the foreign investment dealers.

If we had been more prudent with our own pension funds, if we had used Canada Pension Plan, teachers' superannuation and OMERS funds, not to finance consumption in this province but to finance real wealth-creating devices like Hydro plants and things like that, we would have not been subjected to the vicissitudes of the foreign market. In addition to that, we would have created real wealth in this province by Canadian dollars. Herein lies the story and the dangers of being too heavily involved in the foreign marketplace.

Just to put this into perspective, there was a prospectus floated by Ontario Hydro last year. On one issue they wrote off \$48,000,000 in Swiss francs because it had to be refinanced. That is in their prospectus; it is also public knowledge.

Let me just return now to the province's balance sheet. Our foreign exchange payments for 1977-78 totalled \$3,620,800, all of it on the DM issue. The foreign exchange payment in 1976-77 was \$2,300,000; in 1975-76, \$1,600,000; and in 1974-75, \$10,052,627, which represented the \$9,500,000 loss on the 1975 redemption of the DM issue to which I referred earlier.

The total cost to the province in foreign exchange from 1975 to 1978 was \$17,565,813, a real loss realized at this time and excluding future losses of up to the order of \$1,000,000,000. We have already lost \$17,565,813. Another repayment of 15,000,000 Deutschmarks was made on February 1 of this year. That cost in the order of \$9,000,000 to pay back \$4,000,000 this year already. In addition to the \$17,565,813 we had lost up to last year, we have lost an additional \$5,000,000 this year, bringing our total, real, incurred exchange loss to this point up to about \$22,500,000.

This, of course, does not include the difference in interest on these amounts. That is a separate calculation and would bring the amount much higher because as the face value of the currency changes, necessarily, we are obliged to pay a higher amount in interest to pay that off. I think it is a horror story that should be told in this House and should be repeated to the future Treasurers and money managers so that government will never have to get involved in that kind of operation again.

One of the things that can operate in our favour—and from this point of view I hope it does—is that if the Canadian dollar rises all those liabilities are lessened. Of course you face the danger there that if Joe Clark is elected he wants Sinclair Stevens to become Minister of Finance. He wants to hold the dollar at about the 88-to-90-cent level, a level that we are very close to today; and of course the lower he holds it the more Ontario is going to suffer.

I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to use your good offices, perhaps, to speak to Sinclair Stevens. Perhaps you can explain to him the dilemma in which he is placing the province of Ontario; you, by your own eloquence, may convince him to take a somewhat different point of view on that matter.

Mr. Roy: He may not have to speak to him. Joe Clark said to the financial community that Sinclair Stevens would not be the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Peterson: If Joe Clark can find anybody in his caucus who can add, that guy is up for Minister of Finance. I would suggest, respectfully, that in the Conservative government, even a member like the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) would have a chance to be Minister of Finance; that's how desperate they are. He is probably tempted right now to cross the floor and run federally and everything else.

Mr. S. Smith: Broadbent says he will support Clark.

Mr. Peterson: That is how grim they are, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk very briefly about forecasting by this government, about the accuracy of some of the predictions over the years. Of course, I could speak for four hours on this subject alone but I don't intend to.

Interjections.

Mr. Peterson: Do I hear a popular request to expand this a little bit? My good friend the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) is really enjoying it.

I do want to put into the record some of the predictions of the past. I think they will

prove to all of us that one can only look at this budget document with a high degree of suspicion at best. We have become so sensitized to governments presenting figures that are only in their interests and that have very little to do with the realities of the marketplace and what has actually happened in the province, scarcely any number given by this government can be taken at face value. The only numbers I take at face value are the ones that have already happened; I take none of the predictions at face value.

We have detailed the budgeting inaccuracies of the government during the Davis years, almost a decade now. The record is consistent; expenditures consistently underestimated, revenues overestimated, leading to grossly low deficit predictions year after year.

Mr. Gregory: Good management.

Mr. Peterson: Maybe it is good management because they are consistent; they were wrong every single year. The government whip does make a good point.

Mr. S. Smith: It can hardly be an accident. You still get votes and you are still there; it is amazing how lying to the people gets votes.

Mr. Peterson: Rather than repeating that record this year, we will look at some details of the government's record over the last three years, reported by quarters. As the figures clearly show, estimates for all the major revenue sources have deteriorated from quarter to quarter. At the same time, the budgetary deficit has consistently increased each quarter. This is because the Conservative government tends to paint a pretty, although distorted, picture at budget time when public attention is focused on its management of the economy; then it revises its figures downward in the quarterly Ontario Finance which receives virtually no public attention.

Mr. S. Smith: That is right, that is the game.

Mr. Peterson: In all examples given, the final revenue figures are substantially lower than the budget forecast and the budgetary deficits are higher; and that is without exception.

Mr. S. Smith: Without exception.

Mr. Peterson: As an example, the discrepancy between the original estimates and final figures for corporation tax in 1977-8 was 23.9 per cent. On the deficit side, the discrepancy was 25.8 per cent in 1976-77, 78.3 per cent in 1977-78 and 25 per cent in 1978-79. The corresponding dollar figures in those miscalculated deficits are increases of \$252,000,000 in 1976, \$777,000,000 in 1977 and

\$337,000,000 in 1978-79. In the last two quarters of this year there was some deviation from this pattern; however, the result at year end was still the same.

This year's third quarter improvement in personal income tax and budgetary revenue figures was largely due to an increase in the federal government's estimate of personal income tax revenues for Ontario. The only figures which show some in-year fluctuation are budgetary expenditures and revenues, and that is because they are the only ones which the government can manipulate. However, despite such manipulation year-end revenue figures for the three years examined have been \$300,000,000 under the budget estimates in 1976-77, \$884,000,000 in 1977-78, and \$337,000,000 in 1978.

The government's gross provincial product estimates for the same years demonstrate clearly the very same pattern. In 1976-77, the estimated real growth of 5.3 per cent turned out to be 3.6 per cent. That is a key figure, as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, in jimmying all the numbers in the budget. In 1977 they predicted five per cent real growth, an average of four in the first half and six in the second half; it turned out to be 3.6 per cent. Last year they estimated 4.3 per cent; it turned out to be 3.3 per cent.

There are two conclusions that can be drawn: either the government deliberately misleads the people of this province in order to make their figures look more rosy at election time; or failing that, they are incompetent.

Mr. S. Smith: That's right. Those are the only two possible conclusions.

Mr. Peterson: I want to read into the record the estimates for this year, the government's estimates as well as the Conference Board in Canada's estimates:

In terms of gross provincial product, they are advocating an increase—not in real terms—of 10.9 per cent; the conference board estimates 11.2 per cent. Personal income, 11.8 per cent; conference board forecasting 10.5 per cent. Retail sales, 10.5 per cent; conference board forecasting 8.9 per cent. Employment up 3.3 per cent by the government; up 1.8 per cent by the conference board. The government says 127,000 jobs; the conference board says 71,000. The unemployment rate according to the government will be 7.1 per cent; according to the conference board it will be 7.8 per cent.

I think that is an important bit of background to explain why we view the government figures with some jaundice; how we see ourselves in relevant juxtaposition, not only to the other provinces and to the Canadian

averages, but also to our past. It brings us to our analysis of the 1979 budget, the Treasurer's attempt to deal with some of these problems, and I want to present along with that the way we would have handled it.

I am going to spare you some of the detail, Mr. Speaker. I want you to know I expect you will probably be the first one to come down to my office afterwards for a copy of our industrial strategy, and I would willingly and happily provide that to you. I recommend it to you as excellent reading. I think, frankly, that you are one person, being as sophisticated as you are, who would derive a great deal of pleasure from reading that particular document.

At the outset I want to talk about job creation measures in this budget.

Mr. S. Smith: That should be a brief talk.

Mr. Peterson: It should be a very brief talk, because it wasn't dealt with. It shows a disregard by this government for the 319,000 Ontarians who are currently out of work.

In March the unemployment rate in Ontario was 7.6 per cent; 45 per cent, or 145,000 of the unemployed, are young people under the age of 25. All they talked about in the budget was temporary jobs, the majority of which would be taken by students. It doesn't even come close to dealing with these numbers at all. Equally appalling, the number of unemployed in their peak earning years of 25 to 54, who are often the sole support of families, was even higher at 149,000, or 47 per cent of Ontario's unemployed.

Yet for the third consecutive year this government, now with a new Treasurer who acknowledged that unemployment will continue at about present levels throughout 1979, has not brought forward one permanent job-creation proposal.

[4:30]

It is difficult to understand how the Treasurer can be proud of the fact that 133,000 jobs were created in Ontario in 1978—all of them by the private sector he stresses—when close to two and a half times that many are unemployed. There is clearly room for the government to become directly involved in job creation, indeed by such direct measures that are necessary. We have a number of specific proposals that I will discuss in a moment.

This year the Treasurer hopes that well over 100,000 jobs will be created—obviously, again, by the private sector. He has lowered his sights and is aiming for 127,000 jobs this year—6,000 fewer than last year. The Conference Board in Canada thinks he should be lowering his sights even further. It pre-

dicts only 71,000 jobs will be created this year.

The Treasurer does talk about unemployment. He says in the budget statement, "We must continue to seek new ways to help our people, especially the young, to find lasting and rewarding employment." Then he proposes to buy some of our young people off for yet one more summer. I say "some" because, with 145,000 young people currently unemployed—and with their ranks swollen to 163,000 in July of last summer, the Treasurer hopes to create just over 70,000 jobs. These will be temporary jobs, many lasting over 16 weeks, and none carrying any guarantee of future employment.

I guess what is most disturbing to me is the Treasurer's expressing concern over skills training and job matching. He says his colleagues are developing—but they are not doing anything about it—a program to deal with matching skills training with the job situation.

Since 1963—about the same time that the new Premier (Mr. Davis) became Minister of Education—five government reports have strongly recommended expansion of alternatives to formal institutionalized education and training. After more than 15 years of study there is still no definite plan. The situation cries out for action. This is one area that the government of this province cannot blame the feds for. It is clearly 100 per cent their responsibility. I can personally think of no areas where they have failed to carry the ball like they have in this area.

About 73 per cent of our young people do not go to university or community college. They need help to bridge that gap between school and work. We cannot just throw them on the scrap heap. We must exercise a much greater responsibility than we have discharged so far.

We have concrete, specific proposals. Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is so frustrating being in opposition; you come into this Legislature with goodwill, filled with idealism, trying to make a contribution, and you present many concrete decent, workable proposals, but all are universally disregarded.

I guess that is the most frustrating thing about being in opposition and what inculcates in all my colleagues, as well as myself, a desire to form the government. We know, not spending any more money, we could do so much better because we have more imagination and we are not tied to the old sacred cows of the past.

Applause.

Mr. Peterson: That got them going, didn't it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Acting Speaker: It woke them up.

Mr. Peterson: I made some sort of a commitment that we were going to be out of here by—we want royal assent; I'm just having a time aside here.

Mr. Nixon: Her Honour is probably out somewhere listening to this.

Mr. Peterson: In some respects I would like to put this on the record; however, if I am told that I should hasten, I can cut out some of this.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The House leader is not in his seat. Proceed.

Mr. Peterson: It's good stuff. I know that all the people in the government gallery will be enthralled to hear this.

Mr. Samis: The galleries are jammed.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, let me talk briefly about our apprenticeship and job training programs. We have laid it all out in our industrial strategy, which was presented to the people of this province the day before the budget was presented; and I must say, serious observers gave it a great deal more attention than they gave the budget. I say that with some pleasure.

I will not go into all the details of that at this point. Suffice it to say that this is about the third or fourth time in this House that my colleagues or I have presented specific and detailed proposals. We necessarily need programs at this time. We are experiencing a drain of young people. We are seeing young people thrown on the scrap heap, with no imaginative programs.

There have been imaginative programs out of the government in Ottawa to develop job skills and experience in industrial design and various other types of highly skilled technologically-oriented jobs; and that is where the thrust has to be. To that end we have a specific number of proposals. I won't go into them in detail; suffice to say I recommend them to government. Perhaps one of my colleagues at another time will bring those before the House.

I do want to spend some of my time, before I get thrown out by the clerk, on a couple of government proposals that are, in my judgement, the most disturbing.

The Employment Development Fund: I'm not aware of any other time where the government has tried to set aside \$200,000,000 for a slush fund. It's not as if this thing is even going to be administered by bureaucrats. At least sometimes when bureaucrats administer things there is an appearance of

objectivity, they not supposing to be political beings. But there is no shame in this thing. We have the minister, the Treasurer, and the secretary of something or other, the secretary of the north, administering this \$200,000,000 fund as a slush fund.

It's going to be like the Wintario grants. Every member of this House, with their pet project, is going to be writing letters to the minister and saying, "Won't you please give some money to a particular company in my area, because it's going to create jobs." Why shouldn't they; they've exposed themselves to that kind of political influence. All these proposals are going to be discussed in cabinet. It's going to be on the basis of who supported the party and who gave what to the party; and where do we get the maximum political benefit, not necessarily financial benefit, not necessarily in jobs or anything else.

This is a most dangerous fund, it is a most dangerous precedent; it's a catchall. The government still really doesn't know what it is doing in this area.

It proposed originally that it would come out with \$100,000,000. First of all, it got involved in the Ford grant, saying, "Gee, we'd better give them some money; we've been caught off guard." We in the opposition supported that on a one-time exception basis, given the circumstances. So the government voted \$4,900,000 in supplementary estimates last year; there's about \$22,000,000 or \$23,000,000 still to come, and that's coming out of the \$200,000,000 fund.

Then the Treasurer says, "Gee, we've got to develop a plan for pulp and paper." No one still knows the details of how it is going to be done; what the terms and conditions are or anything more about it; and there is nobody more confused than the industry. The Treasurer says: "We'll extract that out of the fund." Already, about \$125,000,000 of the fund has been committed.

We referred earlier to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Elgie) and the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) being appointed to develop some job training programs. How are we going to finance that? The Treasurer said in his budget, "I guess we can get that out of the fund." So there is a fourth drain on the fund.

Then we asked the bureaucrats about the small business development corporation, how that was to be financed. There is no budgetary appropriation for that. No one has any idea if it will work, and if it does work how much it will cost; they don't know. They're not prepared to budget, so

they say, "We will take that out of the fund."

So what they have done, in effect, is turn every corporation into a beggar. There isn't a corporate manager or corporate owner or director or president in this country who will be considered worthwhile or doing his job if he doesn't line up at Queen's Park, through the auspices of some politician or under political influence along the way, cap in hand, begging for a job, begging for money from the fund. The first question they're going to ask the guy is, "Tell me, would you be going to some other country or some other state if we didn't give you the money?" How many people are going to say "no" to that question?

They are holding this government up to ridicule, to blackmail, to threats, to coercion of the most unsavoury and silly nature. Rather than promoting free enterprise, this government is destroying free enterprise.

Mr. Laughren: Even Martin Goldfarb, for heaven's sake, would say he is going to Tennessee.

Mr. Peterson: I've used the analogy before, it is like playing poker.

Mr. S. Smith: Exactly.

Mr. Peterson: They decided they have to enter the international poker game, bidding for industries. These people they are working with are not unintelligent, they are not stupid people. If I were them, if I were running a company, of course I would be here threatening to go to Tennessee or North Carolina or whatever—of course I would; if it is free why wouldn't I? These guys who run these companies are no different than some of the people who look at welfare and say, "Everybody else is doing it, why shouldn't I get my share?" This government is part of a conspiracy, inarticulate as it is, to ruin free enterprise. Rather than building it, they are destroying it.

Mr. S. Smith: Exactly, no free lunch.

Mr. Peterson: It is exactly like a poker game. We are entering a poker game with a small bankroll and we are going to be playing with a lot of guys with a lot more money than we have. We may win one or two hands, but all we have done in the long run is driven up the stakes, because we are destined to lose. I think it shows a serious lack of principle and lack of commitment by this government ever to get involved.

My leader has stood up in the House, rightfully, and asked the Treasurer to bring into this House the terms, the conditions, what he wants out of this fund; to say on what basis he is going to allocate the money. But

how can the Treasurer say, because he doesn't even know; and probably never will know. If that ever came before the House we would have real trouble voting for it.

It is not that we are sabre rattling or trying to threaten an election. We are not like the NDP who threaten an election every time they turn around. If they ever had one they would be wiped out as a political force and a party, there is no question about that.

Mr. Martel: We brought two new members in today. Did you notice who the two new members were today?

Mr. MacDonald: Have you looked at the Liberals in western Canada recently?

Mr. Peterson: We don't say irresponsible things. When we are serious, members will know it. When we are prepared to go to the people, as we were last year on the OHIP issue—we fought that one right down the line and we were prepared to go to the people—when we are ready to go the government will be the first to know.

I don't want to be irresponsible, our party does not want to threaten this government, but let me say that this is a most dangerous precedent. It disturbs all of my colleagues. Like all political parties, our caucus represents a spectrum of political opinion, but even the right-wingers, even people like my friend the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio), this concept disturbs deeply. Am I right?

Mr. Samis: The Social Credit member—the Lorne Reznowski of the Legislature.

Mr. Laughren: Are you going to take that, Vince?

Mr. Kerrio: It is true.

Mr. Peterson: I won't dwell on that any more, but it has been very poorly thought out. It still hasn't been thought out, as best we can see. The criteria are juvenile, silly; they invite dishonesty, they invite us to lose in the long run, and I am most disturbed about this approach that has been taken.

As I said earlier, that fund of \$200,000,000 is increasing government expenditures 7.4 per cent more than they increased last year. The government denies responsibility, but clearly if they want the credit they have to take the responsibility. In fact, they shouldn't be involved in it at all.

Our proposal would direct all of our government assistance to those companies that are indigenous, that are owned here, that abide by our code of behaviour, that are building jobs—exporting, manufacturing, creating high technology, research and development here in this province.

It is not as if we are anti-American, it is not as if we are anti-multicultural; but, good Lord, it is time for some priorities. Every single fourth quarter there is a run on the Canadian dollar as dividends, profits, royalties, interest payments are run across the border, depressing our dollar. That is a spectre we are going to face. It is not so much the manufacturing trades that are the problem. It is because we are so completely foreign-owned that necessarily we are going to be in a serf relationship until we start breaking out of it.

We don't want to buy them up tomorrow because we don't have the money to buy them up. We don't want to kick them out either because there are ways we can deal with them. I say, with conviction and seriously, we must start now putting all of our emphasis on our industry—and I emphasize “our”—on industry that has a loyalty and commitment to Ontario and to Canada. To that end we have suggested a substantial number of programs. They are good programs. They are excellent programs.

I am not going into great detail about some of them because members have had an opportunity to read them. I have been talking to your predecessor in the chair, Mr. Speaker. I invited him to come to my office for a copy of our paper, and I invite you too because I know it would behoove you, in your esteemed status in this Legislature, to read that. You would probably want to talk about it in the next election to show what kind of responsible people are involved in government in this province.

[4:45]

We have several propositions. I want to go over them briefly. We have talked about procurement; that is an intelligent way to assist Canadian industry. We have said we are even prepared to pay a premium—obviously we do not like it, but we are prepared to—up to certain maximums, depending on certain conditions, to assist Canadian, Ontario-based industry to build jobs here.

I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker: As a businessman, the nicest hand we can give a businessman in this province is not to give him a cash grant, but to give him an order—something to start building his production on. That is how we can help. We have to be helping those industries, and we have to be buying from them.

Every other country in this world with any kind of industrial infrastructure has preferential purchasing policies. We have been so juvenile; we have allowed ourselves to be so outclassed by tougher and more intelligent

trading competitors around the world. That is one of the reasons we have the problems we have today.

I am almost embarrassed. When you go to Germany, to Japan, even to the United States, and talk to these people, they say: “How could you be so dumb? You weren't raped; you invited it.” When you invite it, as you know, Mr. Speaker, it is not considered rape under the Criminal Code of Canada.

We offered no defence; we offered nothing in its place. At least if we had put in a little resistance, we could complain; but we did not, and that probably is the most telling indictment on this generation of government and financiers and people involved in this thing that one can possibly make. I for one, as a Canadian and as a committed citizen of this province, am extraordinarily sad about that particular fact of our economic existence today.

We also made two specific proposals on venture capital. The government has its own proposal on venture capital. We have looked at the bill. We will have further debate on this bill when it comes to second reading, which I suspect will be reasonably shortly; the government House leader is nodding his head, and who knows.

The Treasurer has already said he has no idea whether it will work, and probably he is right. He is clearly right about the fact that he has no idea about it, but probably he is right in the sense that it will not work—or at least not in the way it should work. A bill of this type should be designed to liberate money into higher-risk propositions—Canadian-owned mining, manufacturing, our kind of industry—to build our industrial infrastructure and to give the little guy a hand.

What is going to happen, in our judgement, as to the small business development corporation plan is, it is going to become an alternative source of financing only for relatively successful companies. By definition, by the way it is constructed, it is going to be conservatively orientated rather than risk-orientated. If one has read that bill, it is the most bureaucratic, complicated bill one can possibly imagine, with a disturbing degree of ministerial discretion. Every time you make a move in a company like that, a minister has to approve or disapprove: getting the money out of trust, putting it into escrow, paying out so much, every time you change shareholdings, make a purchase or whatever.

In the Treasurer's plan, you buy shares in a small business development corporation that buys shares in an investee company; so you have two sets of shares, none of which

is marketable. Shares in small companies are not particularly marketable. We do not have securities laws to protect them. Anyone who invests knows that a minority position in a private company is dangerous and fraught with dangers at the best of times.

Understanding that, what is going to happen with this bill—in our judgement, at least—is that if it works, it will only work for the sharpies. It is going to be a tax dodge or tax subsidy situation, subsidizing large companies and wealthy people to divert money into a company in this way that they would divert in another way. All this will be doing is subsidizing the 30 per cent and not really solving the problem of diverting risk capital into new kinds of ventures. If it works, that is how it is going to work, and we are going to look back and say the results were not what we wanted. Probably it won't work because the funds are not going to go where they are wanted, nor will they attract the kind of people we want. The Treasurer talks of wanting to develop this great nursery for capitalists in the province of Ontario. What he is doing is creating a graduate school for tax evaders; that's what he is actually doing with a proposition like this, and it's structurally wrong too.

If we are looking for small business, then the \$250,000-limit is too small because the kind of SBDC I envisage or the kind of SBDC or VIC proposition I think will work will be one that brings the investor together with the investee and minimizes the baggage in the middle, that is the VIC or SBDC. That is one aspect of our particular proposal, but a \$250,000-minimum is probably going to prevent that kind of relationship.

On the other hand, a \$5-million maximum is high and the sharp people will take advantage of it, although it's probably too small to syndicate. It is not as if the same people, the brokers, the drilling funds or the MURBs and those kinds of things, are going to be interested and go to the marketplace for a fee and raise the money and look for places for investment. It is probably structurally wrong. That is why we presented, in advance of this proposal and not knowing what this proposal was, two alternative proposals, both of which satisfy in our judgements a different kind of a need for two different kinds of companies.

Let us recognize there are different kinds of investors and we want an opportunity for both. One is a more conservative one, government-run. You can tick it off on your tax form. You could put up to five per cent of your Ontario tax into a fund of this type. It will be invested with some kinds of government guarantees and government supervision.

It may not be as risky as one would like, but it's going to have the surety. The investor will know, or the widow who is oriented towards more conservative investments will know, that the province of Ontario stands behind its credibility and its integrity.

It's a sensible move. Give people a chance to put some money in Ontario. Give them a chance to invest in their own province. We don't have that now; we let New Yorkers invest in Canada, we let Germans invest in Canada, either to buy land or buy our bonds that cost us so much extra money. Let's give the average Ontarian a chance to have a stake in free enterprise in this province. That's one proposal.

Our other proposal is a different one. It tries to avoid the bureaucracy. It tries to bring the investor close to the investee. It tries to create a flow for money between people who have it, can invest it and get it immediately into the kind of high risk propositions where we think the money should be directed. Recognizing that the ideal venture capital situation is necessarily in conjunction with the federal government, the ideal situation we would like to see—and we would use our good offices, if we were ever the government; and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, when we are the government we will have much better offices in Ottawa with whomever is the government up there than probably this government has ever had—we would like to see a tax deferral program along the lines of an RRSP, MURB kind of a program that gets money quickly, directly and without bureaucratic control into the proper kinds of vehicles and defers taxes—though one pays taxes coming out, whenever that is.

I think the tax deferral program is a good program, just like the RRSP has become a good program for this country. It's a good program for several reasons. It encourages savings, but it also liberates those moneys into many small pools, many small funds competing and building capital infrastructure in this province. More important, they are out of government hands so governments cannot consume those for current consumption.

I wanted to speak briefly on the SBDC because I am concerned about it and because I don't think it is going to work. We will have an extension of this debate later. We are going to put forward our proposals, and definitely that bill will be in committee where we will discuss it at great length.

In my time remaining, I want to deal with some of the other proposals in the budget. Really there is not very much to grab on to. I am sure that the Treasurer subscribed to the theory of Jean Baptiste

Colbert who—as you know, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) would know this—was the controller-general to Louis XIV. He said the art of taxation is the art of so plucking the goose to get the maximum number of feathers with the least amount of hissing.

Can't you see the Treasurer sitting down and saying: "Gee, I think we can get a little more there. It is going to be a little tough to get that. Gee, we will make people mad. Don't fool around too much with premiums because, gee, you know, the NDP, what are they going to do; and the Liberals, what are they going to do. Gee, we can stick a little more on road tax here, even though we are squawking and the principal part of our energy policy is to keep Alberta's prices down, we can still weasel a couple more cents a gallon."

You see, Mr. Speaker, there was no rhyme or reason to it; it was completely politically motivated; and I guess that is what is so disturbing about this budget from this new Treasurer. There was an absence of vision; there was an absence of clarity of thought; there was an absence of purpose. Really, when he leaves his chair—probably sooner rather than later—one is going to say, "What did Frank Miller stand for? What was his vision of Ontario?" At least we knew with McKeough. He was wrong, but at least we knew. With this Treasurer we still don't know; because he is fooling around, tinkering around, putting this tax up, putting that tax down; and what he has done in total is raise about another \$181,000,000 of taxation through new sources or increased contemporary sources.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The old shell game.

Mr. Peterson: What do we have? What can you say about it? You know, we are not going to go to the people on the alcohol tax or the tobacco tax, but we do say and we do recognize that we are committed to an irrevocable course of increased taxation forever.

I think it is this absence of vision, this tinkering, this fooling; it is the media-oriented campaigns—the Employment Development Fund, which I discussed earlier; the SBDC, which probably won't work. The member for Muskoka will be known more for his failures, as he was in the Health portfolio, than he will be for his successes.

Mr. Laughren: Boy, he could sell used cars, though.

Mr. Bolan: Who would buy one from him?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have not dwelled on, as much as I have in the past two years, our positive proposals. I made an assumption this year that our friends in the House will have some knowledge of them; certainly my own colleagues are very familiar with them, and I decided to spare the members some time today by not going into them in any more detail. If I have sounded negative it is because we have done the positive, we have the positive suggestions, but—

Mr. Laughren: Gloom and doom Liberals. They are always so negative.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Bite your tongue.

Mr. Peterson: —it is part of our specific obligation to criticize, as intelligently and as responsibly as we have. Don't ever misconstrue that as an absence of commitment or an absence of vision in this party because I say with great pride, under the leadership of the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) we have a clear vision, competent people, and a plan that we are prepared to lay and have laid before the people of this province.

Before we make any more tax expenditures of the type that the Treasurer has made, or before there is any more superficial tinkering with the budgeting, our commitment is to concentrate on the fundamentals. This is one leader in this House who had the courage to tell people the truth, even when it is politically not attractive. I never heard that out of the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and I have never heard that out of the Premier (Mr. Davis), and that is why I am proud to be delivering his response on his behalf.

Mr. Laughren: Our leader likes Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Peterson: It is irresponsible of a politician today to jimmy the figures to his advantage, or to cloud things and make promises that he cannot deliver. Our only solution is a fundamental approach, a structural approach, which is not necessarily going to be easy; but only if we do that are we collectively, those of us who are charged with the administration of this province and legislating for the benefit of the people of this province, only then are we going to be able to leave some kind of a legacy, a financial legacy, a legacy that doesn't burden our children with debt or with taxes to the extent that it destroys their initiative; only then, if we concentrate on building new wealth for them now, can we leave them the legacy I am sure we all want to leave them.

On motion by Mr. Laughren, the debate was adjourned.

[5:00]

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the Legislative Assembly and took her seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. Mrs. McGibbon: Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, as its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 13, An Act to amend the Ministry of Transportation and Communications Act, 1971;

Bill 14, An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act;

Bill 15, An Act to amend the Local Roads Boards Act;

Bill 16, An Act to amend the Airports Act;

Bill 18, An Act to amend the Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance, a bill entitled an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain additional sums of money for the Public Service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to—I really enjoy that applause.

I don't often get that when I get outside the House. It feels pretty good to get a little bit of it in here.

Mr. Samis: You sound neglected over there.

Mr. Riddell: I hope you give the same applause when Larry Condon wins.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That is a bit debatable. You haven't been down in Lambton or Middlesex lately, or you wouldn't be making statements like that. The third party might disagree with you.

Today, as we approach the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services, I'm very happy firstly to bring to your attention that the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) was critic for that party last year. I look forward to his help with my estimates this year.

From the New Democratic Party, the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) and I have been around here about the same length of time. I think it was about eight o'clock in the evening, September 25, 1963, that the honourable member assumed his role to represent the people of Yorkview.

Mr. Young: A long time ago.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mind you, I've been there a few times since to try to tell the people they should have somebody else representing them, but they pay more attention to him.

Today, I can't disagree too much. Of course, I've tried that with Essex North too, without much success. However, I look forward to the two of you and whatever assistance you might get from your colleagues.

Mr. Riddell: I have a sneaking suspicion you've been up in Huron-Middlesex too.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Not for a few days. It was about two weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman: Shall we get back to the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Ministry of Government Services provides accommodation facilities and a wide range of goods and services in support of government programs.

The operations of the ministry are grouped into three major programs of service; accommodation, supply and service and the communications and computer service.

Number one, the accommodation program has the responsibility for the provision and maintenance of accommodation for the ministries and agencies of government.

Number two, the supply and services program involves the provision of a wide variety of centralized services and facilities to ensure efficiency and economy in the supply

of purchased goods and services as well as certain commonly-used government support services.

Number three, the communication and the computer service program has the responsibility for the supply and promotion of computer processing services as well as the provisions of local and intergovernmental telecommunications services for government use.

The ministry's annual report for 1978-79 provides information on the achievement of all ministry programs and, in addition, complete information on tenders and contract awards is published each year in the ministry's annual report.

I will conclude these introductory remarks by saying the 1979-80 estimates of the Ministry of Government Services are within the target established by the government and are in accordance with government programs of expenditure restraints. I will be pleased to answer questions concerning the estimates of my ministry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex North.

Mr. Ruston: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate the minister on his activity over the past 12 months.

I have a few remarks for the lead-off. I am one who feels we should spend a little more time going through the estimates in detail to discover what the ministry is accomplishing each year; to see if the minister is improving his operations as to the cost of operations and manpower; to determine his ability to carry on the work without increasing the overall cost to the budgets to which some of the departments are trying to adhere.

At one time the Ministry of Government Services was probably something like a ministry of highways, more or less a patronage type of operation, or I suppose you might call it a pork barrel situation. As you go back over the years, you were not a good member if you didn't get a new highway in your area after four years. It even went back into the county council. The present Minister of Government Services, having served on a county council, I would suppose can recall being a reeve. I believe he was warden of Lambton county at one time, where he used to have little discussions, as the fellows say in the backroom, about whether he might get a road approved in this area. For that you try to get support from a fellow councillor.

I think over the past number of years that has gone by the wayside to some extent. I

think we had road need studies and need study reports. I know when I was on county council you kind of planned things out more by way of a long-range program. To some extent, that has gone by the wayside, and probably just as well.

[5:15]

The way the situation is now with regard to the environment and so forth and all the talk about saving land, if you say something about putting in a new highway you may have more people objecting than wanting it in their area. That is the kind of situation we are in.

Take Hydro towers, for example: everybody wants lots of Hydro service available but they don't want the towers going through their property. That's a problem we have in our own area. They are expanding the industrial areas in some towns. Now they need more Hydro service so someone is going to be asking permission to build towers on private property. So the trend has changed from what we used to call the "patterned" situation; now it is more or less a case of looking after what we have and trying to improve the operations.

The minister is involved with new buildings; he is involved in the lease buy-back situation where, as in Windsor, a new office building was built on a 25-year lease buy-back and in 25 years the ministry owns the building. It is financed by the contractor who has a 25-year guaranteed lease. He has no problem financing it through lending institutions, and of course it saves the government from going out and borrowing the money directly itself; otherwise it would have to obtain a large block of money each year. Whenever it is erecting new buildings it would have to go to the Treasurer and request more money.

The only disadvantage in that, I suppose, is that the money is tied up. In other words, every year there is so much money in the budget before the government can start budgeting for anything else it wants to do in that particular year it is already tied up with payments and so forth for the next number of years.

I don't disagree with that system; it has some advantages. I would hope that when we get onto that particular vote there may be some questions as to how planning is actually coming along and how much saving there is by doing it that way.

I often think about this esteemed building we are sitting in. It has been here for a number of years and we keep making little repairs here and there. We have the new committee room on the main floor, room 151,

on which we are spending considerable money to make it one of the best rooms we have. We have lacked proper committee rooms. We haven't had proper sound equipment in them or room for the public to participate; certainly we need a good committee room. We probably need even more than the one large one. The costs of improvement are certainly enough. One cannot help that, because when you are repairing and adding to an old building sometimes you spend many days just doing what you could do in one day on a new building.

I am sure no one here would like to see this building removed or torn down and a new one take its place. That is something we are going to have to be looking at each year. I am sure the minister and his officials are looking at the repairs this building needs now and will need in the coming years. I understand that the slate tiles on the roof are starting to fall. I noticed there were problems with some tiles in the high winds the other day. To put on a new roof alone could run into \$1,000,000 cost just as a rough estimate; maybe even more than that because slate is very hard to replace. I suppose it could be replaced with copper, but probably some support work would have to be done to the roof structure itself.

I noticed in one of the American papers the other day where the home of the vice-president of the United States has a slate roof. Mrs. Mondale had to go around with pans and pails to catch the water from the leaking slate roof. They hadn't allocated enough money to have the roof repaired so she was having a bit of a problem with a leaking roof. I guess we're not the only ones who have problems with older buildings that need a great deal of care in maintaining them.

I'm sure the minister has some estimates on the cost of refurnishing this building, to keep it in its proper state of repair. I hear rumours of figures that almost scare me. Over a period of years we may have to spend from \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000 to keep this building in a good state of repair.

However, when you drive up University Avenue I'm sure there is something about the structure of the building that many of us feel must be left in that general state because of the environment and so forth.

I really don't have very much more to say at this time. I only say I would hope when we're going through the estimates vote by vote that perhaps the ministry could in some way supply us with information about whether they are doing any new type of experiments on the upkeep of buildings and the cost of maintaining the many buildings the govern-

ment owns. They might be inquiring too as to the course mentioned. I think our leader asked the minister the other day about a block of buildings owned by the province located between Bay Street and Yonge Street, south of Wellesley Street. We can get into some discussion on that I'm sure, but that's all I have right now.

Mr. Young: I appreciate the kind words the minister directed toward this side of the House. It's been quite a few years now since the minister and I came in here, he on one side of the House and me on the other. It's been quite an exciting time in many ways and a very frustrating time for some of us on this side; particularly at election time when we saw certain things happening, although the last couple of elections have been much more encouraging to those of us over here.

It may well be that certain fundamental changes are taking place in the thinking of the people across this province.

Mr. Samis: Obviously.

Mr. Young: I do want to say first of all, Mr. Minister, as a bit of criticism, I doubt if you should have brought your staff in as early as you did this afternoon.

I couldn't help feeling it was a little unfortunate that all these wise people should be brought here to listen to a criticism of your government—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We love that.

Mr. Young: —particularly where that criticism was of policies which were identical with those of the federal Liberal government.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You are getting better, Fred.

Mr. Young: Such as this matter of foreign ownership in the acquisition of land and a dozen other things. All these other matters, many of which were mentioned, stem right from policies in Ottawa, which you in your turn sort of go along with. I'm simply saying I doubt if you should expose these tender minds, mature as they are, to that kind of —what; wisdom, a lack of wisdom—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No; they enjoy it all.

Mr. Young: —or whatever it may have been this afternoon.

Mr. Ruston: You may learn something, Fred.

Mr. Young: In speaking to your staff, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Chairman, I do want to pay tribute to one of your staff members whom I understand is fairly ill at the present time, Mr. Gordon Laws. He has been here a long time; we have known him, we

have respected him. He has played a very useful part for this province and for the people within this complex. I know the people in this House want to express our sincere sorrow that he is at the present time ill and wish him well in the days ahead.

I don't think any of us could criticize Gordon Laws in any real way, because he has been helpful. Whenever we have gone to him with a problem, we have found it solved, if possible, very quickly and expeditiously. If he could not solve it, he would tell us; he was honest with us. I hope the minister will pass on the wishes of this House for his speedy recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I realize this ministry is not a policy-making body as such; it carries out policy more than makes it. But there are certain fields where it does initiate and carry through some policy of its own, although my suspicion is that that policy is part of the policy of the Management Board, the Premier or whatever. When I speak of certain things today, I realize this minister may be in a bit of a bind because he has to carry out certain policies and directions that are handed to him. Perhaps he would do better if he were entirely on his own. I do not know; I hope so.

I heard him mention, first of all, a report for 1978-79. Is a report for 1978-79 available? The last one I had was for the year ended March 31, 1978.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It was filed this morning, Mr. Chairman. It should be in the member's mail box today. Does he have this report?

Mr. Young: No, I do not have it. The last report I have is for the year ended March 31, 1978. It may be in my mail box, although my mail came up this morning.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It is in his mail box. I will send over a copy to the member; I have some spare ones.

Mr. Young: It may have been put there after my mail was delivered this morning; I do not know. I appreciate the minister's sending it to us today, although again it does make it a bit difficult for those of us who have this kind of responsibility to criticize properly when we do not get the reports until the day that the estimates start. The minister understands that, but it is still one of those things which perhaps we cannot overcome unless we start estimates a little later and spend a little more time on legislation and other matters earlier in the session.

I have the report now; I thank the minister for it. Perhaps over the supper hour, I will have a chance to peruse it and the

wisdom therein, if there is wisdom there—and we take for granted there is.

I want to spend a bit of time on a matter which the member for Essex North (Mr. Ruston) mentioned on the way through and which I want to bring back to the minister's attention. It is a matter of which he has been very much seized in recent days, because he has heard a lot of criticism. To give him his due, he has been doing a lot of work in this field, but we on this side of the House feel that that work has not been as adequate as it might have been.

I turn to the report of the select committee on the fourth and fifth reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature, which was filed on February 9, 1977. That committee was chaired by Donald H. Morrow, who was a former Speaker of this House and a very respected member of this Legislature for many years. It was also signed by the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Maeck), who since that time has become a member of the cabinet and is, we hope, doing a good job in that field. It was also signed by the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton), who wants to be in the cabinet and has not yet made it, but I am dead certain that all of us on this side of the House wish him well and hope that the Premier (Mr. Davis) has his name on that list which he will consult from time to time when vacancies occur. We are not hoping there will be a vacancy in this particular ministry.

Mr. B. Newman: He didn't ask you to say that, did he?

Mr. Young: No, he did not. We feel like helping along a fellow member of the Legislature, and we like telling the Premier what he ought to be doing. If the minister here wished to vacate that seat and let the other member slide down one row, we do not know whether it would be an improvement or not; we doubt it at this point, because the member for Middlesex might have other gifts which could add greatly to the deliberations of this House.

I am pointing out that three very prominent, up-and-coming members of the House and one past member signed this document. I simply want to read a couple of paragraphs to put them on the record again for the minister's edification, because it hasn't yet sunk in as to what they mean.

[5:30]

"In the opinion of the committee, responsibility for the Legislative Building should be transferred to the Speaker. This would avoid the divided jurisdiction that currently creates problems, ensure that the legislative function

has primacy in the building and also ensure that future planning for the building will be carried out in a non-partisan basis. The necessary changes,"—and I emphasize that word "changes,"—"to the Legislative Building can be carried out adequately only under the direction of the Speaker. To avoid duplication the Speaker should contract with the Ministry of Government Services for the operation and the maintenance of this building." We agree with that. "However, the direction of the building and the well-being of its employees and occupants must be the responsibility of the Speaker."

Then I quote again: "The committee feels strongly that under the direction of the Speaker sufficient funds must be dedicated to bring the Legislative Building up to a standard that befits the capital of Ontario and meets the needs of the members."

"The committee is now of the opinion that the renovation and restoration of the building must be carried out as a matter of urgency. The project will be lengthy"—and advice is offered as to what can be done, but—"it is the opinion of the committee that the project should be scheduled for completion by 1980."

This is, I think, very important: "The committee notes that the government has been willing to dedicate substantial funds to communities for the preservation of historic buildings, such as Osgoode Hall in Toronto, Victoria Hall in Cobourg, city hall in Kingston, and the Norfolk county courthouse in Simcoe. In view of the importance to Ontario of the Legislative Building, it should be given even greater priority."

Since that time we have seen the minister carry through a bill in this House in connection with the Middlesex building. There is some little snag now, but when that is carried through there will be substantial grants from the treasury for that building.

That report, which I think is very fair, and which is imaginative and looks forward to the future, is signed, as I said, by two New Democrats, two Liberals and by three respected members of the government party.

Let us look at what has happened since that time. We have seen plans carried out, and I have before me the Queen's Park space allocation. There has been a good deal of discussion about this between committees and the minister, and it is a very interesting document which I hold here. It shows that far from the Speaker getting control of this building, there has been a reluctance not only on the part of the minister, but as I said before by the treasury board and the Premier, I suspect, pushing him a bit, to allow that to take place. Whether it is because there

isn't the trust in the Speaker—not because of the present Speaker, because this didn't happen before this Speaker was appointed—or whether it is the feeling that the Speaker might do something in a non-partisan way with which the government itself might not agree in the future, I don't know.

I'll just quickly go over the maps which I have before me. We see the Legislative Building basement, where we have the dining room under the responsibility of the Speaker, the restaurant under the Speaker; we have the southeast corner under the Speaker. Then we have the New Democratic caucus room with the lounge, and strangely enough the various print rooms, including the government print room, I understand, under the Speaker. That is a strange thing to happen. But outside of that, the whole basement is still under the direction of the minister.

I don't know why it is; I suppose this is the Tory underground and perhaps where the Tory machine is cranked up behind all those doors down there. There it is and it is not quite as much as we had expected.

When we come to the first floor the entrance to the building is under the Speaker. Some of the offices in the sections to the left and to the right of the Speaker's office are under the Speaker. Back in the north wing, most of that is under the Speaker except for the elevators and washrooms. If we want to go up and down or we want to go into the washrooms, we have to leave the jurisdiction of the Speaker and go to the jurisdiction of the minister. Why that should be I am not certain, but that is the way it is.

Mr. Roy: That is typical of this government. They want to keep control over the washrooms.

Mr. Young: The committee rooms on the first floor are under the Speaker.

Mr. Roy: That is where they get all their ammunition.

Mr. Young: When we come to the second floor—this floor—we have this chamber under the direction of the Speaker. We have the Liberals to the left of us.

Mr. Eaton: To the left of you, you said.

Mr. Swart: The Liberals aren't to the left of anyone.

Mr. Eaton: Nobody is to the left of you.

Mr. J. Reed: Not philosophically anyway.

Mr. Young: We have the offices in the back where the New Democrats are, except again for the washrooms and the elevators, with the back entrance, stairway and that

elevator under the Speaker. When we look at the offices of the Premier, they come under the genial minister, as well as the government caucus offices and the office of the whip—the Tory whip only, the other whips are under the direction of the Speaker. Why that should be I am not sure. Perhaps something goes on in there that the Speaker should not know about. Then there is the caucus room.

We go around to the wings where we find two committee rooms. There has been a real scrap about this because the minister insists on having jurisdiction over rooms 230, 229, 228 and 227, to count backwards, because I think it is a backward step. The minister is holding on there, and holding on tight, at the very time when we need that space for other purposes. That is where government members can meet and plans can be made, I suppose, for toppling seats in Ottawa and other places. They have that for their own.

There is one thing that really gets me. We just had the Lieutenant Governor come in here as an impartial person. She is the representative of the Queen, and the Queen of course could not be more impartial. Here is the representative of the Queen, whose quarters logically should be under the Speaker, but evidently they have given her a blood test and she comes out a Tory in these matters.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: A great lady.

Mr. Roy: The minister has a great sense of priorities. He has the Lieutenant Governor, the Premier and the washrooms.

Mr. Young: Both her second and third-floor premises are white on this map, denoting under the jurisdiction of the minister. In other words, the minister is her boss in this respect and not the Speaker. That seems a strange and weird thing to me.

When we come to the floor above us, the galleries are under the direction of the Speaker. The Liberal members' offices are under the jurisdiction of the Speaker and the Hansard rooms are under the jurisdiction of the Speaker. The library and those offices in the back where the New Democrats are now all come under the Speaker. But the legislative counsel offices are under the minister; and again the stairways, the washrooms and all of these places.

Mr. J. Reed: Does the minister have a thing about washrooms?

Mr. Young: On the other side we have the cabinet offices all down that wing, where the cabinet makes up its mind. It seems to me we have a lot of office space

there which some time ago the minister was told perhaps is a duplication, because some cabinet members have office space outside and perhaps should have less in here. The interesting thing to me is when we come up to the fourth floor where we have the Tory MPPs. This is really interesting, because the Liberal MPPs and the New Democrat MPPs are under the Speaker. The cabinet members and some others, like the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Rotenberg), are under the minister.

Mr. Worton: I wouldn't want to be under him, Fred.

Mr. Young: Well, there it is; a pretty tough job. You might be surprised, but there it is; when it comes to the ordinary MPP on the Tory side the Speaker gets them. What the difference is in the blood test between the minister, the aide to a minister and the back-bench MPPs I am not sure.

Mr. J. Reed: Some are more equal than others.

Mr. Young: They come up here in the blue colour—or green I guess it is, which is turquoise really—so they are under the jurisdiction of the Speaker.

Then we come to the top floor; there's the "roost". Up there too it is all white, under the jurisdiction of the minister. We have quite a lot of attic space up there. What goes on up there I don't know; there are a lot of locked doors up there.

Mr. J. Reed: That's where they store old government policies.

Mr. Young: That's where the Tory skeletons are hidden, I think, up in that tower.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No; Tory strength.

Mr. Young: The Tory strength; I thought the Tory strength was in the basement.

Mr. Worton: Well the roof is leaking there.

Mr. Young: In any case, there we have it. As I look over this whole thing, it is just incredible the way this whole situation has been divided up. I find it hard to understand why these things are so. Why there is a lack of space on the part of this government; and why the Speaker, in his office, can't carry out the kind of supervision carried out in most Parliaments in the Commonwealth around the world, where the Speaker is the supreme in this kind of a building. Why in the world does this minister refuse to listen to reason and to bring about this fundamental change in jurisdiction? Perhaps he will explain a little bit more of that to us in his reply. Perhaps during the estimates we will get further explanations about these changes.

It seems to me that the government has seen fit to assign plenty of little spots and cubbyholes in these places for the government party. Perhaps that is only fair; if we were the government party perhaps we would want to hang on to them, I don't know. I doubt it; but there they are, and they are white on this map. Yet adequate space has not been assigned to the opposition parties.

I leave that, but I will ask the minister if he will perhaps explain the reasoning behind all this.

There is only one other matter that I want to bring before the minister at this time. He set a good example and so did the member for Essex North; I don't want to take up too much time because of the limited number of hours we have for these estimates, but I do want to bring to his attention a letter written by one Lynne Gordon, chairperson, on the letterhead of the Provincial—the trillium is there—Secretariat for Social Development. She says this:

"At a meeting of the Ontario Status of Women Council on March 9, the members passed a motion recommending that provincial employment development funds be used to further the goals of equal opportunity for Ontario women." Now, the minister may say at this moment "That has nothing to do with me"; but wait a while.

She goes on to say: "We believe that the government has a responsibility to ensure that those in receipt of public funds use the same to benefit Ontario women, who make up a substantial proportion of the work force, but who are disproportionately disadvantaged"—those are two big words, Mr. Chairman—"in income during their working years and subsequently in their retirement."

The last paragraph says: "Therefore, be it resolved that the province recognize the urgent need to pursue economic and social goals simultaneously to ensure that all companies in receipt of provincial employment funds establish affirmative action plans for hiring and promoting women."

That addresses one aspect of the government's activities, but I want to bring this to the minister's attention because he is the one who through his ministry allocates a great deal of this government's funds. He lets the contracts for many departments and those contracts are important in doing exactly the things mentioned here as far as the use of employment development funds are concerned.

[5:45]

Lynne Gordon, chairperson, on the letterhead of one of the government departments,

the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development, Ontario Status of Women Council, asks for this consideration. I would ask the minister to get together with Lynne Gordon and ask her what she has in mind in respect to this, particularly in view of what he might do to further this general idea in the letting of contracts for the province of Ontario in a dozen different fields.

I think this is something he might well discuss with her; and it should be considered this year, when we are thinking in terms of the status of women and doing what we can, as a Legislature, to advance the status of women in the province of Ontario.

I think anything else I have to say I can say during the votes as they come through. Having brought these pearls of wisdom to the attention of the minister, I'm looking forward to his reply and I'm looking forward to the discussion we can have with him as we enter the votes, one by one, in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: First, in response to the member for Essex South, in fact in response to both parties' critics, let me touch on the building we're in.

Mr. Ruston: Essex North.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member for Essex North—I don't know why I want to get over south, maybe I like the climate. I'm going down his way tomorrow to see what the climate is like—so I'll have a better idea then.

Mr. Ruston: It will be warm tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: With respect to the condition of this building and the possible future of the building, we all feel the same about the building. We feel it should be refurbished and put back into its original condition. It's going to take a great deal of money. I personally have had my engineers and architects look at proposals, proposals that could refurbish this building from its present condition.

I wish the member for Yorkview had been here a week or two ago when the member for Essex North requested to look at the fifth floor and the condition of the building. We had a tour of it. He had the opportunity to see what we're faced with in refurbishing this building.

First, when we go to bring new air into the building we feel we must bring it from above. We feel the air down at the ground level is such, from the exhaust of the automobiles and what have you that we shouldn't bring it into this building as fresh air. We believe we should bring it from up above. When you start that type of work and you get into the equipment you've got to carry up there,

you have to go up into the attic to do reinforcing and a great amount of work to set up the machinery to supply the necessary ventilation.

The cost of that unit when completed is not far from \$500,000. This is for the committee room and the room next door. We have had to do it right up the four floors. That in itself will give you a guideline as to what it will cost to do the complete building. The member for Essex North suggested many millions, maybe \$25,000,000, \$30,000,000, \$35,000,000.

I have looked at the needs of the private members. We're all aware of a report I presented to each caucus that would give us the necessary accommodation—maybe not the necessary, maybe I would challenge my own statement on that, but it would give us the accommodation recommended by the committee headed by Donald Morrow, a former member of the Legislature.

The accommodation that the committee recommended was such that a member would have a private office and space for a staff of two. It was pretty limited accommodation. When one sees their recommendations and looks at the square footage, it is pretty small.

I did present a report to the committee headed by the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) on what I felt would provide the necessary accommodation for all members here. That report, and the necessary funding for it, is in the hands of the three party leaders until they work out an arrangement.

I could see us going to great expense. I could see us building a major addition on to the back of this building which would accommodate all the members and all the staff of the Legislature here on this site. But the cost of that would be enormous—perhaps \$60,000,000, \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000. The present minister cannot convince himself that he should go forth with those recommendations to his colleagues in cabinet. In a time of restraint, I think we, as members, must practise restraint.

The members of the House are fully aware that it was about September 1, 1978, I believe, when the three policy secretariats were moved out of this building and across the street into the Whitney Block. At that time, all parties got additional accommodation. I know it is not the accommodation that I feel a member is entitled to. I know it is not the accommodation that each one of the members opposite believes he should have; but I would have to say that it is the best accommodation available in this building under the present circumstances.

The member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) went into detail about the coloured map which I had a little bit of input into colouring, and the order in council went through in connection with that map. I would have to say to him that the rooms in the basement that are still under the minister's jurisdiction are more or less service rooms used by my staff. The rooms do not have much to do with the operation of this body.

When we get to the main floor of the building, the offices of the Leader of the Opposition, the committee rooms, and the north wing were turned over to the Speaker, but the area at the other end of the first floor was kept for the government as such. The rooms up to room 180 we turned over to the Speaker for the actual administrative staff of this building.

The other ministers who have rooms in this building are ministers whose offices are away from this complex. When I say "this complex," I include the Frost Building, the Whitney Block, the Macdonald Block, the Hepburn Block, the Ferguson Block, the Hearst Block and the Mowat Block. Any ministers who are in that area do not have an office down here, but I do carry room 180 under the name of the Minister of Government Services. There are 15 ministers who have offices across the street. We share those four offices. In fact, when I left here this afternoon, after we had completed the question period, I attended a meeting of a committee of cabinet which meets in that area every Monday afternoon.

When the different ministers who have offices in the complex adjacent to here—I could name them, but I do not think their names matter; the members opposite know the ministers' names—when they have groups to meet while the House is sitting, they use room 180. Any other ministers who have rooms on the first floor, repeat, are ministers who are outside of that area. I would point out that the offices of the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) and his parliamentary assistant are on the first floor, while those of the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) and the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) are in that area.

When we get to the second floor, the area immediately to the left, as the member for Yorkview said, was turned over to the Speaker. The other areas in the main building on the second floor all have to do with the government. The north wing, second floor and third floor, was turned over to the Speaker.

Some of the third floor area of this building was also turned over to Mr. Speaker,

the area used by the press, Hansard and the Liberal caucus. I believe the New Democrats were moved from there down to the north wing.

When we get to the fourth floor, I believe there is one place where the people operating Hansard have a repair room. The rest is taken up by the staff of the Premier. It was the decision of the Minister of Government Services that any rooms taken up by the government, not the private members, should stay under the Ministry of Government Services.

I went before the committee, which is headed by the member for St. George, and I pointed this out. It was my belief the committee did accept that decision.

Mr. Young: What was the reason behind that decision?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We felt the government offices should be under the government, not under the Speaker. I might say the committee did agree with us on that, they openly agreed. They may personally and individually have had reservations but it was my understanding, when I went before the committee and presented that

map to them, that they accepted it though they expressed some hesitation, the same as the member for Yorkview has today.

The same member brought out a letter from Lynne Gordon, one whom we respect and believe to be a very capable lady. In response to her letter, it has been the practice of the government to hire ladies or women wherever possible. In fact, the Minister of Government Services could be criticized for saying that in a job which ladies can do they do a better job I would say than the other sex. We think if a lady can do the job she does it much better than a man.

Mr. J. Reed: I wonder if the member for Fort William (Mr. Hennessy) would agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: He would agree with me, I am sure; I am sure the complete House would agree with me on that. In my particular department, as members know, I have many jobs women would not want to do, but 28 per cent of my staff is of the fairer sex. That will complete my reply to the opening statements.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 997)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
ON NOTICE PAPER

HOMEMAKERS' SERVICES

58. Mr. Breaugh: What is the ministry's position on training and licensing homemakers for chronic care? [Tabled March 7, 1979]

Hon. Mr. Norton: In response to the above question, originally directed to my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell), I would advise that we are presently working towards the development of uniform standards in homemakers' services. We have requested input from agencies and municipalities respecting desirable criteria and we plan to produce a manual of standards in homemakers' services during this fiscal year. Our intention is to enunciate policy guidelines expected of agencies which offer a home-maker service to the public.

To reassure the honourable member about current practice, those who are employed as homemakers are carefully screened beforehand, either by an agency or a municipality. Some community colleges in urban areas have developed continuing education programs for homemakers. Most agencies now provide in-service training to homemakers. In areas which lack adequate facilities, training grants are available for attendance at short term courses.

PROPERTY TAX CREDITS

105. Mr. Duksza: Will the Minister of Revenue please indicate how long has the investigation of property tax credits been going on. What have been the findings of this program to date as to: (a) number of claims investigated; (b) paid in error rate; (c) actual amount paid in error; (d) amount recovered? [Tabled April 2, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Maeck: The property tax credit is part of the Ontario tax credit system.

The Ontario tax credit system, provided for in the Income Tax Act, Ontario, has been in existence since the 1972 taxation year, administered by Revenue Canada pursuant to the memorandum of agreement made under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act.

As part of the administration, the federal authorities selectively audit all of the tax credit claims filed. The Ontario Ministry of Revenue assists federal authorities in identifying and establishing selective criteria. The audit has been in effect since the program began.

(a) Number of claims investigated: The annual review of OTC claims, of which the property tax credit is the largest component, consists of an audit of a selected number of files in categories where a higher potential for error is thought to exist; as well as a computer match of spouse files to ensure that the claim is made by the tax filer with the higher income. The total of claims reviewed up to the end of the 1976 taxation year was 268,073. The process included a computer spouses' match of well over 1,000,000 claims annually.

(b) Paid in error rate: As the form of audit review covers a very large number of claims, especially by the computer match, and concentrates the audit effort in areas where a high potential for error is perceived, any attempt to define an "error rate" on the basis of total claims is meaningless.

(c) Actual amount paid in error:

Taxation Year	Total OTC Claims \$ Millions	Total Amounts Overpaid \$ Millions
1973	296.0	0.7
1974	385.0	1.5
1975	414.0	3.5
1976	420.0	3.2
1977	434.0	*

*Audit for 1977 is still in progress.

(d) Amount recovered: Under the terms of the memorandum of agreement, Revenue Canada reimburses Ontario for all amounts found to have been overpaid.

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

113. Mr. T. P. Reid: Would the ministry provide the titles and subject matter of all public opinion polls for each government ministry, the cost of each poll, and the name of the company which conducted the poll from April 1, 1978 until April 1, 1979. Would the ministry table copies of each such opinion poll. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. McCague: The above question cannot be answered within the normal 14 days but an answer will be tabled on or about May 24, 1979.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS' TRAVEL

104. Mr. Van Horne: Will the minister please indicate which government members travelled outside of Toronto on government business in 1978-79? Please indicate the name of the community or other province or other

country visited, the length of the visit, the purpose of the visit, the number of civil servants (if any) accompanying the government member, the accommodation cost and travel cost for the government member and the accommodation cost and travel cost for the civil servants (if any) who accompanied the government member. [Tabled March 30, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Amassing the data necessary for even a partial answer to this question would constitute an overwhelming cost both in man-hours and in dollars.

The Legislature or any member therein is free at any time to question ministers in the House or under estimates about travel in and outside of Toronto undertaken by them, their staff or ministry officials.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

Transmitting Estimates, The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	983
Introduction of new members	983
Baptiste Lake rescue, statement by Mr. Auld	983
Flood damage, statement by Mr. Auld	984
Disaster relief assistance, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Nixon	985
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. M. Davidson, Mr. J. Reed	986
Health services, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cooke	987
Food prices, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Cassidy	989
Hydro transmission lines, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Stong	989
Glanbrook landfill site, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. S. Smith	989
Thames River flooding, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Watson	900
Foreign purchases of agricultural land, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Mancini, Mr. Martel	991
Aid for elderly, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. R. F. Johnston	992
Discrimination in hiring, questions of Mr. Elgie: Mr. Eaton, Mr. Van Horne	993
Flood rescue, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Nixon	993
Mining tax, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Peterson	994
Mining exploration, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. T. P. Reid	996
Point of privilege re disposal of hazardous wastes, Mr. T. P. Reid	996
Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Philip	997
Motion re committee substitution, Mr. Welch, agreed to	997
Funeral Services Amendment Act, Mr. Foulds, first reading	997
Ontario Hydro Accountability Act, Mr. J. Reed, first reading	997
Employment Standards Amendment Act, Mr. Breaugh, first reading	997
Tabling answers to questions 58, 105, 113 on notice paper, Mr. Welch	997
Order of business, Mr. Welch	997
Budget debate, Mr. Peterson	998
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Laughren, agreed to	1016
Royal assent to Bills 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1016
Estimates, Ministry of Government Services, Mr. Henderson	1016

Recess	1024
Appendix, answers to questions on notice paper	1025
Homemakers' services, question of Mr. Norton: Mr. Breaugh	1025
Property tax credits, question of Mr. Maeck: Mr. Dukszta	1025
Public opinion polls, question of Mr. McCague: Mr. T. P. Reid	1025
Government members' travel, questions of Mr. McCague: Mr. Van Horne	1025

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, J. A. C.; Minister of Energy, Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Bolan, M. (Nipissing L)
 Breugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Davis, Hon. W. G.; Premier (Brampton PC)
 Duksza, J. (Parkdale NDP)
 Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker and Chairman (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Isaacs, C. (Wentworth NDP)
 Johnston, R. F. (Scarborough West NDP)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Newman, Hon. W.; Minister of Agriculture and Food (Durham-York PC)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
 Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
 Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Colleges and Universities; Minister of Education
 (York Mills PC)
 Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Stong, A. (York Centre L)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)

Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)

Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)

Van Horne, R. (London North L)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

Watson, A. N. (Chatham-Kent PC)

Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Worton, H. (Wellington South L)

Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

McGibbon, Hon. P. M.; Lieutenant Governor



No. 24

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

(continued)

On vote 501, ministry administration program; item 1, main office:

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Just as we retired for the dinner hour I stated that about 20 per cent of my staff are female. I still maintain that particular position, but we have certain contracts jobs with the trades and the female force has not yet entered that field. When we get away from the trades field, 50 per cent of our staff our women and 50 per cent are men; we're pretty well split down the middle.

I wanted to bring that to members' attention tonight as I look up in the gallery among the people there and see a future generation of young ladies from Agincourt. The member for Yorkville would want to know that.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You mean the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young). The minister will have you from Yorkville yet.

Mr. Nixon: He spends a lot of time in Yorkville.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Sorry, Yorkview.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister can add anything to the answer he gave to our leader the other day with regard to the east of Bay site—between Bay Street and Yonge Street, that section in there—with regard to any agreement that may be forthcoming with the city of Toronto as to that property.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the honourable member, we have approximately 13 acres east of Bay Street and south of Wellesley Street. This belongs to the people of the province of Ontario. The city of Toronto presented a proposal but we as the government are not ready at this moment to let that land go. I met with the mayor of the city of Toronto about a month ago and pointed out to him certain interests that we as the government have in that land. He pointed out the city's interest, which he had

done earlier. I told him that I could not accept his proposal at this moment.

I'm sure you all read in the paper about the bus companies that are interested in that piece of property. I pointed this out to his worship.

Mr. Nixon: Bus companies.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, busing companies. A whole group of them went together. They put forth a proposal that that be the centre for the city of Toronto. The city did not accept that immediately. I asked his worship to go back and take another look at it and said that I'd be glad to meet with him again in a few weeks. At this moment we're not sure, as the government, that we don't want some additional buildings in that area. We don't want it all, but as yet we're not in the position that we want to say so much of it is surplus.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I know my colleague the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) wants to ask a question of the minister, but perhaps I may be permitted to follow up on a bit of a review of that property, which is south of Wellesley Street and east of Bay Street. Did the minister receive a letter from a developer in recent days, which I believe was received by a number of members?

Mr. Worton: I have one here.

Mr. Nixon: Was the member talking about this this afternoon?

Mr. Worton: No.

Mr. Nixon: It asked if we had any views on a proposed apartment-hotel development complex that might very possibly be used by members. I think the letter came from Greenwin Developments. Is there a possibility that the government is thinking of either selling or leasing that land for private development? Perhaps I should ask the minister's views.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: First let me respond that I'm not aware of that letter; I'm not aware of that development. The only proposal I have had is the one presented by the city of Toronto. I'm not aware of any proposal. If I've got the letter, I don't remember receiving it. How recent is it? Could the member send it over?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if the minister would permit me: I do not believe this letter is dated, but the letterhead says "Greenwin, 111 Davisville Avenue, Toronto." It's addressed to "Dear member of the Ontario Legislative Assembly: The Greenwin Group, a private company involved in land development and property management in Toronto, is planning to construct a high-rise residential building at the corner of Bay and Wellesley Streets in downtown Toronto." Now, it cannot be the Sutton Place, the Sunoco building, or the southwest corner; so it has to be the land that the ministry owns.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We have not been approached by this company, but let me try to help the member. When cabinet was dealing with the petitions respecting the Toronto central area plan, there was an area immediately north of the Sutton Place where we understood a development was going in; I guess it's Dundonald Street, just to the north. I am not aware of that, but I can assure the member that we as a government have not been approached by this company.

Mr. Nixon: It may very well be that but, when the location was given as the corner of Bay and Wellesley, and since I believe Mr. Eddie Goodman is the lawyer for Greenwin, it just naturally occurred to me that probably something had been arranged.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I give you my word—

Mr. Nixon: Maybe this time Eddie has struck out.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I give you my word here in the House that I have not been approached by this company. Maybe other members have. The member must have some particular tie-ins with this company that they would send him that letter and not me.

Mr. Nixon: It went to all members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am very disappointed. I will have to approach them.

Mr. Young: Isn't it possible, Mr. Chairman, that the minister would be the last to hear about it; that plans might go forward and then it would come to him only when the building is a sort of fait accompli? Or does he have to sell the land first?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No, I can give the honourable member the assurance that the government as such has not been dealing with this company. I can give him that assurance.

Mr. Young: It is a pipe dream, I guess.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I feel there's always an appropriate time, and I think it's in this vote, to say a few words of appreciation to the minister for the co-operation I

have received for my constituents, especially in terms of the buildings that his ministry has provided through the association with the University of Guelph.

I also want to pay tribute to the minister for his co-operation and that of his deputy and staff with regard to the Macdonald Stuart Centre, which has now come into being and which I am sure will be a good asset for the city. The minister was very co-operative and in his usual manner got things done in a hurry. We appreciated that; it had been hanging fire for some two years. The other big thing of importance, which has happened in our main building, is that my former leader, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), the member for Windsor-Walkerville and I have been provided with new and very impressive offices overlooking University Avenue. Mine is the biggest office I have ever had down here—

Mr. Nixon: It's not as big as the mayor of Guelph's, though.

Mr. Worton: The funny thing about it is that, prior to this office, I had always had too much furniture. In this one, I didn't have enough. My wife likes to spend my money; so I sent her out to buy a chesterfield of my own. I just wanted the minister to know that it's a great improvement on what the three elder members have had here. Perhaps, if I consult with them too, we will have an official ribbon-cutting and have the minister cut the ribbon. I thank him very much.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the honourable member for those kind remarks.

Just after the six o'clock adjournment I had the opportunity of visiting in his office the honourable member on your right. I have to agree. I think it is about the best office he has had around here in what—20 years?

Mr. Cooke: When do the rookies get half decent offices?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Time goes on; it is a great healer.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I want to pay tribute to the minister or not. But I tell you, when I look out the window from my office, I look over the park just in front of the buildings. There, framed in the window, is the headquarters of Ontario Hydro. I hope to goodness this minister will never allow a building, such as Ontario Hydro, to be constructed under his responsibility. It was built without any tender whatsoever being called. Surely it wouldn't be possible for any other government ministry to erect a building without calling for ten-

ders? Can he give us his assurance in that regard?

Mr. Worton: I use it for a looking glass.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am sure the honourable member is well aware of the policy carried out by the departments that I speak for tonight.

Mr. Nixon: Only Ontario Hydro builds without a tender?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Well, you know, that is a little bit debatable. I was one of those who sat down in the north room, where the NDP have their caucus, one summer not too many summers ago, listening to evidence over that particular building.

Mr. Nixon: Was there evidence of a tender?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: There was evidence that we were getting good value for our money. In fact, the chairman tonight was the chairman of that committee. But we, within the Ministry of Government Services, certainly do tender. It is only in extreme circumstances that the low tender is not taken. The minister has to be satisfied that it is a "must" that we not take the low tender.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if I may just pursue this general field for a moment. I had occasion to write to the minister a couple of weeks ago—he was good enough to respond—bringing to his attention the rather disreputable appearance of some of the properties under his care on University Avenue, somewhat below the headquarters of Ontario Hydro. Of course, the building immediately south is the old Ontario Hydro headquarters. It has remained empty and totally unused for these many years since Ontario Hydro moved into its new facility.

Farther down from that—and really I should have the address here but the minister knows the buildings—farther south on University Avenue there are two office buildings which I suppose are two of the dirtiest, dingiest buildings in Toronto. You might see them down by the slaughterhouse or down in the factory section. But these are sitting there with their venetian blinds askew, filthy from top to bottom, except for the sign in the front that says, "Ontario Government Office Building."

I don't believe they are even used. But they comprise extremely valuable real estate, as does the old headquarters for Ontario Hydro. We don't want to go over the decision to build the new headquarters for Hydro again. I still think it was a very bad decision on the part of all concerned; really, a serious, bad decision. But I would hope this minister, with the kind of initiative and influence he

has demonstrated in the past, can turn those buildings into some good use for the benefit of the taxpayers.

One of the obvious moves, in my view, would be to turn one of those buildings over to the ombudsman. In this House, there has been debate in the past about the rather luxurious and certainly very expensive facilities used by the ombudsman for his offices. I have never visited them myself, but I certainly have received reports from those who have, from both Legislature members and from people reporting for newspaper. I would hope that the new ombudsman, using the good sense he has demonstrated so far in his career, would use every opportunity he might have to what you might call "rationalize" the costs of his important office.

[8:15]

I would hope he would move out of his present location. Although it is centrally located at the corner of Bay and Queen, he could very well reach an agreement—an arm's length agreement—that would maintain all of his autonomy, which is so important both to him and to everyone else, to rent some of the facilities that are under the jurisdiction of the government of Ontario. It could be the old Hydro building, although I suppose that still rests with Hydro. We might very well take it over from them since they have shown something less than initiative and skill in getting it rented. Ontario Hydro has this huge office building, which it cast off because it happened to be a few years old and which has been sitting there empty. It has been paid for by the consumers of electricity across this province now for a number of years. It is in the area that should and could command some of the highest rent in Canada if it were properly administered, but it sits there empty.

The minister has two other buildings that I have already described as somewhat disreputable further down University Avenue. They should either be sold to allow the private sector to use them and pay taxes on them or else put to some profitable use for the taxpayers of Ontario. I have just made one suggestion and that is we ought to approach the ombudsman and make him an offer he cannot refuse as far as financing is concerned in providing him with the kind of office facilities he needs. I know he would be somewhat unwilling to deal in anything other than an arm's length way with any emanation of government. He understands his responsibility there better than anyone else.

I am very satisfied in that connection but I wanted to bring this to the attention of the minister because I, as a taxpayer, am offended

every morning when I come up University Avenue to see those buildings sitting there unutilized. If we cannot use them, we should give them to somebody who can. We should bring to the attention of Ontario Hydro the fact we do not appreciate the inadequacies of their management in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am sure the honourable member last week was aware there was one of the committees of this House listening to an employee who had left the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. It was brought out at that time that one of these buildings is going to be occupied by the staff that has to do with our new Canadians. We hope, within a few weeks, one of these buildings will be occupied.

Mr. Nixon: I thought they were going to use the old Ministry of Labour down on Front Street.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: They are. We have not got full plans for it at this moment. We are going to move them from 8 York Street up to the complex to which you are referring.

Mr. McClellan: Put the Ministry of Labour back.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You are correct, Ontario Hydro does have an empty building that should be looked on in a useful way. In the next few months one of the two buildings will be in full use.

Mr. Nixon: If I may just take another moment: The Ministry of Labour, as I recall, rents office space in that black tower, Travelers Tower, that brand new building.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: 400 University.

Mr. Nixon: Yes. It concerns me—and I see the Minister of Labour and Manpower is here—that they would leave behind these buildings as they get 10 or 12 years old, and get a little dingy. There is no way the ministry could stay there. They have got to move into these new facilities.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: You don't mean that.

Mr. Nixon: I would suggest the financing for that Travelers Tower was probably based on the fact one of the important ministries of government would enter into a long-term lease at the top per square-foot fee, plus. They would be able to borrow money to build that blooming building, whereas the ministries leave the buildings owned by the government, or owned by agencies of the government, because they are not fancy and posh enough.

The honourable minister is a good, practical man from Lambton county. He was not in the driver's seat when this happened, but

I would certainly hope and trust he and the present Minister of Labour and Manpower are not the sort of top government people who would allow this sort of wastage of public money to go on. When you look at the government offices around—we want everything nice for our people but it has got to be just the worst kind of wastage of public money and ought to infuriate taxpayers. My own experience is they are used to this attitude after 36 years. There is this feeling, "What can you do about it?" It probably takes a change in government to change the attitude. But in many respects, I have a feeling that the minister in charge of government service shares some of these views.

I don't spend a lot of time in ministers' offices—maybe sometime in another incarnation I will spend some time in a minister's office. But I don't believe there is anything more luxurious and ornate, short of Valhalla and Nirvana, than you ministers have provided for yourselves. I don't mind, you can come into my office and I am just as pleased as can be. It's right handy to the House, and I am just absolutely pleased. There is only one other move that I want to make before I go to a more important reward.

But there is something going on in this big mob of ministers; they go and visit each other in their offices, and they say, "Wow, he's got a bigger refrigerator than I have." Or, "His carpets are deeper than mine." Or, "I see he's got a Group of Seven on the wall, and I've just got those old calendars back from the garage in Petrolia." It is not even one-upmanship; it is keeping up with the Joneses and the McMurtrys that really is just murder around here.

I've heard the Tories in Ottawa rake the Liberals back and forth over the coals for their delusions of grandeur and the penthouse suites; I really think it is terrible down there too. You can have good offices and whatever staff you need; but just be careful when you treat the taxpayers with that kind of dismissal.

It is true, I suppose, that when the delegations from Brigden on Wyoming come into your office it would take their breath away. They would say, "Gee, we thought Lorne really had it great when he was in the warden's office there in Sarnia. But look at this." Well, you've got to watch it. In our system, there is some justice; and we certainly don't want you people to be dissatisfied with the private members' offices when you have an opportunity to occupy them. It may not be our responsibility to provide them; but whoever does, I hope at the same time they don't provide for themselves in such a way

that would be offensive to the taxpayers if they could see what was being done.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Prior to the commencement of the estimates, the chairman of the committee of the whole House sent out a little memorandum to all of the members, drawing their attention to section 48(c) of the standing orders. I will just read it again: "Latitude shall be permitted to opposition critics on the first item of the first vote of each set of estimates, and thereafter members shall adhere strictly to the vote and item under consideration."

Mr. Nixon: I hope you are going to tighten right down.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Not on this item now. I think everybody who wants to speak to this item of lavish accommodation should have the right to do so. But when we are through with this, I suggest that this more properly belongs under item 502.

I never know when you are going to talk about policy and when you are going to talk about something else. But that latitude belongs to the party critics.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly appreciate the situation you find yourself in.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I will allow the minister to reply. Then I will recognize the member for Bellwoods on the same item.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I am quite happy to have the honourable member inform me about these offices. As I suggested earlier, we are moving one group up to one of these buildings. Next, his proposal about the ombudsman is a good proposal. At the appropriate time it will be looked at.

Just to comment about the warden's office in Lambton county, anything in Lambton county is outstanding within this province. That would be my response.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Does the member for Bellwoods have any response to make on the accommodation in Lambton county?

Mr. McClellan: No, I don't, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: On the same item?

Mr. McClellan: I just wanted to ask for two pieces of information. I thought this was an appropriate time to do this so that I will, hopefully, have them tabled by the time we get to the item, which is under 503. The first of these pieces of information I would like is the current fair wage scale, or fair wage rates that are used by the ministry when they are awarding cleaning contracts, particularly for the office buildings here in Toronto. The second piece of information I asked the minister to provide for us is the salary rates per hour paid to regular civil service janitorial

staff, who are performing cleaning and maintenance work as regular members of the staff.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It is under 503. We will have that for you when we get to that vote.

Mr. McClellan: Right. Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted first to thank the minister for the very nice way he treated me when they were opening the provincial public building in the great riding of Windsor-Walkerville. I thought it was very nice of you, Mr. Minister.

While I'm on that, I wanted to ask the minister about the policy of the government in relation to surplus buildings. The minister can recall my discussion with him and his deputy concerning the old Essex county jail and the desires of several groups in the community to develop sort of a cultural centre there. How far has he proceeded with the various groups in assisting them to eventually acquire that property and develop the cultural centre, the arts centre, they so eagerly would like to develop on the west side of Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'm not personally acquainted, as you know, with the particular property. Is this part of the building you and I spoke about approximately a year ago, when I made it clear to you the way we would make it available? Is that still satisfactory to the honourable member? That offer still stands.

Mr. B. Newman: I thought possibly you had gone further than that, Mr. Minister, and already come to some type of an agreement so either they or the municipality would take possession and they would develop it.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I don't have anything further than when I spoke to the honourable member eight or 10 months ago.

Mr. B. Newman: Maybe even a little longer.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. It could be a year ago. But our offer still stands.

Mr. B. Newman: If you wouldn't mind, Mr. Minister, I would appreciate your officials looking into it and the next time we come around to the estimates, in a day or so, maybe they might have an update for me.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to come back to the question raised by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, about the lease on the black building down the street by the Ministry of Labour. Has the answer been given as to how long that lease runs? I may have missed it. What is the possibility of a move from that building to one of the others we now have?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The lease expires March 1, 1983.

We have taken some additional floors in that since I became minister. We consolidated the Ministry of Labour, all of it into that building.

Mr. Young: You are tied to that lease for another five years or better?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Four years approximately.

Mr. Young: Are you planning ahead to what you're going to do at the end of that period? Have you any definite plans laid for that particular lease?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We generally do five-year leases. We're not planning beyond that at this moment. If we planned on leaving the building, we would be making our plans to move two years ahead. We are satisfied. The rate is \$7.50 per square foot, which is a pretty competitive rate in Toronto, I think you'd agree. Did that answer your question?

Mr. Young: I'm just wondering what the possibility is of that kind of move into some of the buildings we own, such as the old Hydro building, and others, and whether there are any long-term plans for those buildings. You mentioned you're thinking in terms of plans for the building, but nothing definitive yet, nothing definite.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I thought I made it clear that one of the buildings vacated by the Ministry of Labour is being used by the Ministry of Culture and Recreation which will more or less highlight the building as the greeting place for our new Canadians.

[8:30]

Mr. Young: That would be the one down at the corner of Dundas Street and University Avenue?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. They are now down at 8 York Street, the old Ministry of Labour building. We don't think they have a high enough profile there. We think they're entitled to the higher profile farther up University Avenue. That will leave us with one building we're looking at, the one at 434 University Avenue; the Commission of Inquiry on Aluminum Wiring is now using that building. The Ministry of Culture and Recreation is going to use the one, as I suggested, and the Ministry of Community and Social Services is using a portion of one of the buildings; also, the Ministry of Labour is using it for the summer students program. So they're pretty well in use—not on a full-time basis, but they are actually being used.

Mr. Young: Is there still a great deal of vacant space in those buildings at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: There is vacant space, but when you compare it to the overall office space we have, and the movement we've got to accommodate, such as that of the aluminum wiring inquiry commission, it's not that great. If you look at those buildings, the vacant space may look great; but in terms of the overall government buildings we've got here, it's a very small portion of one per cent.

Mr. Young: So it's a space absorber?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct some questions to the minister, and I hope I will get some answers from him, which I'm sure I will.

To enter this building on the east side, I often walk up the travelled portion of the roadway, and I'm concerned to find automobiles parked on the sidewalks. I often think it may be required to get emergency equipment, such as fire equipment or fire apparatus, to come in off the main streets, in which case it would encounter those vehicles parked on both sides of the street. What is the policy of the government? Do we allow cars to park on the sidewalks here?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the member, he's pretty well aware why the cars are parked in the street to the east side of the building. That's really not a traffic artery. Yes, if there were an emergency, it might cause some anxiety, but it's not that far from University Avenue.

The situation has been looked at within the last month, but we don't have a reasonable solution. We don't have parking space in the immediate area.

When I look out the front of the building and see the cars parked there, it concerns me. I would personally like to see the whole front of the building kept clear. To me, the front doors of this building are very important. It's a heritage and a privilege for the member and me to be able to walk up to those front doors and take our seats in here.

The situation concerns me, but it's the lack of parking space within the immediate area that causes the problem mentioned by the member.

Mr. Haggerty: The reason I raised the question with the minister is that on different occasions, the fire department has had to come into this building. I'm sure if they had to bring an aerial truck into that laneway, with parking at both sides, they'd have some difficulty, because they would have to get to the east side if the building to hook up to the standpipes.

I think some of the vehicles that are parked there ignore the signs. I suggest that the custodians at the entrance perhaps should give a little guidance as to where these persons should park. Often you have to walk up the middle of the road and sometimes you don't hear the cars coming up behind you; somebody is liable to get clipped one of these days.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Correction: You have to do it pretty near all the time; not often. Practically all the time you have to walk up the middle of the road. I walk that way morning, noon and night over to my office, and I would have to agree with the member about the sidewalk. I always have to walk out in the middle of the road—not often; practically all the time.

Mr. Haggerty: The other matter I want to bring to the minister's attention—I think I brought it to the attention of the previous minister—is my concern about the design of handrails around these buildings, particularly those at the Macdonald building, for ramps for handicapped persons to come up or down in wheelchairs. I don't know who designed them but if you look at the design of those handrails, they didn't design them right. The bar projects out about 18 inches. If you sit in a wheelchair, you will notice it is about at height where it would almost project into a person's eye. I suggest in future these things should be either changed or the design made so that there is a loop there with no sharp edges or corners that a person would encounter and which might cause injury. I suggest you or someone on your staff should look at it.

The other matter I want to raise with the minister is the disposal of crown land or lands owned by MTC. I understand much of this may go through your ministry in the disposing of these excess or surplus lands. Normally, the practice is that the conservation authorities in local communities will have the first offer. In some cases in the past, they have almost given it to them. I suggest to the minister that we should be looking at other ways of disposing of that land. The land should go back to the original owner from whom it was taken for the purpose of road widening or reconstruction of a new highway. They should at least be given the opportunity to purchase it either for themselves or for a member of their family. If that can't be done, I suggest it should be put on the auction block so that anyone who wants to purchase it may have the opportunity to bid on it.

We are now giving it to the conservation authorities. I can think of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority which has a surplus of land now. If we ever get into the business of market value assessment or assessing all the properties, that burden will have to be borne by the region or the municipalities that are contributing to the cost of operating the conservation authorities.

My main concern, as was mentioned this afternoon in questions to the ministers, is that the purpose of the conservation authorities is flood control, not buying up or getting their hands on all the small pieces of property which can be anywhere from one acre to two acres to 65 acres of land.

In particular, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, which is not under this ministry, in the reconstruction of the Welland Canal bought property on both sides of the Welland Canal which extends out to where the railroads were relocated. There is property in Wainfleet township, for example, consisting of well over 400 or 500 acres of land. The policy of the federal Department of Public Works is to notify any of the provincial government ministries to see if they want first choice of buying that property. In this particular instance, I understand the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority is again interested in this land. If you keep on building up land for the conservation authority, eventually it will cost the taxpayer a fortune in taxes.

I suggest there are other uses for this land, that is, to let the individual who is interested in buying it buy it and let him pay the taxes on it and generate revenue to the municipality. I don't know what your policy is on that, but that of MTC is to give it to your ministry. Then you turn around and give it back at a reasonable cost—in some cases almost for nothing—to the conservation authorities. May I have your comments?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: This is a very important point and I think we should all know the policy of the government. Firstly, if the Ministry of Transportation and Communications has a narrow strip of land—odds and ends, foot patches or what have you, it disposes of that. Before they dispose of it, they circulate a description. I might say that when my ministry has land to dispose of, it does the same.

We get the land appraised by a qualified appraiser. We circulate a description to all ministries of our government to see whether any government agency wants it at the appraised value. Next we circulate a description to the local municipal authorities to see whether they are interested in it. Following

this; if no governing bodies are interested in the land, we put it out for either public tender or public auction. We use both methods.

Earlier in the member's statement, he suggested the original owner should have an opportunity. Where the land has been expropriated from the original owner, we go back to him and he gets the first opportunity to buy it at the appraised value. We do that where there hasn't been a willing seller.

Mr. Haggerty: What I am suggesting to the minister is that, where there is a larger acreage of land that the Ministry of Transportation and Communications has acquired for road construction purposes and so on, perhaps adjoining farmers should have the opportunity of purchasing it and putting it back into farm production, instead of letting it grow over with weeds over the years while waiting for MTC to decide what it is going to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That is not the present policy of the government. I fully understand what the member is saying. Maybe the government should reappraise its position. If it's going to be out of farm production for even five years, that to me is wrong. I'm not aware that there is a lot of land in the position that the honourable member is mentioning; it was my understanding that, when MTC gets to the point where it knows it is not going to need that land for a highway, it takes the necessary steps to dispose of it.

As I suggested to the honourable member, MTC does dispose of the odds and ends. But if there's a parcel of land large enough for a building lot, the present policy of the government is that it is referred back to the Ministry of Government Services, and again MGS takes the same action as MTC takes.

I am not aware of what the honourable member brought up about the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Welland Canal. I can't answer him on that; I don't have that information yet.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman; I want to spend a little while, if I might—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: These are policy matters?

Mr. Martel: It is a policy matter. It deals with a specific building—in fact, not just a building, but a series of buildings.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In Sudbury?

Mr. Martel: In Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member is always telling me I don't do anything for Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: I want to chat with the minister tonight about a little establishment called Burwash, if I might.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's south of Sudbury—

Mr. Martel: It's still in my riding. I tell the minister it's still in my riding.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: It's not anywhere near your riding.

Mr. Martel: We have some problems. I may take the Minister of Labour and Manpower there and show it to him; maybe he can impress upon the government the need to do something in view of the fact that we have had that in mothballs at a cost of about \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year since 1974. We have spent several million dollars keeping it in mothballs.

The minister's predecessor, as the minister is aware, took it upon herself to sell it; she got one offer, I think, of \$1,000,000. The place is, as he knows, about 5,000 acres or more. There are 95 homes there—or at last count there were 95 homes; I'm not sure how many are being demolished.

As a result of the decision of the minister's predecessor to sell, a committee made up of the chamber of commerce and Sudbury and District Labour Council, the local members of the regional council, and the local members of Parliament, came to Queen's Park to meet with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and asked that a study be done along the lines I'd been asking for since 1974: a multi-use concept for this facility that sits there idle and could provide many of the services that are not available to people in northern Ontario and for which we're paying \$350,000 to \$400,000 a year to keep in mothballs.

[8:45]

I would remind the House that it was this government that wiped out the fourth largest employer in the Sudbury basin when it wiped out that institution, and relocated it in the Minister of Transportation and Communications' (Mr. Snow) riding. The argument, of course, in those days, was that half the prisoners—pardon me, 90 per cent—were from southern Ontario and it was difficult for people to go and see them. Now, prisoners are taken from the Sudbury area and sent to Monteith at Thunder Bay and it doesn't matter that it's a 600-mile trip from Sudbury to Thunder Bay for anyone who wants to visit. But the government couldn't have somebody from southern Ontario travel 200 miles from Sudbury to Burwash to see someone in the institution. That was the excuse and it was closed, wiping out the fourth largest employer overnight. I remember Dick Potter—you re-

member that fellow, don't you?—saying to us in the House, "You know, I am not running an employment agency," when we complained that the government had wiped out a variety of jobs in the Sudbury area. He said, "I am not responsible for running an employment agency. I am Minister of Correctional Services."

We came to Queen's Park, after three or four years of agitation, and finally the minister decided that she was going to sell it. We met with the Premier and the Premier, at our request, indicated that a study would be done. It took a year and a half. It was this little document. I well recall the day the Minister of Government Services announced this study in this House; that it was finalized after 18 months and he was tabling it and there were three recommendations. I have the minister's press release on that occasion when he said:

"This proposed use is considered to be the most appropriate for the following reasons: It provides for an integrated use of the entire site, it will effectually utilize the arable land and institutional facilities, including Camp Bison, which the federal government had previously purchased from the province for \$1,800,000, and it will provide jobs for local residents."

Before this study was completed, the federal authorities had decided they weren't purchasing Burwash and weren't going in there. Jean-Jacques Blais couldn't get the bundle to utilize Camp Bison and here we have a study handed down saying, "That's the use it should be put to." My, what a magnificent study. I wrote the Premier, when this study came out, because the Minister of Government Services thought this was a great report.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What was the date of that letter?

Mr. Martel: December 22, 1978. I will quote from it in a moment. I wrote the Premier and I made the following observation with respect to that study. Let me just quote what I said. "After over a year and a half of study, the recommendations put forth, which would see the federal authorities purchase the rest of the property in the Burwash area for use as an integrated maximum and minimum security institution and farm, are totally useless. M. M. Dillon Limited's report could have been prepared by a six-year-old after a cursory walk around the property."

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You wrote that?

Mr. Martel: I think I did. I am saying a six-year old could have done it better because

I want to tell you that that report is a sham. I am going to quote some people you know well before I am through tonight; some people you know well who are great supporters of the government of Ontario. There aren't many in the Sudbury area but there are a few. There are a few.

I am going to quote a few letters and indicate what the reaction or the response to this study is. Before I do that, though, I want to say that there are people in the Sudbury district, Mr. Minister, who have made the following two observations: (1) that it was decided beforehand what the facility would be used for; in other words, the study was a sham and what M. M. Dillon did was a waste of everyone's time; (2) that the government had decided it wasn't going to spend any money. So how in God's name could you have anything else but the type of recommendations that are contained here? It obviously had been decided you couldn't put any money into it.

I want to tell you that if you put money into Burwash as you did into Minaki Lodge, we would have a great service for the residents of the Sudbury area. You know that monstrosity that hangs around your neck, that millstone from northwestern Ontario you can't even give away—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Careful now.

Mr. Martel: —on which you have spent \$10,000,000 already. It hasn't created a job. If you had put that kind of money into Burwash, some of the types of things that have been recommended could be done.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In fairness now, the Speaker of the House (Mr. Stokes) might have different reasons.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, would you tell that popinjay to be quiet for a while? If he wants the floor, I will sit down.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I will take you up on that.

Mr. Chairman: Well, will I recognize the member for Prince Edward-Lennox? The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I think in fairness, if the member would just consult with the Speaker of this House, he would realize Minaki Lodge is something close to his heart. Don't you for a moment think he wasn't in favour of the government taking over that lodge and spending the kind of money it did. Now, let's be fair.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am afraid he is right, Elie.

Mr. Martel: Now we have got that in the record, it is not even in the Speaker's riding I believe it is in the great riding of Kenora.

Mr. Mackenzie: Wrong again. What's new?

Mr. Martel: I think the responsibility for all of that great expenditure for nothing lies with that public relations firm called the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier). That is who is responsible for that. It had nothing to do with my colleague, the Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He was in favour of the north and you should be concerned. You can't write off the north.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Martel: You have done a pretty good job of it up to this time.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You can't write off the north.

Mr. Mackenzie: When are you going to be right for a change?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You know that is wrong.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, let me go back so the minister understands what I was saying before we were so rudely interrupted. The government decided the outcome before the report was even commenced and they had decided not to spend any money. Let me tell you what the decisions were, even the back-up positions.

You were going to have a federal institution. The federal government didn't proceed, either on the maximum security prison you were talking about or the minimum. You were going to tell Jean-Jacques Blais he should let the rest go for farming purposes. I can imagine the response Jean-Jacques Blais would give you when you told him the rest of that land was going to be for agricultural purposes. That is like someone coming down here and saying you are responsible for cleaning up the mess Dennis Timbrell has got himself into with OHIP. You would say, "No, that has nothing to do with me. Go away."

So you had a federal prison. Let me tell you the list of recommendations: A Sudbury and district kennel club to train retrievers. My golly, are we going to create the work for the people in the Sudbury region. By the way, Mr. Chairman, it is already there. They have a little plot and they go and train their dogs on the weekends. That is one of the things going to create some of the employment the minister spoke about the day he read the recommendations in the House.

Mr. Sterling: What have you got against man's best friend?

Mr. Martel: It will provide jobs for local residents.

Mr. Worton: They have gone to the dogs.

Mr. Martel: What else did they recommend? A children's camp. Well, the children's camp is already there. It was built by a church group and has been there for a good number of years. It is nothing new, but that is what they are recommending.

Snowmobile trails: Wow, is that going to create employment and opportunity for the people of the Sudbury region.

A truck inspection station: That ought to do us a lot of good. We own all the property, you know. Somebody decided here is something to fool the peasants; we will put a truck inspection station there and that will create two jobs. You only removed 250, you have to recall.

What else are you going to do? Hay production; we are going into hay production. It has already been leased, as the minister knows, to I believe four or five different farmers. That is already there. Everything that was recommended was there. There is nothing new.

The things the committee recommended, the committee established in Sudbury which met with the Premier, dealt with the meaningful things, things that are now lacking in terms of services, opportunities for work. Let me tell you just a few of them.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Tell us what you want.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you listen?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have heard all this before.

Mr. Martel: We wanted—this was recommended by the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce—a market garden. By the way, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) has, on a number of occasions in estimates, recommended that part of it should be utilized for that purpose.

We also recommended a commercial campground. We recommended—and this came from the University of Sudbury through Rev. Newbery—a community for non-reserve Indians who had been in trouble with the law. We could use part of that as a facility for them to be rehabilitated both in the sense of breaking away from the habits they had that got them into trouble in the first place and, also, to do something useful once they were outside. A whole community could have been established there—a very small community—using the facilities that were there. A village for the handicapped was recommended.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is what you wanted.

Mr. Martel: Let me tell my friend what I wanted, because he was minister at one time.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is right.

Mr. Martel: I wanted 15 of the homes to be utilized for mentally retarded kids who are now stuck in Smiths Falls, so we could bring them back and put them in group homes, then transport them daily from there to the city of Sudbury to work in the Jarrett Centre or to go to school, and make that just as a stepping stone to being totally integrated into the community eventually. They objected to that in the Dillon report. Dillon distorted what we said. He said we wanted a whole village. My friend was the minister and he recalls my saying we only wanted to use 15 homes. That is the type of distortion that is in this report.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It was only feasible as I understand it—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Sudbury East has the floor.

Mr. Martel: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Would you please direct your remarks through the chair to the minister?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is that we said if the whole village were utilized we would use 15 of the homes for kids, remove them from Smiths Falls and bring them back into Sudbury. That is why we are talking about a multi-use concept, because as I understand it no one ministry is big enough to handle the whole facility that is there. But Dillon distorts it; he says we wanted the whole village. My friend, who was minister at the time, knows we did not ask for that. That is why there is no credibility to this report, Mr. Chairman. The minister can ask his colleague, we did not ask for an entire village.

Through the Sudbury and District Labour Council we also asked for an occupational health and safety centre, because no area has had more problems with health and safety and a variety of cancer—whether from Elliot Lake or the sintering plant in Sudbury, or the types of accidents that are unique, I guess because of the severity of those accidents in underground mining. We asked for that as one of the things for which it would be utilized. We also proposed a rehab centre. We proposed a psychiatric hospital, a therapeutic camping program. In other words, on one of the lakes build a camp for emotionally disturbed kids so they could be taken from the Algoma sanatorium

in summer to this area for several weeks during the vacation period.

An industry training and apprenticeship centre was also recommended; the Labourers' International Union asked for that so that we could train people in a variety of skills. A construction industry training centre was also asked for.

Cambrian College wanted to utilize part of the facility. It was interesting that the government played games with that one. They said to Cambrian College, "You can have that or you can have phase three; which are you going to take?" What we have now is that Cambrian College accepts phase three at the community college and all the kids from the Sudbury area who are taking apprenticeship come to Toronto or go to Sault Ste. Marie for that purpose.

[9:00]

These were just some of the ideas we put together as potential uses. Out of that we hoped that a scheme would be established which would utilize what was there and provide benefits which weren't available and, at the same time, provide job opportunities, particularly when this government wiped out the fourth largest employer by the stroke of a pen.

I want to mention a couple of other things. Because there is a huge gymnasium with, I believe, four brand new basketball courts, the northeastern Ontario regional sports committee wanted to utilize part of it. It sits there vacant. We are spending \$400,000. This whole range of ideas was presented—and I only listed some of them; there were many more—and what does the Dillon report come up with? A federal prison, a district kennel club to train dogs, a production which is already there, a children's camp which is already there, and a snowmobile trail which is already there. For good measure, they are going to throw in a truck inspection scale.

I want to say that is a sham. Let me tell you what some of the people think of it. I want to read a letter to you very carefully. I want to tell you before I begin that this is written by the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce. I want you to get the flavour of what they think of this report by M. M. Dillon.

Mr. Young: You wouldn't accuse them of being New Democrats.

Mr. Martel: I don't think they're New Democrats, either Dillon or the chamber.

Mr. Van Horne: You can't even spell it.

Mr. Martel: I wouldn't want to.

Mr. M. Davidson: It is an unbiased opinion.

Mr. Martel: I think this is unbiased. It is written by the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Eaton: You were never unbiased.

Mr. Martel: It is addressed to the Premier—

Mr. M. Davidson: Your friends.

Mr. Martel: —with a copy to me. I want you to get the flavour of this.

Mr. M. Davidson: It starts off "Dear Bill."

Mr. Martel: No, it says "Dear Sir." It is dated March 21, 1979.

Mr. Eaton: It has probably got a raspberry flavour to it.

Mr. Martel: It says: "We are sorry to have to pursue further the matter of the Burwash land-use study, which upon serious examination we find to be a disservice to yourself, your government and the people of Ontario."

It reminds me of that other report that was done just about a year and a half ago. What was it called? A Profile in Failure.

Mr. Young: That's the one.

Mr. Martel: It says there are three troikas.

Mr. Worton: It is called snafu.

Mr. Martel: Yes. It says you aren't doing anything in the north.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Whatever happened to the letter?

Mr. Martel: Let me go on. "This is a sad conclusion regretfully arrived at and which we suspect that you may have already shared, having regard to what we understood to have been a very substantial cost to the taxpayers of the province to produce a document of 223 pages which is permeated"—and get this—"with bias, contradiction and imbalance of emphasis, both in the selection of study areas, conformity to accepted terms of reference and failure of terms of reference to reflect both in spirit and action the commitments which we felt to be normally binding between us."

That's a pretty strong line adopted by the chamber of commerce. It says quite categorically that what they thought was an agreement between the Premier and that committee has been totally negated by this study. I remember the minister when he came in. I questioned him on this crazy report. Let me read what else it says:

"The steering committee formed by your authority was to address itself to concerns originally identified by the Sudbury Burwash committee"—that's what we thought—"formed

around local citizens and groups which met on chamber of commerce premises to effectively document their collective concerns and which we felt would ensure us of effective, ongoing, direct input and liaison with the steering committee.

"In reality, we were exorcised from further involvement by the procedure of holding meetings alternately in Sudbury and in Toronto, which effectively ensured the nonparticipation of the chamber volunteers and others, both through cost and the subsequent failure to invite meaningful participation."

"This point was brought more precisely into focus by independent and voluntary appearance of chamber members at the public information gatherings, and meetings held by M. M. Dillon Limited; during which no specific recognition was accorded the visitors, no special courtesies extended, and no notes made or tapes recorded; so that it is then bemusing, in the ultimate, to encounter the outright gall evidenced within the report, wherein it states that interviews were held with the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce—page 93.

"This statement is so lacking in substance as to bring into question the quality of all purported contacts and leads us to the following observations . . ."

That's pretty strong language, Mr. Minister. It says, quite to the point, that the report is not even factual, that they reported there were meetings and people had an opportunity to provide input, and that the chamber was consulted. The chamber is saying, rather dramatically: "That's a pile of bunk." This didn't occur. What's even more intriguing is that notes weren't even taken. Nothing was recorded.

I said to you earlier a decision had already been reached—I'm convinced—before the work commenced, as to what the ultimate recommendations would be. So we went through this charade, this exercise.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's what studies are for.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, you heard the former minister say—and he's supporting my contention—because he said we did not ask for a village for the mentally retarded but, in fact, only for 15 homes. M. M. Dillon's study says we were asking for a village for the mentally retarded. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that he's obviously supporting the position I take that—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Point of order, Mr. Chairman: My name has been taken—I don't think in vain—

Mr. Martel: It wasn't.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —but it's in connection with the concept of utilization of this complex. I think I should call it a complex. It is my vivid understanding—and my friend can correct me if I'm wrong—that the concept was really a multi-use concept, in terms of utilizing the complex for different functions, whether commercial, industrial or social. Within that environment, some of the housing would be used to accommodate the mentally retarded. Through that, they would be in sort of a mini-community, which would normalize them to some degree, in a half-way house on the way to full integration with the community.

That was my concept of it. I don't know whether my friend from Sudbury agrees with that or not, but as I understand it, that was the proposition put to the ministry at that time.

Mr. Martel: We're on exactly the same wavelength. I agree with you: that's what we asked for. The point I'm attempting to make here is that we have the chamber saying Dillon distorted the facts in his report to the minister. I'm indicating that not only do they say they were not interviewed—although the report says they were—I'm indicating further that the former minister was prepared to have 15 of those houses utilized for mentally retarded children, as part of a community. Dillon says—and that was fought by the chamber of commerce—on page 28: "Village for the mentally retarded: specific proponent, Ministry of Community and Social Services." That was never the case.

I just make the point again, that Dillon obviously went its merry way—on whose instructions maybe we'll find out before the night is over. But the whole report, the chamber says, is really a distortion of what the committee studying this fought to obtain for the Sudbury area. Dillon is so far out to lunch that it has no credibility with anyone who knows the area at all. That's the reason I'm addressing these remarks to the minister, because I want to ask the minister later on whether he will do what we're hoping will come, and that's to establish a committee of local residents and government officials who know the Sudbury area well to see whether we can put together a real multi-use concept based on the ideas that were put forth. I've tried to get an answer from the Premier for three months on that, but his writers are all on strike and they just don't bother responding.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: No, it's the umpires who are on strike.

Mr. Martel: Is it the umpires who are on strike? I knew someone was on strike.

Let me go on with the chamber's letter to point out some of the inaccuracies in this report. They start out on page two of their letter with the following title:

"Credibility Analysis: Perceived need of a steering committee:

"The structure of the above to preclude any ongoing input by the Sudbury-Burwash committee was not in keeping with the spirit of your commitment to that group and led to a totally imbalanced, biased, bureaucratic delivery of terms of reference which, enunciated by a Dillon representative, amounted to instructions from the Ministry of Government Services to place emphasis on approved governmental programs and to relegate to the near impossible anything that might involve cost."

Was it this ministry that did that? Was it this ministry that decided, although it is spending \$400,000 a year to keep it in mothballs, to set out some terms of reference that indicate rather clearly that we're not going to spend any money, so don't come up with programs that are going to cost the government any money? If this ministry did that, then it has distorted the whole purpose of that exercise and it has distorted what the people in that area thought the government was committed to trying to do.

"Throughout, it is strongly evident that entrenched interests are totally dedicated to maintaining the status quo, and the cost of this report is an expensive way of telling the citizens of the province that their views are secondary in consideration and quality to those of the bureaucrats."

That's pretty tough language in any man's ballpark. I think the government has to answer to the charges of the chamber, in addition to those of other groups, including the Sudbury and District Labour Council and just about anyone who was involved, who feel that this document is an insult to anybody's intelligence. As I started out by saying, it does two things; it recommends that we retain what is already there and we don't spend any money.

It's interesting to note that I did not speak to the chamber from the time this report was tabled until they wrote. I might indicate that I sent copies of this report to them, as well as to other people, because I got 15 copies to send out.

It's also interesting, I say to my friend the minister, that once I received the report, I wrote a number of people a very brief letter and simply asked them, because of the content of both reports, to petition the Premier

and to ask him to do as I recommended and establish a committee of local residents and civil servants who know the area and who would take the ideas that were presented and try to cost them.

[9:15]

I think that can be done. I know some of the concerns that were expressed, but I think one can cost what the total outlay in cash would be to put kids in 15 group homes there. I think we could have a training centre for civil servants in the north in the single male quarters, which is brand new. I know one of the objections to it was it was going to be too costly to take them from Sudbury to Burwash. I can't understand why it is any more costly to take them from Sudbury to Burwash than it is to take them from Toronto to the camp at Barrie where civil servants go almost daily during the summer.

There are groups in there from various government branches. Why would it be any more costly to go 20 miles to take civil servants to train from Sudbury to Burwash than it would be from here to Kempenfelt Bay? We send them up there by the carload. One of the concerns was it was too costly to do that in Sudbury. Close down the one in Kempenfelt Bay, then. Those are the considerations that went into this report.

It is just nuts. When you want something down here, it goes. When you need something up there, all the obstacles possible are thrown in the way. My friend is a reasonable man. Maybe he can tell me why it is more costly to go 20 miles in the Sudbury basin than 60 miles from here to Barrie. That was one of the considerations in ruling out, I am told, the utilization of those \$500,000 quarters that sit empty. The quarters are brand new. I don't think they were used six months. They could be utilized for training, but that was ruled out: "You can't train civil servants up there. It's too costly."

Mr. G. Taylor: Where would they swim there, Elie?

Mr. Martel: There is all kinds of water; there are all kinds of lakes there. There are all kinds of lakes and rivers around there, although not quite as close as Kempenfelt Bay, where you just run down the hill and jump in.

Mr. G. Taylor: It would be colder, wouldn't it?

Mr. Martel: Not in the summer.

Mr. Ashe: Just as wet, though.

Mr. Martel: For the life of me, it was as though this whole thing were designed and the study was organized in such a fashion as to rule out a multi-use concept. I realize it

is going to cost money, but I see it sitting there year in and year out, with a \$400,000 or \$500,000 cost. I see the services lacking in northern Ontario. When the only place for the young mentally retarded right now is on the fourth floor of a nursing home where the play yard isn't as big as this area and there are 64 young people there, there is something wrong with a government that can throw obstacles up.

Mr. G. Taylor: Are they still there, Elie?

Mr. Martel: They are still there.

Mr. G. Taylor: You are kidding.

Mr. Martel: No. They are all supposed to be bedridden except there isn't one who is bedridden. Yet they are all there. I just think it is a disgrace when we have a facility available to us 20 miles away that we can't come up with multi-use concept that is meaningful in terms of providing services that are lacking or providing jobs so desperately lacking in the Sudbury area.

Sure it is going to cost a little bit of money, but as I was saying a few moments ago, it costs money to keep those children in Smiths Falls, probably more than group homes would cost. It costs more or as much to train civil servants in Kempenfelt Bay as it would in the single quarters in Burwash. It is only 20 miles away.

I think we could cost the obstacles which are there. I think if you put the task to some of your staff who have a great deal of expertise, but with a different set of references, we in fact could come up with a multi-use concept for those 95 homes, for those single quarters, for the gym and for those six buildings that used to house all of the equipment. They could be turned into training areas for apprentices so they wouldn't have to come to Toronto for eight or 10 weeks every year for three years. Maybe the Ministry of Labour could help. They wouldn't have to go to Sault Ste. Marie.

This is the kind of thing we're talking about. There's not a great deal of capital cost. There are going to be some renovations but you have to remember the Ministry of Correctional Services spent \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 in the two years before they decided to close it. It sits there, and it's a bloody disgrace that it sits there vacant when we so desperately need services and we so desperately need jobs. As a result of this report, I wrote to the various groups.

Listen to what Henry Best said. I think you know Henry Best, don't you? Dr. Best is the president of Laurentian University and I believe he is a rather well-known Tory.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: He must be good.

Mr. Martel: That's why I wrote to Dr. Best and asked him if he would write to the Premier to see if we could get this group of civil servants in the area to help us do the costing. Here is what he wrote to the Premier: "The utilization of the Burwash facilities is of extreme importance to the Sudbury region. In today's tight economic situation which, at the present time, is more restrained in this area than in many others, it would seem that the funds used for maintenance could be put to much better use in a productive capacity." In other words, we could take those funds for mothballing it and utilize them.

"It seems to me that the implementation of a viable plan for Burwash has already been delayed too long. Since it is the people of this area who are most concerned, I would therefore like to endorse Elie Martel's suggestion that you establish a local committee of civil servants and interested citizens to study the utilization of the Burwash facilities now that the decision has been made not to utilize it as a federal prison. A multi-use concept for Burwash is needed and we should get on with drawing up a plan." It is signed by Henry Best, president of the university.

I could go to the regional chairman, Doug Frith. I could go to the corporation of the town of Onaping Falls or of Rayside-Balfour. By the way, Mr. Pelland, who is a Conservative candidate, wrote: "I am in receipt of the report you sent me on the Burwash land-use study for which I thank you. Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter which I have forwarded to Premier Davis."

He is supporting it. So is Dr. Newbery at Laurentian University. The corporation of the town of Nickel Centre endorses the establishment of this committee to get on with the work immediately. So does the town of Valley East.

It goes on and on. People see this facility vacant. They see this crazy study which is so distorted that they don't believe it because they come from the area. The last letter I wrote to the Premier about it was on April 5. I said: "Further to my letter to you of February 5"—that's two full months ago—"concerning the Burwash facilities, I am wondering at this time if the government has decided to establish a committee of Sudbury people to study the utilization of the facility."

I am still awaiting a reply. It's now April 7.

Hon. Mr. Walker: Did you send it by post?

Mr. Martel: I sent it from here right across. It was hand-delivered, just so it wouldn't get lost.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The government will live longer than you.

Mr. Martel: You've had four and a half years—five years almost. You've played around with this.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Just remember, government goes on forever, but you'll die one of these days.

Mr. Martel: Unfortunately we're all going to go, hopefully, not so soon.

I don't know if he's got permission from the big brass but I ask the minister if he is in a position to indicate what the government intends to do with the Dillon report. Scrap it is my recommendation. Secondly, would he establish a committee such as has been endorsed by every municipality in the regional municipality of Sudbury? Thirdly, would he let us get on with the job of utilizing that to provide services which are not there by establishing a multi-use centre and to provide jobs for an economy that's staggering because the mining industries continue to cut back and capitalize so intensely that we're losing jobs every day? I ask the minister to give me some indication of what he is prepared to do.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member, you will note that I have listened to each and every word that the honourable member has said tonight respecting Burwash. I was also listening to my colleagues on this side of the House. Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Government Services listens to all proposals. I am a little bit surprised to hear the member suggest that a decision was made in Ottawa before the report was presented. I believe he read out October 16 as the date I presented the report.

Mr. Martel: December 15 was the day you tabled it.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The date I tabled it was December 15? I don't have my file here with me tonight but it was a good two months before I heard back from our colleagues in Ottawa to the effect that the report was not suitable and they really didn't care about Sudbury. I think that you would have to say that.

Mr. M. Davidson: You mean the Liberals said that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I have listened to the member's suggestions. I can assure him that I will be rechecking them all. I will be visiting that area within a very few weeks and might well ask the member to accompany me out into the area.

I note a former colleague from Windsor in the gallery, if I might refer to him; Fred Burr, our former colleague. Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to speak to the

former member through you, I would have to tell you that when we served on the land drainage committee we were not made aware of this great agricultural land in the Sudbury East riding. I am a little shocked, a little disappointed that he didn't tell our committee—

Mr. Martel: It was a prison in those days.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: —when we travelled throughout that area and he really was not helpful to us.

Hon. Mr. Walker: That's the reason it was closed.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the report is a major one and as I said I will be in the area within a few weeks. By that time we will have recorded everything he has said tonight and will be looking at it. I thank him for his suggestions.

Mr. Martel: May I pursue it for one more moment? When the minister does come to the Sudbury area will he be in a position to indicate whether he will establish a committee of his own staff, who are very competent in the Sudbury area, select a group from the citizens at large, ask them to put together a multi-use concept utilizing that facility and then present it to government rather than this hunk of junk? I hate to call it that but it is.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, no, I would not give that assurance tonight. I want to go there first. I am not like some of the rest. I have never had the pleasure of spending a few days in that particular area.

Mr. Martel: I will take you around.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Black fly season.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Maybe we could go out and—

Mr. Martel: We will do that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, but I won't give you that assurance tonight. That may follow my visit, but at this moment I am not ready to make that commitment.

Mr. B. Newman: Last Thursday a resolution was debated in the House concerning the accessibility of government buildings to the physically handicapped. Does the minister have a program or a schedule indicating when and how he intends to improve the accessibility of various government buildings to those who are afflicted or have some type of a physical handicap?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the only response I could give the honourable member is that all of our new buildings are provided with the facilities to take care of

the handicapped and for several years now we have been working on the older government buildings to provide this service. We feel that we are well along with the project. If the honourable member has some buildings in mind where we have not done a full job, I would be very glad to hear about them.

[9:30]

Mr. B. Newman: I am not referring to any particular building; I am referring to a general policy and maybe a deadline by which the minister would hope to have most of the buildings made accessible to those with handicaps.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: As to setting a deadline, I really believe that deadline is here. That is the reason I would request him to advise me if there are some buildings where we have not done that. We believe we have provided access to all government buildings at present. There may be one or two we have missed out; if there are some, I would certainly appreciate the member's bringing them to my attention.

Mr. B. Newman: I couldn't name buildings that are or are not accessible, I am sure the minister understands the concern of all of us in this House. We would like to show to the handicapped that the discrimination that has been imposed on them in the past—the discrimination of accessibility—is going to be eliminated as quickly as we possibly can.

I want to ask of the minister if he is considering, for all provincial buildings, having parking areas specifically designated for the handicapped. The location of those areas would have to be as close as possible to the entrances to the building. I can see this building itself having parking areas at the back end as well as the front end, or at the east or west doors, so that the handicapped could have ready access to the inside of the building. Mind you, going in the east or west doors, or in the front door, there are all the stairs that make it extremely difficult; at the north door that problem is minimized a bit, but still it is a difficult task for the handicapped to go up those stairs.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member's suggestion, the handicapped get priorities in all our parking areas, wherever government buildings might be. We do give them priorities, and they are number one in our minds. I was here for part of the debate on the resolution last Thursday, and the honourable member will remember that our windup speaker, the member for Prescott-Russell (Mr. Belanger) who is not here tonight, did

offer the congratulations of this side of the House to the member who brought forth that resolution. We thought it was a good resolution, and our party did support it, as the honourable member will remember.

Mr. B. Newman: I know the minister would have parking areas available, but I think they should be designated, because the areas are taken over on sort of a first-come, first-served basis. I think we really should have one or two locations right at the front for those handicapped individuals who may come in by vehicle; they should be set aside and maybe even painted, as they do in a lot of the US centres, "For handicapped only," so that those who aren't handicapped, when they see a vacant spot, won't just plough right in with their vehicle.

I was very much impressed, in travelling on the freeways in the United States, to see how at all of the service centres there, spaces as close as possible to the door entrance to the service centre are set aside solely for the handicapped.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's point is well taken by the government. We don't think only of this building; we think of all our buildings.

To set space aside, this can be considered, but I am sure you would recognize that if we set two or three spaces aside, they would not be used most days. I would sooner feel that the attendants surrounding this building would be aware, and would see that the handicapped were taken care of by being given an appropriate parking space. It matters less who was here than that they be taken care of. I am sure they look on it that way.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, could I suggest that you actually designate them by marking them in some fashion, possibly by a sign? I know it means an expenditure of funds and I hesitate to suggest it because of that, but that's the least we can do for the handicapped, I think. I know you are concerned and I know everyone else is concerned, but I think we can express that concern visibly by identifying the location in some fashion.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, we will certainly look at this proposal.

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Minister, my colleague, the member for Sudbury East, has just brought to your attention some of the problems that exist with the vacant and unused section of land and buildings known as Burwash. On a smaller scale, I would like to refer back to a year ago when you and I had some discussion regarding another par-

cel of land that I understand now falls under your ministry. It contains, I believe, four dormitories, an auditorium, an arena and a swimming pool. It still sits empty within the community of Cambridge, with the exception of a portion which is being utilized by the Ministry of Correctional Services.

But I am given to understand that they have in fact now declared the rest of that lot surplus land and it now rests in your hands.

Can you inform me at the moment, what, if anything, is being done with regard to that property? I am aware that you are negotiating with the regional government for around six to seven acres that probably will be used for the site of a regional police headquarters.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman: Yes, this parcel of property does come under the Ministry of Government Services. Yes, the region has looked at buying six acres—a small portion of it. There are several buildings on it. Recently—not recently, maybe late December; I really don't have the date—but after the present mayor was sworn in at Cambridge, she and a lady controller came in to see me. I spent quite some time with them and got their ideas on the building.

I informed them at that time that if there was no proposal for some of the buildings we would erase most of the buildings on the property. But I told the mayor I would not do anything further—and I believe I gave her until about this time of the year; I think the end of April—to come back to me with a proposal. In view of that I just have not made any plans. I am waiting for her proposal from the municipal council.

I am sorry I cannot tell you whether that was December or January, but it was in that general time period when I had them in. We had a really good debate; they brought many things forward to me.

Mr. M. Davidson: Mr. Minister, when you say, "Erase the buildings," I hope you don't mean you are going to level them, I do not know whether you are aware or not that the buildings on that property have all been recently renovated. When it was in the hands of the Ministry of Correctional Services as a juvenile centre thousands and thousands of dollars were spent converting those buildings into what supposedly was going to be a co-educational centre. If you are talking about levelling those buildings on that property, you are talking about throwing somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$400,000 of the taxpayers' money out the window. I do not know how you can explain to the people of Ontario that that is in fact what you intend to do.

Before I go into what I want to say, I understand you have allowed the community the use of the arena; you have allowed the community the use of the swimming pool; and you have allowed the community the use of the auditorium. For that, I am sure everyone in the Cambridge area is grateful.

Certainly, I don't see how you can justify tearing down the dormitories and living accommodation after more money has been put into them because you can't find any other use for them. I don't know what proposals the city has recommended to you. I know they have held discussions and I know they probably are still holding discussions as to what can be done.

There are many organizations within the community of Cambridge who are trying to assist people. For example, we have a group of volunteers who are providing a form of halfway house for alcoholics and drug addicts. They rely primarily on grants from the region of Waterloo in order to conduct and operate this kind of program. Out of those grants they must pay rent. Your ministry is paying out money to maintain that land and those buildings at the present time, and I am quite sure you could provide accommodation at a lower rental cost than these people are currently paying.

We have a group of volunteers in the city of Cambridge who are trying to provide some assistance to battered wives and battered children. They are conducting their operation by trying to raise funds and relying on grants from both the municipality and the region. Their purpose is to set up a place where, if a wife is being beaten in her home, or the children are being beaten in their home by a male parent, there is a place for them to go. There are people there who understand those problems and deal with those problems and can look after them in those circumstances. They also rent a place and I am quite sure you could provide a place for those people at a lower rent than they are now paying.

In the communities of Cambridge and North Dumfries township the list of volunteer groups that are doing these kinds of things in an effort to help people goes on and on.

I would think, Mr. Minister, that rather than suggest tearing those buildings down—you are paying the cost on the property in any event; you are carrying the cost of looking after it—you could probably recoup some of that expenditure by providing space to these groups within the communities of Cambridge and North Dumfries which are attempting to help people.

By doing that, you would be not only maintaining the buildings as they are—as I said,

they have been renovated at a cost of thousands of dollars—you would at the same time be helping to provide a service to the community. You would also, in some way, be getting some remuneration in the form of rent. I don't know what kind of rent you would ask, but I am quite sure that, knowing you and the kind heart you have, you would certainly give them a better deal than they are getting at the present time in the locations they have.

Believe me, they are doing good work, Mr. Minister. They are doing excellent work in the fields in which they are working. They could get that kind of help from your ministry at the present time, until some decision is made as to what will be done.

I can well see I am probably going to be standing here again this time next year asking you what is happening with the Grandview School property. The buildings will still be there. The auditorium will still be there. The arena will still be there. The swimming pool will still be there. The 250 acres of land, or whatever amount it is, will still be there. If you could only utilize it for the betterment of the people in the community, then really we wouldn't have to be asking these questions.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the main reasons I brought this to the attention of her worship, the mayor. I wanted to make her aware, as the situation now stands, the government doesn't have any use for those buildings.

The heating plant is not the best. If we continue with those buildings as they are for many more years, it is going to involve great expense just to maintain them. I felt by informing her worship that we would erase them if there was no use for them, this would make her aware of the situation. I am sure she will come forth with the community groups, or at least that is what we are hoping.

I think the deadline was the end of April. I told her we were quite flexible, and if she needed another week or two at that time, yes. We're out for the good of all the people of Ontario.

I would suggest that you should bring your proposal to the attention of her worship.

[9:45]

Mr. M. Davidson: I certainly will do that. As a matter of fact, I will attempt to contact her first thing tomorrow to find out what, if anything, the city council has decided with regard to any proposals it may be putting forward to you. I will also contact some of these other groups I have mentioned to you and ask them, if they are interested, to contact the

mayor of the community and request her on their behalf to get in touch with you and let them know that they are interested.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss with the minister his policy in regard to preservation of some of our historic sites in this province. As he knows, a couple of weeks ago we passed a bill in this Legislature which gave the title of the courthouse in Middlesex county to the county of Middlesex. It received support on all sides of the House, except maybe from the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson). Even his comments were perhaps critical of what had been the failure of a committee from London Centre.

The member for Huron-Middlesex (Mr. Riddell) apparently gave lip service to it too. I say that because I understand from one of my colleagues that I got considerable criticism from him in the estimates of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications for not being there. I have been standing by here, waiting to get on to discuss this particular item.

As far as I'm concerned, all the member for Huron-Middlesex has given to this particular project is lip service. In fact, I can remember being at two or three openings in his portion of Middlesex county at which he wasn't present. I feel it's rather small of him criticizing me for not being down in that committee when I was waiting to do a service for Middlesex county. I hope some of the members of the Liberal Party will relate that to the member for Huron-Middlesex who is down in that committee and who brought on those personal remarks.

The situation with the London-Middlesex courthouse has been going on for some time. It's been one that many of us had wanted to see proceed because it's a rather historic site, not only to that area but to the province of Ontario. We felt it was proceeding extremely well. The Minister of Government Services brought in a bill to turn over the title to the courthouse. He had committed \$800,000 to that project to see the preservation of that historic site.

He had committed that money on the basis that the federal government would be committing \$800,000 to the same project in preserving the courthouse and that the county of Middlesex would be committing \$600,000 to that same project to do some things that were probably beyond the preservation that they had to do because they were going to use the building for administration at the same time. It is a very practical use to preserve it as a historic site and at the same time have it for the functioning of the administration of the county of Middlesex.

I'd like to look back over several letters that have come out over the period of our discussions. Those were discussions in which I took part before this particular minister was in his chair and since that minister has come to the job. Since then, he has certainly made it proceed with much expedition.

I refer back to August 9, 1977, at which time a letter was sent to the clerk of the county from the Ontario region of Parks Canada. It is signed by a Mr. Christakos, a director of that branch. The letter indicates that the federal government would be prepared "to enter into a cost-sharing agreement on a 50-50 basis between the provincial government and Parks Canada in restoring the courthouse." That was the first indication we had that they would share 50-50 with the province in providing the funds for the restoration of the courthouse.

I refer to a letter of only one month later received in September in the county clerk's office, actually dated August 31, from Susan Smith, special assistant in the office of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in which she indicated:

"As you are now aware, according to our mandate, Parks Canada is willing to participate on a 50-50 basis with the province of Ontario," once again referring to the restoration of the courthouse.

I think from our discussions, and I understand from correspondence that I have from the minister, he was of the understanding that Parks Canada would be sharing with the province on a 50-50 basis on the restoration. The province was willing to put up to \$800,000 into this project, and I took from our meetings, and I'm sure the minister did too, that the federal government was willing to put \$800,000 into the restoration project. The county had originally indicated \$300,000 and then, after some further discussion, indicated that they would go for \$600,000.

Basically, this broke down to a cost of \$1,600,000 for the restoration of the project; \$800,000 from the province and \$800,000 from the federal government and the \$600,000 being for additional factors that would come about for their administrative use. I would quote from a letter from the minister, dated October 5, 1978, in which he indicated that because of our discussions at a meeting he was prepared to see that the land which had a cloud on the title was turned over to the county of Middlesex. I quote from his letter to our warden:

"In addition, I will be prepared to execute an agreement on behalf of the province of Ontario with the appropriate federal

government minister and yourself by which each party agrees to contribute to the cost of rehabilitation of the courthouse building. Under this agreement the province will agree to pay up to a maximum of \$800,000 for the restoration work providing the federal government will contribute a like amount and the county will contribute approximately \$600,000 towards additional costs required for the rehabilitation of the building to the needs of the county."

I think the minister made a pretty firm commitment. His word is usually pretty sound on things like that and I certainly am one who respects it as do the members of this House.

We had meetings in January at which staff of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development of the federal government were present. It was certainly my opinion that they were making that same commitment that if the province put up \$800,000 and turned the land over to the county of Middlesex, they would put up \$800,000 and that the county would pick up that difference.

A letter from the minister, of January 26, 1979, to the Honourable Hugh Faulkner, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, indicated the same thing:

"During our meeting, we discussed the letter of January 3, 1979, to Mr. Eddy and the cost breakdown provided by the architect was reviewed. Mr. Smith of Parks Canada was most helpful during this discussion and advised the county representative that it might be possible for a grant to be made by your department once all of the requirements had been met prior to the decision to proceed. He indicated that if approved the grant from your department would be a one-time payment and there would be no possibility of additional future subsidies."

The letter goes on to state, and I quote from it:

"It appeared to the county, and to me also"—and I might interject at that point, to myself also, who was present at the meeting—"that it might be appropriate for the governments of Canada and Ontario to share equally in a cost of restoring a heritage building, but the two governments should not also be responsible for the cost of the interior work required specifically by the county. This proposal would divide the cost in the following manner: Government of Canada \$800,000, government of Ontario \$800,000, and county of Middlesex \$600,000."

Since that letter went to the Honourable Hugh Faulkner, the county has received fur-

ther correspondence, and I would quote from that:

"There appears to be some confusion, however, on the method of cost sharing. [This is from Hugh Faulkner.] The maximum cost level of \$800,000".

At that point he agrees to the maximum cost factor of \$800,000, but then he starts to back off. He indicates there appears to be some confusion on the method of cost sharing:

"As indicated in past correspondence, we are prepared to share equally in the cost of restoration aspects of the courthouse with the county of Middlesex as the landowner and the provincial government."

Here is where he starts to renege, because before he had indicated quite clearly, through two members of his staff, that they were prepared to share equally with the province of Ontario up to \$800,000. I further quote from his letter:

"Accordingly, as expressed in my letter of January 3, 1979, to the county of Middlesex, we are ready to enter into an agreement for the restoration on a cost-sharing formula of 33-1/3 per cent to each party. Any costs other than for the restoration would be outside the terms of agreement."

I think everybody at all the meetings we attended agreed that any costs other than restoration would be carried by the county of Middlesex, but the cost of restoration would be shared equally between the province of Ontario and the county of Middlesex.

I believe this Minister of Government Services has carried forth his commitment on this. We have certainly seen a speedy movement by the province in seeing that the bill was carried through—it was the first bill given royal assent in this session—to ensure that the county of Middlesex would get ownership of this particular property. Now the federal government seems to be backing off on the agreement.

After some two years of working on this particular agreement, not to say four or five years of working to save that historic site in our province, we now find that the federal authorities are backing off.

I want to know the minister's position on this; whether the Ontario commitment of \$800,000 still stands. Certainly I know the bill turning the property over has already been passed, as committed. We had indications from local federal members that the federal government was going to share in this, but the local members have never given a commitment as to how much. Unfortunately, I guess they are like the member for Huron-Middlesex; they gave lip service to it but they never got directly involved in it. They

weren't at the meetings we had, and they have really never given their personal commitment to it as have some members of the county council; nor have they given the time that has been given by council members, by me personally and, since he has become involved, that the minister has given to this project.

I would ask the minister to clarify the provincial position on it and say what he feels the federal government has done; if it is reneging on its position, and if he will in some way pressure the federal government at this point to live up to its commitment of \$800,000 shared equally with the province to make it possible to restore this historic site.

If the federal government has backed down to one third of the cost and we meet that equally, it means the share for the county of Middlesex will go from \$600,000 up to probably \$1,000,000 and maybe \$1,200,000. It will just be impossible for the county to carry it. The county cannot do that on its own.

I have already heard from some of our county councillors who have thrown up their arms and said: "We just can't do it. We will let it deteriorate. We will let it go."

There are people in Middlesex who are far more committed to it than that. They have worked hard on it for a number of years. We feel the federal government has pulled the rug out from under them. Maybe you have some further information from your discussions with the federal government. Mr. Minister, I would ask you what you have received in commitment from them. What can you do to see this historic site is saved?
[10.00]

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the member for Middlesex, I would have to concede and admit I am very disappointed in the present status of this project.

Not many weeks ago, I went to the House leader of that night of the New Democratic Party, to request third reading on the bill before the House. I was told their party wanted a chance for their critic to be here to speak to it. I informed them that in October I presented to the county of Middlesex the letter to which the member for Middlesex has referred. I made it quite clear in that letter I felt the moneys mentioned firstly were for the refurbishing of this building.

Middlesex is left in a very peculiar position with this building. In 1963, Parks Canada had this declared as a building that should be preserved and maintained. Following this of course, there was a new provincial courtroom, a new jail. Middlesex county themselves built new buildings only to find they

have a piece of property with a building on it they cannot tear down. They don't know where to go or what to do with it.

The Minister of Government Services has a letter of February 1978 from the federal minister, the Honourable Mr. Faulkner, in which he reassures the federal member, Larry Condon. He refers to the letter you referred to of August 1977. He referred to that letter and stated that the offer of that time is a firm offer and they are quite willing to carry out the proposal of August 1977.

Just to reaffirm that, clause one of that offer definitely stated the government of Canada were willing to share on a 50-50 basis with the government of Ontario the refurbishing of this building, or they would go one third for Canada, one third for Ontario, and one third for Middlesex in refurbishing it.

Middlesex have a county building. They don't need this building for themselves. With this thought in mind, my letter of October and my meeting with the Middlesex committee was to confirm that we, as the province, felt the government of Canada and the government of Ontario should refurbish this building.

The architect appointed by Middlesex estimated the cost of the refurbishing of this building at \$1,600,000, so my offer of \$800,000 was half of that estimate. He also, in the same estimate, proposed that the cost of updating the building to today's needs—air conditioning, an elevator to help the handicapped and what have you—would be an additional \$600,000. I felt the county of Middlesex should bear that.

Early in January I got a copy of a proposed contract from the government of Canada. I got a letter which said they had backed off from the 50-50 to one third. I felt there definitely must be a mistake. A letter I received some three weeks ago says there is no mistake. The government of Canada have said that they will pay a third of the cost of refurbishing.

They will provide nothing for the updating of this building. Nothing at all.

As the member for Middlesex has suggested, the government of Canada have suggested the architect's estimate of \$1,600,000 is quite likely outdated and will not meet today's needs. The cost will quite likely run to \$2,400,000.

I regret to have to report this to the House tonight. I have met with the Middlesex committee. They are convinced that Middlesex cannot proceed, as suggested by the member. If Parks Canada's estimate of \$2,400,000 is correct, Middlesex would have to spend some \$800,000 for the renovation. If their architect

is that badly out on the refurbishing, their estimate on the updating must be out as well. Middlesex already has a county building, and sufficient area and accommodation space. So the county would possibly end up spending maybe another \$700,000 to \$800,000—\$1,500,000 which is not necessary, as far as they're concerned.

Yes, the member for Middlesex is correct. I am disappointed. I could read several letters in here that I feel were firm commitments. I let the federal minister know of my disappointment and I believe Middlesex county has let the government of Canada know. It's very disappointing.

I would only add that when I went to Middlesex last October we were looking ahead one year. It was our thought that that contract with the government of Canada could be closed by February of this year. The architect at that time suggested to us that if the contract could be completed in that four to five months he could have the building ready for tender calls in July. This is what I went over with the New Democratic Party when we were debating the bill to clear up the ownership; that tenders could be called in July with the contract to be awarded in September. Work would start in October and thereby create employment in the London area for the upcoming winter.

Now you can fully realize the position in which it has put the architect and the county of Middlesex. Action is going to have to be pretty quick for that architect to call tenders. If I were a Middlesex county councillor, I don't believe I could accept the present position that the honourable minister of the government of Canada has put them in.

Mr. Eaton: A further question of the minister: The minister agrees then that throughout our discussions this was the indication; there would be an \$800,000 sharing. We still feel and the architects still feel that we can do it within that amount. If you will support that position, you then support the position that Middlesex felt they had an agreement with the federal government and you will work towards establishing that agreement still, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, as Minister of Government Services I would have to take it a step further and tell you that the federal minister reinforced—I just want to bring it out again—that in a letter of February, 1978, to Larry Condon, the federal member for the larger portion of Middlesex county. In it, he reaffirmed—

Mr. Eaton: Only after May 22.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Well, of course, I am possibly going to end up referring to May 22 but this summer—

Mr. Ruston: A federal election campaign is going on, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The letter of February 1978 from the federal minister reaffirmed the position of August 1977. The letter that I received from the federal minister some three weeks or a month ago put forth a different position.

Yes, the offer of the government of Ontario stands firm, sound—whatever you want to say. We would like to see the building refurbished. But, in the present position, I say again: if I were a county councillor in Middlesex, I would have a difficult time convincing myself that they should proceed under the present proposal.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening with interest the last while as the member for Middlesex discussed the problem they had with their historical site. It seems as if we are running a kind of secondary election campaign in the federal election, involving the member for Middlesex and the Minister of Government Services. It seems as if they are working on a little plan here.

I believe \$800,000, \$800,000 and \$600,000 come to \$2,200,000. Generally the normal procedure when a municipality owns property and the province and the federal government make agreements to supply money or whatever the case might be—and we had one or two cases in our own area in the past number of years—is that the federal government agrees to contribute on a one third, one third, one third basis. Where the province owns the property, the cost-sharing is done on a 50-50 basis. Since the property is now in the name of the county, then naturally the federal government contribution would under normal procedure revert to a one third, one third, one third basis.

I am not protecting anybody or speaking for anybody, but I am just looking at the situation. This is the general procedure I have seen in agreements in our area. I am wondering what the minister might have to say with regard to that specific point. That would then mean \$733,000 on an equal basis by the federal government, the province and the county. It would mean less money from the province, but it would also mean \$133,000 more from the county. That is the figure that was quoted by the member for Middlesex.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I want to read a portion of a letter here, but first let me clarify the last part.

The government of Canada's contract under clause two of its proposed contract definitely singles out the refurbishing as one item that it will share in. The cost of the refurbishing, according to the architect appointed by the county of Middlesex, is \$1,600,000. As to updating the building, as I said earlier, the cost of air conditioning, partitions within and changing offices comes to \$600,000. The government of Canada has made it quite clear that it will not share in that \$600,000 at all.

You are all pretty reasonable people. I could read you paragraph one of this letter, but I would like to read you paragraph two. I would have to tell you that I personally had not been involved previously in the refurbishing of an historic building. This is the first one I have been involved in where the three levels of government might be involved. This is a letter signed by a director for the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

It says: "The Middlesex county courthouse was declared of national and historic importance by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada in 1955. In 1963, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board recommended federal assistance towards preservation of this historic structure. These recommendations form the basis for Parks Canada's mandate for involvement with respect to the restoration and preservation of the courthouse.

"Within our mandate we can only concern ourselves with the courthouse. In addition, our involvement must be on the basis of actual costs incurred for acquisition, restoration and preservation in an equality-shared arrangement."

[10:15]

I want you to really listen to what follows and you can form an opinion the same as I did. "For the past number of years, the following options have been under discussion with the city and the province of Ontario: (a) a cost-sharing agreement on a 50-50 basis between the provincial government and Parks Canada; or (b) a cost-sharing arrangement with Parks Canada, the local government and the province of Ontario each contributing 33⅓ per cent of the total cost. With either option it will be necessary for the property to be brought under the administration and control of the local government as a party to the agreement."

Those particular three lines are very important. They have made it clear that it must be owned by the local government. Furthermore, it is essential that all parties to the

cost-sharing agreement fully participate in such an undertaking. That letter was dated August 9, 1977.

I have another letter here signed by the minister, the Honourable J. Hugh Faulkner. The date on it is the date Larry Condon, the local federal member, received it, February 7. The clerk of Middlesex received it on February 20, 1978.

After I became minister and more or less got my feet under me, I met with Middlesex. I had them here one morning and I felt I did not understand it fully. At that time, I had a member of staff go into it and I got a full updated report. That is when I was convinced we, as the province, and the government of Canada should pay the cost of refurbishing this building. That was the basis of my letter of October 1978. I hoped we would be given a year's advance to make winter works projects for the fall and winter of 1979 and 1980.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Minister, you said sharing the refurbishing which was \$1,600,000, which is \$800,000.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That is the architect appointed by Middlesex. There is a little discrepancy there in the letter I have received from the federal minister. It gets a little more than that. This letter was dated April 2. I won't go into details. You would say that was getting political. It gets a little different.

Mr. Ruston: You still read in a letter the municipality owns it. The federal government said in their letter from Mr. Faulkner it would be one third, one third and one third. I am having trouble figuring out where you got the share of refurbishing of \$1,600,000, which is \$800,000. We have another figure of \$600,000 for other work which brings it to \$2,200,000. In the letter you were reading you did say under a cost-sharing agreement the province and Parks Canada would pay 50-50, but when the ownership comes to the municipality it is one third, one third, one third. I must say from what I have heard so far, I think there is a misunderstanding either by someone in your ministry or from Middlesex county as to what Parks Canada was saying in its letter.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I will be very glad to give the honourable member a copy of the letter of August 1977 that Parks Canada sent to Middlesex. I will be very glad to give him a copy of the letter sent by the minister to Larry Condon, the local MP, which Middlesex received on February 20, 1978. I will be very glad to supply him with a copy of my letter to Middlesex of October

1978, and a copy of the letter the minister sent to me, dated April 2. In between there is another letter he sent to the clerk of Middlesex in January 1979.

In the letter of August 1977, Parks Canada left "(a) a cost-sharing agreement on a 50-50 basis between the provincial government and Parks Canada; or, (b)"—and they put the word "or" in there; either/or—"a cost-sharing agreement where Parks Canada, the local government and the province of Ontario each contribute 33-1/3 per cent."

The next paragraph: "In either option it will be necessary for the property to be brought under the administration and control of the local government as the party to the agreement." That was following either (a) or (b).

Let me try to clear up the difference in the estimates of cost. An independent architect appointed by the county of Middlesex, an individual whom I have met only in the presence of the Middlesex county council, made it quite clear to the committee of county council and to myself—the member for Middlesex was also on hand—that the cost of refurbishing was \$1,600,000. That figure is still good in his mind with today's dollar, with tendering in the midsummer of this year.

The cost of updating the building—the air conditioning, elevators and other things—is \$600,000. That is from the consultant architect appointed by Middlesex county. In the letter that I received from the minister last week, dated April 2, he pointed out that the estimated cost of refurbishing would be \$2,200,000. Now, we don't have that figure; that is the figure he quoted in the letter. He doesn't document who said that, but that is the figure the federal minister quoted. He pointed out that with the escalation of costs it would quite likely run to \$2,400,000 for the refurbishing, not for the updating.

He went on to say that the federal government would be willing to pay one third of the cost of the refurbishing.

Mr. Ruston: Up to \$2,400,000?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Up to \$2,400,000.

Mr. Ruston: One third of \$2,400,000?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. Up to \$800,000; but only on the basis of thirds, not on a 50-50 basis. I will quite gladly supply you with the letters from which I took this, not my staff. It

was this minister who read the letter and felt it was a firm commitment, as did the members of Middlesex county council.

Mr. Ruston: In other words, they are committing themselves to the original \$800,000 that you felt they were going to give?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: They commit themselves to \$800,000, provided the cost is \$2,400,000, and provided Middlesex puts in \$800,000 towards the refurbishing. Then, in addition to that, Middlesex still has to update the building, which the Middlesex architect says will cost \$600,000. But I say to you, if he is out that badly in his estimates on the refurbishing, it will likely cost \$800,000. So this would put Middlesex at \$1,500,000 or \$1,600,000 for a building they really don't need but are hooked with because it was declared an historic building under Parks Canada, back in 1953.

Mr. Ruston: I thought I understood the minister to say that the \$1,600,000 for refurbishing was a pretty firm estimate.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes.

Mr. Ruston: So why are they then saying \$2,400,000?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I don't know.

Mr. Ruston: Don't you think they're putting the updating and air conditioning and elevators into it?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No.

Mr. Ruston: It looks like it.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No. They make it quite clear in the proposed contract that it is only the refurbishing.

Mr. Ruston: You had better put that all in at the same time when you refurbish it. Then you would get your \$800,000.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No. The proposed contract they have presented us with doesn't permit the updating.

Mr. Ruston: I think it is a matter of interpretation, Mr. Chairman, and I wouldn't care to go on any further. I really think it has to be a matter of interpretation, and probably a bit of a political football. So I would prefer to let it go at that.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Henderson, the committee of supply reported progress.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

Estimates, Ministry of Government Services, continued, Mr. Henderson	1033
Adjournment	1056

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Ashe, G. (Durham West PC)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Walkerville NDP)
 Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
 Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
 Edighoffer, H.; Chairman (Perth L)
 Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour and Manpower (York East PC)
 Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Deputy Chairman (Humber PC)
 Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
 Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Taylor, G. (Simcoe Centre PC)
 Taylor, J. A. (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
 Van Horne, R. (London North L)
 Walker, Hon. G.; Minister of Correctional Services (London South PC)
 Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
 Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)



Ontario

No. 25

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Thursday, April 19, 1979

Afternoon Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1979

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

DEATH OF DR. ROBERT JACKSON

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I believe all the citizens of Ontario are aware, and I am sure deeply saddened to learn, of the death yesterday of Dr. Robert W. B. Jackson in a tragic motor vehicle accident in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Dr. Jackson was recognized as one of Canada's outstanding educators. He served as the first director of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education from 1965 to 1975 and was largely responsible for establishing that institution as an educational facility with international acclaim. Upon retirement from the institute, Dr. Jackson moved to Halifax to become the senior research associate at the Atlantic Institute of Education.

In August 1977 Dr. Jackson was appointed by my predecessor as a one-man commission to study the effects and the implications of declining school enrolments in Ontario. The scope of that inquiry by the commission was the most comprehensive on the subject of declining enrolment ever undertaken anywhere on this continent. Over a 15-month period Dr. Jackson assembled a group of eminent Canadian researchers, who produced a large volume of research material on this topic. That material is being widely used by educators in Ontario faced with the problems of declining enrolment. I should like the House to know that requests for research reports have been received from many other provinces and from several other countries as well.

On behalf of the government of the province of Ontario I should like to extend our sincere sympathy and our condolences to Dr. Jackson's family, his widow Heather and his two sons. I should like the members of the House to know that the funeral service for Dr. Jackson will be held tomorrow in Halifax, but at the same time in Toronto there will be a memorial service held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Educa-

tion auditorium, 252 Bloor Street West, at 2 p.m.

Mr. Cassidy: On behalf of my party I would simply like to express our feelings of deep sympathy and regret to the family of Dr. Jackson, who died yesterday in a tragic accident in the Halifax area. Dr. Jackson has provided to this province, and I believe also to this country, long service in the area of education and a great deal of leadership.

While members of this House know we had some reservations about parts of the recent report he was preparing for the government, we felt the final document he prepared on the area of declining enrolments, which reflected his lifetime of experience in the area of education, had excellent recommendations to make. We would only wish that, as a tribute to his contribution to education, the government had been prepared to put the recommendations of that report into practice.

I want to join with the Minister of Education in expressing our regret. We would have hoped that Dr. Jackson could have continued to make a contribution as the elder statesman of education in this province and not had his life cut short in such a tragic way.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word at this time on behalf of the official opposition—a word of condolence to the family of the late Dr. Jackson, and a word to indicate how much the citizens of Ontario have to appreciate people who devote themselves to public causes and who take on, even at later stages in their lives when they could well decide simply to enjoy leisure time, very difficult and onerous duties in the public interest. Dr. Jackson was such a person. In that regard we certainly owe a lot to the late gentleman and certainly want to give our sincere condolences to the family.

TRAINING SCHOOL CLOSURES

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members will recall that in February 1978 I announced a three-phase plan to reduce the number of provincial training schools to three or four and to provide

alternative forms of treatment in the community for children who are wards of the juvenile corrections system. Under the plan only those who are a danger to themselves or to others and require special care will be placed in a training school.

Research has questioned the necessity of institutionalization for many juvenile delinquents. Alternative types of community care have shown positive results for this type of child. At the same time, the populations of our training schools have been dropping because of an overall decrease in the numbers of children in the 12-to-16 age group, the use of community group homes, and shorter and fewer committals to training schools by juvenile-court judges.

The first changes affecting training schools took place when Elmcrest School in Toronto was closed in 1973 and Grandview School in Cambridge was closed in 1976. Last year Hillcrest Training School in Guelph was closed. The wards of the training school in Hagersville were transferred to more modern facilities at the Sprucedale School in Simcoe.

Even with last year's closing, the training-school system has more room for wards than can be justified by reason of either program or budget. The maximum capacity of all our existing training schools is approximately 850. Under present conditions only about 450 wards are in residence at peak periods of the year. Operating any type of institution below capacity is clearly not an effective use of either financial or staff resources for ensuring the most appropriate type of care for these children.

Today, therefore, officials of my ministry are meeting with employees of the Kawartha Lakes School in Lindsay and Pine Ridge School in Bowmanville, to announce that those institutions will be closing as training schools later this year. The Lindsay school will close July 31; the Bowmanville school will close October 31.

Under the new policy for care and treatment of juvenile offenders I announced last year, we still require a training school for each of our province's major regions. The opening of Sprucedale in Simcoe ensured adequate facilities for western Ontario. Cecil Facer School in Sudbury is the only training school in the north and will continue to serve that region. In eastern Ontario we have four training schools. In addition to the two which will close we have Brookside School in Cobourg and Champlain School in Alfred near Ottawa.

We chose Pine Ridge and Kawartha Lakes for closure because both schools are felt to

be unsuitable for use in our overall plan for juveniles found to be delinquent.

I would like to reassure the honourable members concerning provisions made for the employees and wards of the Kawartha Lakes and Pine Ridge schools.

The two employee unions concerned, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and the Federation of Provincial School Authority Teachers, have been advised of the changes. Senior officials of my ministry are informing the staff of both schools and community leaders of our decision and our reasons today.

Classified civil servants at both Kawartha Lakes and Pine Ridge will be offered other jobs within the ministry and government which utilize their skills and experience. There are sufficient vacancies within the government to offer alternative positions to these employees.

Children placed in training schools stay an average of five months. This means that most children in Pine Ridge will have graduated by October 31. Many will also have left Kawartha Lakes by July 31. In the six remaining schools we have ample space for any remaining wards.

A comprehensive review of Champlain School in Alfred is under way and we hope to develop a program there that will benefit a wider range of children than are presently being served. It is our intention to develop a broader use for this school with its 163 acres of land and buildings.

A special school, Project DARE in South River, will be maintained, but not as a training school. Its unique Outward Bound program will be made available to a wider range of juveniles, not only training school wards.

I know concerns have been expressed that in reducing the capacity of the training school system, the province will be returning difficult-to-manage children to communities that may not be fully prepared to deal with them. We will continue to place children in the community only when and where there is appropriate care for them. The closures I have announced today will allow us to reallocate funds to develop new alternative programs in the community.

Group homes for juvenile offenders have been a feature of the correctional system for several years. We will continue to develop other kinds of community programs, including specialized foster care and selective intervention, which give individual support to wards who are able to live in the community.

During the planning stage of these closures, we asked the federal government and all

other Ontario ministries if they could use any of the training school facilities for other purposes. While none was in a position to do so, I sincerely hope that by making our plans public today, we can more easily approach business, industry, municipalities and private groups to find uses for lands and buildings in Lindsay and Bowmanville. Residents of both of these communities have proved to be excellent hosts to our training schools over the years. We plan to work actively with these communities and other ministries to develop new job opportunities.

Mr. Mancini: That's why you're taking them away?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Finally, I would like to stress that the changes I have announced today—the closing of two training schools, the new roles for two others, the more efficient use of the remaining schools and the development of more community resources—are all part of our long-term program to make better use of the funds at our disposal and to provide improved types of care and rehabilitation for delinquent juveniles in our province.

GO TRANSIT TICKETING FACILITIES

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would like to advise the House today that the Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority, which administers GO Transit, is about to embark on a program to assume the operation of GO Transit ticketing facilities with its own staff, phasing out the existing contractor, Canadian National Railways, over a two-year period.

The phasing-out procedure has been adopted following my discussions with my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Elgie), Cliff Pilkey, president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, and representatives of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers. It was agreed that the changeover would minimize the effect on the 80 CN staff involved.

In a subsequent meeting I had with Mr. A. R. Williams, CN vice-president of the Great Lakes region, I was assured that CN will have little difficulty reassigning existing staff within the company during the transitional period; and further, CN will do everything in its power to minimize any possible adverse effects on its employees.

The change in staffing procedures will enable TATO to unify GO Transit's complex ticketing function throughout the entire area served by the system.

[2:15]

ORGANIZED CRIME

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Legislature the contents of a letter I have received signed by some 52 members of the Italian-Canadian community which was prompted by the recent Canadian Broadcasting Corporation production titled *Connections*. This letter is signed by 52 people, as I mentioned, including labourers and professionals, businessmen and union leaders, teachers and students.

I will read an excerpt from the letter and then table it. I would also like to deal briefly with some matters raised here on April 9 by the members for Downsview (Mr. di Santo), for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) and for Rainy River (Mr. T. P. Reid).

The letter, briefly, reads as follows:

"This program has improperly created the impression among the viewing public that the Italian-Canadian community is riddled with members associated with organized crime. It is a well-known fact that presently and historically our community is, and has been, as law abiding as any other in this province.

"Our greatest concern is the adverse psychological and social effects which this program has had on our children who, we hope, will be among the future leaders of our country. The unspoken reality is that innocent children are continually being taunted simply because of their cultural heritage.

"We certainly lend our support to the efforts of any media source in their attempt to surface these kinds of issues and inform all citizens about criminal activities in any community. However, the CBC must recognize the effect of journalism which, in our opinion, has created an image that the Italian-Canadian community as a group condones elements of crime. Our community, like all other communities, assists in and wholeheartedly supports the enforcement of law and order for the well-being of all citizens.

"Our comments are couched in words of disappointment and sorrow rather than anger, since a community of approximately 600,000, ranging from the professional to the labourer, from the child to the elderly, and who have had and will continue to contribute, now have been maligned by being cast among the handful shown by the CBC."

I have great sympathy with the sentiments that are contained in this letter. There, of course, should be no doubt about the truly phenomenal contributions that Canadians of Italian origin have made to this province. The evidence is all around us, be it social, cultural, charitable or political.

As someone born and raised in Metropolitan Toronto, I personally have experienced how much our community and our lifestyle has benefited by our Italian-Canadian citizens.

As Attorney General and Solicitor General I am in regular contact with law enforcement officials and I have no hesitation in stating once again that the Italian-Canadian community is as law abiding as any other community in the province.

Members asked last week whether I would make a statement on the status of our continuing law enforcement efforts against organized crime as a result of the CBC program.

I want to emphasize that the key individuals identified on the program in this jurisdiction have been convicted and imprisoned or are now before the courts on a variety of charges. Unfortunately, the program made little or no mention of this fact and because of that viewers may have been left with an inaccurate impression of the activities of the police agencies and the administration of justice.

Several years ago the three major police forces involved in the fight against organized crime—the Ontario Provincial Police, the Metropolitan Toronto police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—formed a tri-force task force. In early 1977, I directed that senior members of my ministry be available to advise the task force on a continuing basis.

As a result, senior officials of the crown law office are consulted by and advise members of the task force at regular intervals in the course of every major investigation. In addition, there are regular meetings and exchanges of intelligence information that have enabled us to develop expertise in both the investigation and prosecution of organized criminal activities. Counsel in the crown law office have also participated in intensive courses dealing with the prosecution of organized crime at Cornell University.

Both the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of the Solicitor General are, of course, committed to this effort. The government stands ready to provide additional financial assistance to the police for use in this regard as we did in 1977 when an extra \$1.25 million was allotted to the OPP.

Through this concerted effort charges have been laid against approximately 250 persons involved in organized criminal activities in the past two years. This, as I have already mentioned, includes most of the individuals identified on the CBC program.

Among the charges are several involving complex conspiracies. Others involve loan-sharking, extortion, counterfeiting, gambling,

burglary, theft, forgery, fraud and other criminal rackets. These prosecutions are as a result of intensive investigation into patterns of criminal activity that are planned and organized by persons acting in concert, to paraphrase the law-enforcement definition of organized crime.

As I have said on previous occasions, it is a significant fact that the number of convictions of organized-crime members brought about as a result of the tri-force effort has exceeded that of any other comparable jurisdiction in North America during the period the task force has been in operation.

It is the view of the police and counsel in the crown law office criminal that the fight against organized crime can most effectively be waged by established police methods; that is, gathering evidence on which to secure convictions in court. It is the police view—and I share it—that a public inquiry at this time would interfere with a number of investigations under way and with the cases currently before the courts, and would simply not be as effective as the task-force approach.

ORAL QUESTIONS

REED PAPER COMPANY

Mr. S. Smith: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott), who is not here. But I also have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources; I see him arriving now.

Could the minister comment on the allegations regarding the cut of Reed Limited? Could the minister explain whether in fact it's true that in the southern portion of Reed's timber rights they have exceeded the annual allowable cut by some 50 per cent? Could he comment on whether this represents good forestry practice?

If he wishes to deny this report would he be good enough to give us some explanation for how this report arose and to bring us up to date on the actual figures with regard to the allowable cut in the southern portion of Reed's timber limits?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I really don't know how the report was put over the air—as I understand it, in Thunder Bay by CBQ, I believe it was—

Mr. Foulds: It was from your ministry's figures. It is from figures supplied by your ministry.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That's right, but the figures they used were not the figures that were supplied by our ministry.

In the southern working circle, there are two areas that Reed has for a period of, I

think, some 20 or 25 years. The actual cut from the spruce working group is less than the approved allowable cut over the last five years. In the northern working circle, the actual cut from the spruce working group has been slightly higher than the approved allowable cut over the last 15 years.

Reed has advised us that since 1969 the company has spent approximately \$4.5 million on road and bridge construction and maintenance in the northern working circle to distribute its cutting operation more properly. This will result in the balancing of the spruce allowable cut over both working circles, which is a situation totally acceptable to the ministry.

I might add that the allowable cut is generally based over a period. Quite often companies will exceed it in one year and be well below in the following year, for a variety of reasons—weather, conditions in the mill, conditions in the market, a variety of things. As I understand it, Reed has a volume agreement. It's based on a 20-year period, so there can be variations from year to year and from one five-year period to another.

It's difficult to understand how the information originally supplied by the Dryden office of the ministry in response to a query from Thunder Bay came out over the air in the form it did.

I might say one other thing. White spruce, which is what I believe they were talking about, comprises only 0.6 per cent—six tenths of one per cent—of the total allowable cut of Reed. It's considered to be an incidental species because the big cut there is black spruce and jackpine.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of a supplementary, would the minister be good enough to supply the House the figures for the annual allowable cut and for the actual cut for the various species in the various timber limits that Reed has had, so that we can judge for ourselves what the situation has been over the years?

I take it that the minister is saying that the annual cut is a kind of mean around which fluctuations are permissible. I'm sure the minister wouldn't like us to believe that the whole cut of a 20-year supply could be cut in one year, because of the implications for regrowth. Could the minister, therefore, tell us what kinds of variations are permissible around the annual cut as a mean figure, and what the figure has been this particular year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'll be delighted to do that, Mr. Speaker. I would say that in the normal course of events we don't give yearly figures.

Ms. Gigantes: Who says they are going to be around in 20 years?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We will be delighted to give the allowable cut but not the actual cut—for a variety of reasons, as far as the companies are concerned; competitive conditions, negotiations, a variety of things.

I can give the member the cut over the period and I will give him the allowable cut each year, and the total to date, but I would prefer not to give a breakdown for each year in the last two or three years and the current year because, as I say, this information is of advantage to one's competitors, I'm told.

Ms. Gigantes: Oh, come on.

An hon. member: Give them to him for all of them.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I realize that some of the honourable members over there don't believe in competition, but there is some.

Mr. Wildman: Give it to us.

Mr. S. Smith: It belongs to the people.

Hon. Mr. Auld: And I think that it is important that we recognize that. I will try to give the member all the information that is available and, in fact, if it is insufficient we will have another go at it.

Mr. Foulds: Can the minister tell us how many other companies are engaged in the practice outlined in the radio story yesterday, allowed and abetted by the ministry, of cutting on a global-lease basis? In other words, can he tell us how many other companies are engaged in overcutting certain parts of their limits or leases and undercutting in other areas? Does he not think it is time for the ministry to abandon its nine-year-old global-lease cutting policy and adhere strictly to cutting the allowable cut, with minor variations, in the individual tracts as they were leased by the companies?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I haven't seen a transcript of the broadcast so I'm not sure what companies were involved, but I will endeavour to get the information. I would point out to the member that the DREE agreement that the province and the federal government have entered into for northern Ontario for, amongst other things, access roads in the forest areas—some \$60 million—is to get at over-mature lumber. So there will be, I would assume, some additional cutting going on to harvest that fibre before it is too late.

Mr. S. Smith: If I may ask a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: That's your second final.

Mr. S. Smith: It was final for me.

Would the minister reconsider his statement that he might withhold from us the annual cut of crown timber by various companies in the light of the fact that these are

crown resources and that if a company were to leave, for instance, its entire cut to the end of its lease, this would have very important implications for reforestation, among other things, such as the possibility of giving them new leases if they've mismanaged the first one?

Would the minister recognize that in fact the companies announce their production each year, anyway—

Mr. Martel: That's two.

Mr. S. Smith: —which is really cut under a different name? Would he, therefore, provide the annual figures—

Mr. Martel: Three.

Mr. S. Smith: —and allow us to draw our own conclusions in this House as to whether proper forestry practices are in vogue with regard to the Reed paper company?

Mr. Martel: That was three questions.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will give the honourable member as much information as I can, and if there is some problem I will be in touch with him before I give the final figures.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary, the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Can the minister tell us whether or not, under the terms of the DREE agreement for additional forest roads in which Ontario is participating, one of the terms of giving funds to companies to build those additional roads will be a far stricter adherence to cutting less in the limits that are now accessible and nearing the overcutting stage; in other words, that we will develop the northern parts that have been leased and have not been cut because of inadequate roads, in order to use the mature timber that is there? [2:30]

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say this: The agreements will be implemented in the way which will achieve the best forest practice.

Mr. S. Smith: I had a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott). I was told he'd be here, but I guess he is delayed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He'll be here.

HYDRO URANIUM CONTRACTS

Mr. S. Smith: I'll ask a question then of the Minister of Energy. Is there an agreement between Shell Canada and Ontario Hydro concerning uranium exploration in Ontario? Can the minister tell us how much has been spent by either party for exploration for uranium in this province? Can he tell us whether there is some exclusivity in the ex-

ploratory rights granted under this contract and whether the costs and benefits are shared equally by Shell Canada and Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I can't say at the moment whether or not there is such an agreement. I have an idea that Hydro has agreements with a number of possible suppliers of various kinds of materials, such as coal in the United States. I will get that information for the member and provide it on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary, has the minister received complaints, as we have, that persons have been prohibited from contracting with Ontario Hydro to explore for uranium in Ontario because of this agreement with Shell, specifically in the Elliot Lake area? Is the minister not concerned that Ontarians are prevented from exploring for uranium in their own province because they haven't reached some agreement with some multinational company, namely Shell? Has he received complaints, as we have, with regard to this?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have received no complaints. Who would be prohibiting companies from exploring?

Mr. Mancini: We're supposed to ask the questions.

An hon. member: Shell.

Mr. S. Smith: By way of supplementary and, I guess, by way of an answer to the minister, it would appear that Ontario Hydro is prohibited—

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the minister aware—But he asked me the question, after all.

Mr. Breithaupt: Obviously he wasn't aware of it.

Mr. S. Smith: He's getting used to what the situation will be some year or two hence.

Mr. Breithaupt: He has to be a little crisper.

Mr. S. Smith: Is the minister aware that Hydro appears to have been prevented from entering an agreement with a particular consulting geologist on the basis that Hydro is already in an agreement with Shell which would appear to give Shell exclusive rights to explore in the Elliot Lake area and other places? Can he tell us what has been spent and how these benefits have been divided and what he thinks of an agreement where multinationals can prevent Ontario people from exploring for uranium in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: First I should clarify something. It is the Ministry of Natural Resources which issues licences to explore and stake

claims and so on. Hydro has no authority in that field. However, I'll find out exactly what agreement Shell and Hydro have and what Hydro may have with other companies and I will report.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton East with a final supplementary.

Ms. Gigantes: Can I ask the minister if he understands the arrangement of Ontario Hydro to enter into co-operation with companies for exploration of uranium to be an indication that Ontario Hydro is thinking of trying to get out of its existing contracts which will provide an oversupply of uranium for planned nuclear plants?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would say, assuming that Hydro has these agreements, the opposite would be the case. Hydro is attempting to ensure it will have a long-term supply of uranium.

Ms. Gigantes: They already have it.
[Later (3:13):]

Hon. Mr. Auld: Earlier this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) asked me a question about Hydro and an agreement with Shell Canada. I've come across some information about it which I thought I should give him today.

As part of the program to improve security of supply for its long-term nuclear program, Ontario Hydro is providing financial support for selected uranium exploration projects. Late in 1975, Hydro entered two exploratory ventures, one with Shell Canada Limited and one with Amok Limited. The former involves a five-year program of exploration. Work has been carried out in northern Ontario, the Northwest Territories, Labrador, Quebec and British Columbia. The Amok program is a continuation of work already done by the company on its property near Cluff Lake in Saskatchewan which has led to the discovery of uranium deposits on another part of the property.

In 1977, Hydro acquired a 15 per cent interest in uranium explorations being carried out by Norcen Energy Resources Limited in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario and Nova Scotia.

Mr. di Santo: Statements, statements, statements.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Through this venture, Hydro has an interest in the Blizzard uranium deposit in the Kelowna area of BC, where mining development is planned, subject to the outcome of a board of inquiry into uranium mining in that province.

Mr. di Santo: Time, time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: In 1978, Hydro acquired a 20 per cent interest in a uranium exploration

program being carried out in New Brunswick by Canadian Nickel Company, which I believe is an Inco subsidiary.

Ms. Gigantes: Is there an excess profit tax on that?

[Reverting (2:35):]

HOSPITAL BED ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health confirm that the government's present intention is to cut more than 4,000 hospital beds in Ontario over the course of the next two and a half years as a result of the cutback policy which the minister has decreed? Can the minister say what the medical justifications are for such a sudden reduction in beds in Ontario and what studies or preparatory work was done before the ministry reached that decision?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can confirm to the honourable member that what we are planning, and what is becoming more and more apparent in most areas of the province, is to see first of all a recognition of the need for more chronic- and long-term care beds. Wherever possible, we plan to see those met out of conversion to those uses of beds which, while called acute-care beds, are actually being used for that purpose, in order that new programs will be established or existing ones expanded.

I think at this point it would be quite irresponsible to speculate on 4,000 beds closing. I think the change in terms of numbers will be minimal over the coming years, but the uses will certainly change. This is what I have been saying all along when I talk about the health-care system in transition—that we have to see the system change, preferably first within our resources, to meet our changing needs.

Mr. Wildman: Not in transition, in limbo.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the fact Ontario already has the lowest proportion of hospital beds to population of any province in Canada, and in view of the fact the minister is proposing to reduce the number of active-treatment beds from what was estimated at 4.63 beds per thousand a year ago to 3.5 beds per thousand in southern Ontario by 1981, can the minister say whether that decision was motivated purely by budgetary grounds, as appears to be the case? If not, what is the medical justification which the ministry went through before deciding that it was going to impose those hospital cutbacks on many communities where hospital treatment available is already in short supply?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Comparisons with other jurisdictions can be sometimes quite difficult inasmuch as one doesn't always use the same base. I would invite the member to look at the statement I made on February 7, 1978, at which time I announced the budget for hospitals for 1978 and indicated what the budget figures would likely look like for 1979. I also announced the change in the active-treatment bed planning guideline.

I went on to say that the guidelines for chronic- and extended-care beds were being retained as the minimum level. Where needs above those levels were identified, the government would move, over time, to see that those needs were met.

In particular I would draw to the member's attention his own city. There the local health council, the overall health planning body for that region, examined the need for chronic-care beds and made a recommendation to me that we make provision for 150 more chronic-care beds with the ability to expand to 200 chronic-care beds for the future.

As a result of that, even while the new Ottawa health sciences centre general hospital is under construction, even while the new rehab unit at Royal Ottawa is going ahead and while the new forensic unit at Royal Ottawa is going ahead, we have approved the conversion of the "old" Ottawa General to provide for, initially, as soon as it is renovated, 150 chronic-care beds with a capacity for 200 eventually.

That kind of thing is going on all over the province. It is perhaps one of the better examples of what I have been talking about with the health-care system in transition. We are recognizing that many beds we presently call acute-care beds have to be reordered in order that proper chronic-care programs—this is what I am concerned about—that chronic-care patients who need the chronic-care program are going to get it and not be lost, as it were, in the shuffle of a much larger acute-care ward.

Mr. Cooke: Isn't the real problem in this transition that the minister has not bothered to put the alternatives in place, such as chronic home care, before he decided to close many of the active-treatment beds and make the switch to chronic beds? Wouldn't it have been better planning and make more sense if some of those alternatives would have been put in place first and more nursing-home beds provided? Further, since the minister says he believes in decentralizing decision-making in this province in health care, wouldn't it have made more sense for the minister to allow the district health councils

in the various communities to determine what the proper number of active-treatment beds would be for their community, rather than have the bureaucrats here in Toronto and the minister making the decision strictly on budgetary grounds?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Again, I think if the honourable member thinks one can run something the size of the Ministry of Health, which spends over \$11 million a day, without having some kind of standards by which to plan, then he's misleading himself and the House really.

Mr. Swart: He can but you can't.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You can say that; I won't say that.

Mr. Renwick: Why not cut the red tape?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We've got to have some kind of standards and some kind of benchmark to plan by. One of the points that bears repeating is that when we talk about moving over three years—not over one year because that kind of change in one year would be too traumatic—to 3.5 active-treatment beds per thousand in the south and four in the north—

Mr. Warner: You should be replaced by a computer.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —we're talking about moving towards the day when that number of beds will be available purely for active-treatment purposes.

Mr. Wildman: What is the justification for that remark?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In the process we are moving to identify what numbers of beds are required for chronic long-term care and extended care and to put the wheels in motion to address those needs as well. In planning for the health-care system we can't say, "All right, today we'll fix it all up, that will be it, and we won't have to touch it again." It is an ongoing process obviously.

Mr. Swart: It should have been finalized years ago.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member cannot—and I think this is a mistake which is made by many so often that I'm not being critical of him—look at a chronic home-care program as something which can replace every person who is now, ever was, or ever will be a chronic- or extended-care patient. It will address the needs of a number of them. It will help to keep people out of those facilities longer and to maintain their independence in their own home. It will help perhaps to get some of them out sooner. But we cannot equate one with the other because we are always going to need institutional services for some people.

Mr. Foulds: Bring back Matt Dymond.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: I would say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that I find it hard to stomach—

Mr. Speaker: Then ask the minister then.

Mr. Cassidy: —today a proposal for 200 chronic beds which was promised by this government in 1975, before he even became the Minister of Health. I want to say to the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Ask a question please.

Mr. Havrot: Never mind grandstanding.

Mr. Cassidy: My question is can the minister explain why on March 27 he told this House: "We have set standards for the province which compare well with any jurisdiction which one chooses to bring forward in Canada or in North America," when in fact the latest figures available at that time indicated that the number of hospital beds per thousand on average across Canada was 5.76; that Ontario already had a full one hospital bed per thousand less than the rest of the country; and that the minister's new standards are now going to reduce that to a point where we would have more than two beds per thousand less than the rest of the country?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. Cassidy: The question is—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked. Let the minister explain.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, let him explain.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I'll take a look at the member's figures, but if memory serves me correctly what he is in fact quoting for the other provinces is all beds—chronic, extended care, psychiatric and acute care. What he is quoting for Ontario is just acute care. He has his figures mixed up, and I'll confirm that for him.

Mr. Cassidy: Those figures came from—

Mr. Foulds: The College of Physicians and Surgeons. They must be true.

Mr. Cassidy: —from the Ontario Hospital Association. If the minister wants to take them on, that's fine.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question for the Minister of Education who is responsible, among other things, for apprenticeship programs, at least until the Minister of Manpower takes on his new responsibilities. Can the minister explain why, when we had 319,000 people out of work in Ontario in March and when we had 145,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 out of work, the government of Ontario was advertis-

ing in the daily newspaper, *The Sun*, in London, England, for qualified and experienced tradespersons to work in the GM transmission plant in Windsor?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I have no knowledge at all that the government of Ontario was advertising for anything in any newspaper in London, England.

Mr. di Santo: You were in China. That's why.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: In view of the fact that the government of Ontario's selective placement service was advertising in *The Sun* for industrial pipefitters, electricians, machine fitters, millwrights and tool and die makers to go and work in the GM transmission plant in Windsor, can the minister explain why we are not training people to fill these positions here in Ontario?

[2:45]

Why, in particular between April of last year and February of this year, did the number of pipefitters apprenticing in Ontario fall from 610 to 606; why did the number of industrial electricians apprenticing fall by close to 200; why did the number of millwrights, now being sought in London, England, to apprentice here in Ontario, fall from 349 to 131? Why is it that the only sector showing an increase in apprenticeships is tool and diemaking in the areas I have cited? When will this government begin to ensure that Ontario men and women can train for these skilled trades that are so badly needed in Windsor and throughout the province?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, we have indeed taken, I think, significant steps to increase the number of available training positions for individuals within the machine-tool trades specifically. However I would remind the honourable members opposite that while the places for training are there, it is not this government's position that we go out and coerce people into the training programs. The retraining is available through the AOTA agreement with the federal government. The places are there and available to young people who wish retraining in this province. If they do not take them up, we cannot, unfortunately, coerce them into doing so.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What steps is the ministry taking to update the counselling or guidance programs in the secondary schools of this province so that students can be made much more aware of potential opportunities and so that they will be given more encouragement? We are not asking that they be coerced but they could be encouraged to consider seriously these

areas of employment. What updating is taking place?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of very real concern. The information in the process of being developed will be distributed not only to secondary schools but to parents and to young people both inside and outside the secondary school system. It will be available very shortly for perusal by all members of this House.

Mr. Swart: After 34 years of Tory government.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: We have embarked on a very active campaign of public information in an attempt to bring about the important and absolutely necessary change in public attitudes regarding the acquisition of such skills as appropriate career choices for our young people. That program is actively in production right at the moment and should be available very shortly.

Mr. Breagh: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain why the Ontario government is advertising on behalf of General Motors of Canada? Couldn't they do that little task themselves?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I said earlier I had no knowledge that the government of Ontario was advertising at all. I shall be pleased to investigate this matter and to inform the House. I have not seen it.

Mr. Breagh: It is coming over.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Thank you very much.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Would the minister look back to the program set up during the Second World War when they used vocational schools throughout Ontario for development of the various types of skills needed for the war effort? We could look back at the past. I think we could resolve part of our problems by the full use of these schools. At that time they used them from right after regular school until eight o'clock the next morning.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, we have most certainly been aware of the traditional kinds of programs developed in other jurisdictions as well as in Ontario. I am happy to be reminded again of the program established during the Second World War in the vocational schools. We feel there is a great need for increased utilization of those facilities that are available to us now, as well as increased co-ordination of all the programs available in Ontario. That's precisely the route we are attempting to follow at this point.

GREAT LAKES POLLUTION

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Does the minister agree with the Great Lakes pollution assessment by the American head of the International Joint Commission supported by the past Canadian chairman, Maxwell Cohen, in which they said such things as, "We may have to write off the Great Lakes, particularly Lakes Erie and Ontario, as sources of fish and drinking water unless measures are taken by governments to control the input of toxic waste," and, "We have a time bomb on our hands and it is up to government to stop it from going off"?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: He denied that in a later speech.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to answer that yes or no.

An hon. member: You've never answered a question yet.

Mr. McClellan: Let Stephenson answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I do not disagree that we must be very careful, and to have someone bring this so forcefully to the attention of people will I think do nothing but good for those of us who are concerned about the environment. On that note I welcome the article.

I am not so pessimistic as to believe that the Great Lakes must be written off. I would, however, go so far as to say—and I probably agree with the member—that unless all of us become—

Mr. T. P. Reid: There is government accounting.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —concerned and do something about it—and that means more than just government, that means all of us as concerned citizens—we do have a potential serious problem of great magnitude.

So I guess I would take the public position that I welcome that kind of flag-waving for those of us who are concerned about the environment and would join with those who say we—if it is more than just government—must be doing something about it.

Ms. Gigantes: Some of us do more about it than others.

Mrs. Campbell: And wave the flag, too.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think the government is doing a fair amount; I think the things we proposed last fall and the deadlines we placed for January 1 are significant and will be effective. So I guess I am somewhat supportive, yet I don't go quite as far as that gentleman did, or indeed the headline might suggest.

Mr. Warner: We will use the fish for thermometers.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask, what has the minister and the ministry done in carrying out the toxic substances control program specified in the new Great Lakes water quality agreement that went into effect some five months ago? In other words, what are the minister's plans, what are his programs with respect to that particular agreement?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think there are many plans. Some of them are to find better sites; some of them are to find better methods of controlling toxic waste.

Part of it, I think, has already been accomplished. I am not persuaded that the waybill system, improved as it is, has still reached its ultimate in sophistication to do the job it should do. We will be making further amendments to our waybill classification system.

I think when I put that to the House I said better we do something today and get it started than to wait until it is perfect. We now see some areas where we think there could be some improvements and in the not too distant future the honourable member will find us making changes in the waybill classification system.

I think we have to do a more constructive job with the private sector in the testing of wastes as they are accepted. I think in the private sector we are short of adequate control of materials when they come into their possession. Those are the kinds of things that will be done this year that I think in many ways will address the problem the International Joint Commission was trying to bring to the attention of the people of Ontario. Without that help on their part, I think it will appear as though we are putting something onto the private sector, onto society, that they may not want.

I am sure, knowing of the honourable member's interest—I hope he knows of mine in this regard—we welcome that kind of bringing to public attention of the importance of government's doing something, but in conjunction with the private sector and the individual citizen.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister when is he going to institute mandatory registration of all hazardous chemicals used by industry so that he can see whether they are providing adequate methods of disposal of any waste from them and whether they are testing them before they put them into manufacturing processes?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can give the honourable member a specific date on that. We have attempted to

address that issue in meetings with sister ministries because I think we have arrived at the point in time in our society when if you are going to produce a chemical you should be responsible not only for its use but any side effects it might have and its after-use care. I do not disagree with that at all.

Ms. Gigantes: What about environmental assessment?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I do not think it necessarily should fall within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Environment for Ontario. I think the honourable member would agree that if we are going to that degree of control, there is significant involvement for the federal government.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, does the minister intend more strict enforcement as it applies to industry with regard to the regulations and acts that are now in place? Secondly, is the minister intending to put the 2.5 phosphorus limit on dishwashing and commercial detergent to accord with the limit on household detergent?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: The answer to the first portion of the question is yes, we will. I only wish I were in a practical position to do it today. I wish we had, not only in this province but in all 10 provinces, sufficient sites for the treatment of our waste. The fact is, not only Ontario, but many places—

Mr. Kerrio: Wishbones instead of backbone.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: —and certainly the states to the south, are not in a position to control to the degree I think we should. We have to have those facilities in place.

We have, as the honourable member knows, a significant study contract with a firm to find those sites. That is progressing very nicely. That was the first step. Last fall, we tried to set out step-by-step programs that will allow us to be more stringent than we are today, but I cannot be stringent when I do not have, nor does the rest of society have, some of the necessary facilities to treat those wastes. We are trying as quickly as we can to get those facilities in place. Once they are in place, it is the time to get more stringent and we will.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister if he is aware of the statement by Dr. Arthur Porter in his interim report for the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning that the implementation of recommendations by the International Joint Commission for control of radiation levels in the Great Lakes would seriously affect the development of the

nuclear program in Ontario? Does he not think that is a good reason to have an environmental assessment of Darlington?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I fail to understand that as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It relates to the other ministry.

ELECTION EXPENSES

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question to the Attorney General. Why has the government procrastinated so long in responding to the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses with regard to amendments to the Election Finances Reform Act? Quite apart from his past procrastination, is it the government's intention to move in implementing those reforms, 17 of which date as far back as the 1976 report, and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I do not concede we have procrastinated at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Three years.

Mr. Warner: That is your normal way.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I would be happy to review the specific proposed amendment. We will be introducing an amendment in relation to the limitation period, that is clear. There has been some debate over the responsibility for the initiating of charges and we have made it very clear that in our view that is primarily their function as the investigative agency. I will be quite happy to review any other amendments that may have been suggested and report back to the honourable member.

Mr. Warner: When?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there are over 20 recommendations; 17 of them date from 1976, three years ago, with requests for amendment. Would the minister, when he reports back, indicate why he is picking only two and leaving the other 20 to be neglected still further?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I said we will report back.

[3:00]

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the chairman of the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses has also had the responsibility of being Attorney General over a considerable period of time, and it is his view that the Attorney General does have the responsibility to prosecute charges, would not the Attorney General feel he might get an impartial opinion on this matter, since it seems quite reasonable that the chief law officer of the crown might very well implement the charges recommended by the commission?

Would the Attorney General comment on the fact that one of the charges pending would be against a Conservative who had defaulted on the requirements of the act?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member has demonstrated by his question the enormous confusion that exists in some people's minds, obviously including his own, in relation to the responsibility of the Ministry of the Attorney General.

The member has lumped two issues that are of fundamental importance and difference; that is, who initiates the prosecution and who prosecutes it. I want to make it very clear that there has been no issue as to who prosecutes it. We made it very clear that, once the charge is initiated, we will prosecute the charge.

Mr. Nixon: The former Attorney General says you should initiate it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: With respect to the former Attorney General, I think perhaps he misconstrues what the role of the Ministry of the Attorney General is in this respect.

There is absolutely no question in my mind that it is important to point out that the Ministry of the Attorney General is not an investigative agency, and that the Commission on Election Contributions and Expenses is properly constituted to investigate any possible breaches of the Election Finances Reform Act and to initiate any charges. Indeed, a private citizen can initiate a charge, except that the legislation makes it necessary for that person to obtain the consent of the commission.

I might say further, with respect to matters that were drawn to our attention, these matters were drawn to our attention after the limitation period had expired in relation to the initiation of any charges.

BELL CANADA CASE

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1979, in response to a question posed by the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), I indicated that I had asked my staff to obtain a report on the incident referred to wherein an accused person prevailed upon Bell Canada to connect a telephone in his office, said phone being an extension to that of the victim of a criminal offence.

As the accused is appealing his conviction and sentence, it would be inadvisable for me to comment on the case in detail. But, inasmuch as the evidence was led in open court, I can indicate that the accused person did in fact pose as a young lady's husband and

succeeded in having Bell install an extension phone in his office.

The accused person, by virtue of a previous social relationship with the victim, was able to gain access to her apartment and, with the assistance of an unknown female accomplice, was able to convince Bell employees, when a check was made by them, that the request was authentic and that the holder of the telephone number in question did in fact wish to have an extension placed in her husband's office.

This extension was in effect for approximately 11 days, and the extension telephone and other equipment were seized by the police during the investigation of an offence of counselling to commit murder.

Since the accused was convicted and was sentenced to a lengthy jail term in the penitentiary, and because the evidence of the deception practised on the telephone company was led in court, it was decided not to lay a separate charge with respect to this incident. Undoubtedly, this deceit practised by the accused was taken into account by the presiding judge in sentencing the accused on the main charge.

I understand the police have brought the matter to the attention of Bell and in similar applications for extensions in the future we trust Bell will govern itself accordingly and take extra precautions to ensure it is actually the subscriber who is requesting the installation of the extension.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Attorney General's response, but does he not feel something more than a trust in Bell Canada is indicated in a case where they would put an extension on a phone without ensuring the phone, in fact, was the subscriber's phone and that the subscriber approved of that extension? Does he not think he has to exercise more than a trust?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't know what the honourable member has in mind in relation to the jurisdiction I should attempt to exercise over Bell, but I can indicate there is no question from the evidence that rather a clever deceit was practised, so far as Bell was concerned, and as a result this extension phone was put in place, as the honourable member well knows, having brought it to my attention.

Bell Canada, firstly, having been advised of the deceit that was practised upon that company, and secondly, knowing that that deceit was part of an offence of conspiracy to commit murder, I think it would naturally follow that, having been apprised of these details, Bell would take greater care in the future to avoid a repetition of that type of

deceit. I would be curious to know what further the honourable member would like me to do so far as Bell is concerned, the police having already brought this situation to the company's attention.

Mrs. Campbell: I'll advise the minister.

Mr. Speaker: I think in the future when ministers have an answer that lengthy, it should be done by way of ministerial statements. Do you have another?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have another statement of the same length in reply to a question by the member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead with it. I'll add to the question period.

ST. LAWRENCE STARCH DISPUTE

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) raised a question about the involvement of the Peel Regional Police in the strike at St. Lawrence Starch Company Limited. Since that time I have received a report on the matter and am able to make the following comments.

The Ontario Police Commission has developed standard procedure for municipal and regional police forces to deal with labour disputes. When a police force becomes aware of an impending strike and there is information that suggests there may be a confrontation between management and the union, the police liaison officer discusses with both management and the union leaders the role the police play in such matters.

Legal picketing is discussed, as are the various sections of the Criminal Code that are occasionally violated by either side in the dispute. The officer stresses that the police are not available to assist either side but only to ensure that peace and order are maintained. He also explains that the police presence at a strike will be only for the purpose of preventing incidents of violence or ensuring that streets, roads and access to the establishment do not become blocked.

When the Peel Regional Police force became aware of the impending strike at the St. Lawrence Starch Company, a liaison officer visited the premises on April 6. The officer made arrangements to meet with the company manager, Mr. Fred Troughton, and Mr. William Spencer, the representative of Local 410 of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union. The meeting was held on neutral ground in the employees' lunchroom.

At that time the officer explained what the role of the police would be during the strike

and provided both sides with copies of the relevant passages from the Criminal Code. Both union and management, I am advised, expressed their desire to co-operate with the police and expressed their appreciation for the time and trouble taken by the police to acquaint them with the relevant information.

I am further advised that the ensuing strike at St. Lawrence Starch Company premises on Lake Shore Road in Mississauga has not been unusually disorderly. There have been approximately five charges laid. I want to add further that the police presence at the scene has consisted of one officer in a marked police car. I believe the situation has been handled reasonably and professionally by the Peel Regional Police. Both union and management have generally conducted themselves responsibly.

I want to conclude by stating that the Ontario Police Commission ensures on a continuing basis that police forces are provided with adequate guidelines for dealing with situations involving strikes and lock-outs.

TRAINING SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr. Cureatz: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. In the light of the closing of the Pine Ridge School and in the light of the fact that the Participation House group over a year ago submitted to his ministry a proposal for using one of the facilities there, would his ministry now consider funding the Participation House project group and permitting it to use of one of the facilities?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, in each of the communities where training schools are to be closed we have been engaged, in so far as we were able prior to this date, in seeking within government alternative uses of those facilities, both at the provincial and at the federal level. I have had discussions with the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Henderson), who will have responsibility for the future use of the facilities. I have been assured by him that we will have the co-operation of his ministry in co-operating with the communities in seeking to find alternative uses.

I am advised by him that the policy currently in place would require, prior to any direct consideration being given to local groups, that the ministry first seek alternatives within government and then seek alternatives at the level of local government, following which the facilities would then be open to alternatives from private groups.

I can assure the honourable member we will certainly follow that course and offer

any assistance we can, along with the Ministry of Government Services in finding alternatives.

An hon. member: What about Burwash and Grandview?

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, following the minister's announcement of the closing of the training schools at Lindsay and Bowmanville I would like to ask him whether he has a report on program options. If he has, has it been released and if not, when will it be?

What are his real alternatives for these young people living in a community setting? If the alternatives are group homes, does the minister feel there are sufficiently trained personnel to staff such homes, both at present and in the immediate future?

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Norton: In answer to the latter part of the question first, yes, I believe that in so far as the reference would be to the number of group homes at present in operation, there are adequate numbers of trained staff available and employed in providing that service.

I would emphasize, though, that the transition in terms of the reallocation of funds within the children's services division from the existing training-school operations to the alternatives is not something that is going to happen overnight. There will be a phased-in period and in the course of that we are not going to be faced with placing large numbers of children or, necessarily, any children, immediately back into a community setting for whom a more appropriate setting would be a training school.

I would emphasize that even with the closings I have announced today, we will still have approximately 50 per cent excess capacity within the existing training schools. So there will be no need for us to return children unnecessarily to the community because we don't have the accommodation for them in training schools. But as a result of the closings, the funds that are freed up by that for the alternatives, both in the community and in improved programming and physical plant within the remaining training school system, will then be applied to those purposes. This has been the case over the last couple of years, as we have improved the community resources for children.

I don't think there should be any concern on the part of the communities that there will be any need to attempt to absorb children they cannot, and are not equipped to, cope with.

Mr. Eakins: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell me how many total employees will be affected at Lindsay and Bowmanville combined? Will the minister give me his assurance that every effort will be made to accommodate the long-term employees at the Kawartha Lakes School who have invested in property and who are a vital part of that community?

Hon. Mr. Norton: Absolutely. As I indicated in the statement, beginning at two o'clock this afternoon, the senior officials from the ministry began meetings both in Lindsay and in Bowmanville with the staff of each of the training schools discussing questions of alternative locations and assistance that would be offered to the staff.

The number of persons who are affected in Lindsay—classified or full-time, long-term staff—is 55. There are also approximately, I believe, 27 unclassified staff who had been hired on shorter-term contracts. In Bowmanville, there are 66 full-time, classified staff and 26 unclassified staff.

We have assured all the classified staff we will offer them alternative employment within the ministry or within government. In some instances, it will be in the remaining training schools. In other instances it will be alternatives for them in terms of employment in community-based programs that are being developed or are developed.

We cannot make that assurance to the unclassified staff. I believe it was the understanding at the time of hiring that we would not be able to offer them the longer-term job security. But we are prepared to say to them that once we have assured the relocation of the classified staff, we will lend every assistance we can to the unclassified in terms of future employment as well.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, further to the minister's statement, and by way of supplementary, since this is the second phase of the training-school review program, whatever happened to the small, secure facility to provide treatment for severely disturbed adolescents to be located in Oakville and which was promised in the original February 1978 statement announcing the program? It was originally promised by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in November 1976. Has the minister made any progress in obtaining a small, secure facility to provide treatment for severely disturbed adolescents?

Hon. Mr. Norton: As the honourable member knows, certain difficulties were encountered.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow)

torpedoed it because he didn't want it in his own riding.

Hon. Mr. Norton: The Minister of Transportation and Communications did not torpedo it, I can assure the member of that.

An hon. member: He sat on it.

Mr. Cassidy: He tabled it.

Mr. Samis: He stonewalled it.

Hon. Mr. Norton: I think the member is also aware that there were certain concerns in that community that made it very difficult at that time for us to proceed. I can assure the member though that on giving further consideration to that project we hope to proceed with a model that would allow for the development of a small, secure unit in each of the regions of the province.

For example, if one looks at the physical structure of the buildings that we have, as stated in today's announcement, chosen to retain, for example, in Cobourg, the relatively new buildings that have been built there in the last few years are on the model of separate cottages which would lend itself to several levels of security. It's our intention—

Mr. McClellan: It's been almost three years.

Mr. Martel: You guys live on announcements.

Hon. Mr. Norton: —that provision can be made within that facility for the more highly secure and intensive treatment unit for disturbed adolescents.

Mr. McClellan: Some of us reread your old announcements, you know. You keep recycling your old programs.

ATTACK ON UNION OFFICIAL

Mr. di Santo: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General.

Mr. Samis: Come on, Roy.

Mr. Breaugh: He's down in the penthouse.

Mr. Samis: He's burning magazines over there.

Mr. di Santo: Given the considerable concern created among the members of Local 1 of the Bricklayers, Masons Independent Union of Canada as a result of the attack on John Meiorin, business manager of the local and president of the Confederation of Canadian Unions, on March 7, 1979, has the minister ordered an investigation into the case; and, if he has, has the investigation led to the identification of the authors of the attack?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, my information is that there is a very complete police investigation currently under way. A number of union leaders from across the

country have corresponded with me in relation to their concerns following this attack. I haven't had any report from the police officials as to the success to date of their investigation, but I do know that an extensive investigation has been made and is still current.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary: Given the nature of the attack and the position of the person attacked, Mr. Meiorin, can the Attorney General undertake that the investigation will be intensified and will he report to the House and table the results?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will obtain a further report as to the nature of the investigation and attempt to satisfy myself that—as I believe that it is—it is in fact being carried on in an intensive fashion. I will report to the House in due course as to the results of the investigation.

EASTERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Sterling: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. In view of the fact that negotiations have been going on for some time with the federal government in relation to the eastern Ontario development agreement, I would like the Treasurer to bring us up to date as to exactly where those negotiations now stand.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Set up.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to re-establish those negotiations. A week or two ago in a telephone interview Mr. Lessard, who was then at his home in Alma, told me that he had to withdraw, I think it was the \$10,000,000 industrial stimulation package from the eastern Ontario development agreement. Our staff reviewed the implications of that and felt we really needed that package in the eastern Ontario agreement or else we would have very little left.

We have since then received some indication that ARDA agreements for drainage already started would be honoured, but little else.

As of this morning I couldn't find any response at all from the DREE group. My staff told me they had run into a brick wall and were getting no response at all in their attempt to negotiate there.

[Later (3:30):]

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

Hon. Mr. Auld: Last Thursday the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) rose on a point of privilege and questioned, "the credibility of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) in regard to my efforts last Friday to obtain copies

of Ontario Hydro's internal significant event report."

I am sorry the honourable member isn't here. He was not here on Tuesday either, but I would like to respond to this question.

Mr. Mancini: He is back home working for his constituents.

Mr. Gaunt: I will tell him all about it, Jim.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Good.

Actually what transpired was that on April 6 the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Smith) asked the Premier (Mr. Davis) a question about nuclear plant safety. The Premier answered and also said the minister would pursue this further.

The Leader of the Opposition asked me a question on April 6, to which I responded, and a supplementary, to which I responded, which had to do with Hydro's Babcock boilers; and then the member for Grey-Bruce asked a supplementary:

"The Babcock boilers? I have knowledge that there is a series of happenings with dates on them that is of great concern to me as a citizen. If he"—meaning me—"has seen these reports, would the minister be so good as to supply the Leader of the Opposition and both parties with copies of these reports as they come out. I know they're classified as secret, but what is more important at this point than that the members of the Legislature know what's going on in this very serious field?"

In replying to the Leader of the Opposition a few moments before that, I had said: "I am aware of the reports but I don't see them on a regular basis. They are mainly of a technical nature. They are given to the Atomic Energy Control Board, I believe, on roughly a daily basis and then they are filed in the public reference library so that any member wishing to see them can go down to the Hydro library and see them."

After the member for Grey-Bruce had asked that question, the Premier said, according to Hansard on April 6: "They are down in the Hydro library. Read them on the weekend." Then I said: "As I said, all the member has to do is walk down the street and they are in Hydro's reference library. They are not secret reports."

Subsequently, in the honourable member's question about privilege—

Mr. McClellan: How do you turn him off?

Mr. Conway: I don't know. There's got to be a plug.

Mr. McClellan: Somebody unplug the speaker.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —he said: "I have a point of privilege regarding the credibility of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) in regard to

my efforts last Friday to obtain copies of Ontario Hydro's internal significant event report. Last Friday the Minister of Energy denied that these reports were classified secret and at any time anyone could go into Hydro and get a copy. I will read from Hansard what was said."

Mr. McClellan: Take your time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Subsequently, he said: "Following this, I went to my office and called the minister's office and asked the exec for copies of the report. He said: 'Yes, the minister says you can have them right away. I will send them right over.'"

"I waited for a long time in my office. Nothing happened. I phoned back. They said: 'There is a meeting arranged for you to go down to Hydro. You are supposed to meet this exec under the information board.'"

"I did that, I waited there for a long time. Finally, the cloak and dagger started. For the next 45 minutes I met four other top execs who examined me and asked me questions. Finally, after 45 minutes, they took me to the top technocrat who wanted me to pinpoint a happening I wanted to see about."

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is my office received a telephone call from the member for Grey-Bruce that afternoon, shortly after the question period. My secretary, who answered the call, said Mr. Sargent said: "I have just talked with Mr. Auld and he has said I could have a copy of the papers." Mrs. Marshall said: "I'm not familiar with the papers you refer to, Mr. Sargent, but we will call our energy communications officer and arrange that they be delivered to your office as soon as possible, since Mr. Auld has agreed that you should have them."

I just refer back to Hansard. I did not say the honourable member could have them, I said they were available to be seen at Hydro.

My secretary called the information officer from the Ministry of Energy who indicated he would get in touch with the honourable member. Eventually, he did. He suggested he go to Hydro and he would be met there and could indicate what he wished to see.

I understand he was met there by an information officer from Hydro. Hydro had some delay in finding a person technically competent to in effect explain and understand the notes, which are of a highly technical nature. The Hydro policy is that those notes not be removed from the library, because they are highly technical and technical people are required to explain them. Explanations were given as requested by the honourable member.

[Reverting (3:25):]

REPORTS

STANDING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Philip from the standing administration of justice committee presented the following report and moved its adoption:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr2, An Act to revive the Portuguese Club of London Inc., the title of which is to read an Act to revive Portuguese Club of London Incorporated.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the actual cost of printing, be remitted on the said bill.

Report adopted.

STANDING SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Gaunt from the standing social development committee presented the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Resolved that supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation be granted Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980: ministry administration program \$7,611,300; heritage conservation program \$18,735,700; arts support program \$38,603,000; citizenship and multiculturalism support program \$8,923,500; libraries and community information program \$143,436,200; sports and fitness program \$20,714,000; ministry capital support program \$51,150,100.

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE TRAVEL TO KINGSTON

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the standing resources development committee be authorized to travel to Kingston to visit the Urban Transportation Development Corporation test site on Wednesday, April 25, 1979; and that two and a half hours be credited against the time allocated for the estimates of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications; and that provisions of section 66 of the Legislative Assembly Act be not applicable.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SIMCOE DAY ACT

Mr. G. E. Smith moved first reading of Bill 63, An Act respecting Simcoe Day.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, as in previous bills, the purpose is to change the name of the public holiday celebrated in many municipalities on the first Monday in August from Civic Holiday to Simcoe Day in honour of John Graves Simcoe, who was appointed first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada on September 12, 1791, and who convened the first Legislative Assembly and established the capital of the province at York, now Toronto.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Breithaupt moved first reading of Bill 64, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this is a re-introduction of my bill in the last session, and the purpose of the bill is to provide for the appointment of a curator of Queen's Park. The curator of Queen's Park would be responsible for advising the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor in Council concerning the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage at Queen's Park.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE PAPER

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the interim answers to questions 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 126 and 127 standing on the Notice Paper. I wish to table the answer to question 121; and the interim answer to question 114 standing on the Notice Paper. At the same time I wish to table the answers to questions 111, 112, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 124 and 125; and the interim answers to questions 116, 122 and 123 standing on the Notice Paper. (See appendix, page 1104.)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt. Applause.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and a special thanks to my colleagues who have done what they were told to do.

This is a good time for a New Democrat to be responding to the budget of the Treas-

urer (Mr. F. S. Miller), not because of the ammunition we have with which to respond but because it is a good feeling in general in Ontario today to be a New Democrat. Ever since a year ago, when we elected a new leader, we have gone onward and upward. We saw, just a couple of weeks ago, the election of Colin Isaacs and Richard Johnston to this chamber, both of whose presence will be felt.

When occasionally I ramble through the back alleys of bureaucracy around Queen's Park, the word I hear from the bureaucrats, many of whom are in highly placed positions in the civil service, is that the Liberal Party in Ontario peaked early and it's all downhill from now on for them; that the Conservatives under the benign neglect of the Premier (Mr. Davis) are withering on the vine; and that tomorrow belongs to New Democrats. So I serve notice to them: "Move aside; we are coming through."

Mr. Nixon: That and 60 cents will get you a ride on the subway.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would know—certainly the Treasurer would know if he were here; and I understand he is coming back—that preparing a budget is an onerous task, and I can assure you that responding to one in a serious way is also an onerous task. Whatever my input is today, it would not be as good as it is without the assistance of some people who are very important to me: namely, my assistant, Claudine Salama; and two researchers in our research group, in the economic area, each of whom has more cumulative knowledge about economic matters than the Treasurer and I combined: Anne Martin and Sym Gill, who have done a yeoman job.

Mr. Samis: Neither one of them sold cars, either; or tampered with odometers.

Mr. Laughren: I shall try to proceed despite my colleagues. Seriously, it really is a pleasure to be out and about in Ontario these days. No matter where you go in Ontario, you see the strength of this party. In eastern Ontario we have our leader and the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis), and the member for Carleton East (Ms. Gigantes), who is doing an excellent job in this chamber and back in her riding. When you go to western Ontario you have our member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Bounsall); and a little closer, the member for Welland-Thorold (Mr. Swart). No one knows more about budget matters dealing with municipalities than my colleague from Welland-Thorold. He has a great deal of knowledge about that. In northern Ontario, of course—well need

I say anything about the quality of the members from northern Ontario?

Mr. Makarchuk: Self-evident.

Mr. Laughren: Perhaps a special comment should be made about our critic from northern Ontario, the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman), who has the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Bernier) on the run daily. The Minister of Northern Affairs never knows when he is going to find the member for Algoma hounding him about one problem or another in any part of northern Ontario.

Then of course there is the Metropolitan Toronto area. I see the Liberals immediately turning all green with envy when I talk about representation in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: How can we turn green with envy? We have the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) on our side.

Mr. Laughren: It is with enormous self-discipline that I refrain from responding to that.

Mr. Gaunt: A wise course.

Mr. Kerrio: You daren't; she is bigger than you.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I shall—

Mr. Makarchuk: You will pay for that one.

Mr. Martel: I am sending her that Hansard.

Mr. Laughren: I shall attempt to address myself and this chamber to the problems of the Ontario economy.

The New Democrats regard the annual Ontario budget as both an economic and a social document. We regard it as an opportunity to either reinforce the existing economic and social system, or to effect changes in it. This budget obviously has done the former. I have never seen an Ontario budget that changed so little, yet so strongly reinforced an economic system that rewards and punishes in such perverse fashion.

I shall indicate in some detail the considerable shortcomings I see in the budget. But first, it is appropriate to lay before this Legislature a vision of the future towards which we believe a provincial budget should take us. My criticisms are based on the degree to which this budget fails to provide the proper direction and stimulus towards such a future.

By the way, I am happy to see the Treasurer here. I hope that he can stay and absorb a little.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't say. I can't guarantee the absorption.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats are optimistic.

Mr. Martel: He absorbs very little.

Mr. Laughren: We believe Ontario has enormous potential to provide its citizens with a healthy, prosperous and satisfying life, but we also believe that such opportunities will not be fulfilled unless our social and economic priorities are changed.

The Davis government, even more so than those headed by John Robarts or Leslie Frost, is lacking in leadership that provides us with direction and goals. It is a sad commentary on this administration that it hearkens back to the days of Leslie Frost, rather than looking forward to a better Ontario.

New Democrats have a vision of a better Ontario; that vision includes a determination to build an egalitarian society; the determination to build a full employment economy and the determination to make our own economic decisions here in Canada, to build a healthy manufacturing sector and to be industrially more self-reliant. Those are our visions. In those visions, we put first and foremost our determination to build a social system that is not designed solely for the young and the swift. We firmly believe that individual initiative and personal growth can best be realized and rewarded within an economic system that insists on equality.

[3:45]

This government—and both the Premier and Treasurer are its strongest advocates—believes that we need a healthy private sector if we are to provide the social services that people need. This government will never build an egalitarian society because there will always be other priorities. The Treasurer believes that social services can be enhanced only if the private sector creates sufficient wealth to do so. We oppose this residual or trickle-down approach to vital social services.

New Democrats understand, of course, that social services are not free, but at the same time we know that the Tory free enterprise theory will always ensure an inequitable tax system and perverse distribution of wealth. The evidence is not even debatable. Since the Second World War, almost 35 years ago, the only redistribution of income has been to the top 20 per cent. Of course, this has occurred while the bottom 40 per cent has been deluged with a plethora of income support programs.

Never has a Treasurer so graphically demonstrated that he has no commitment to redistributing income. His abolishment of the succession duty tax, which applied only to the top three per cent of estates, is a good example but by no means the only one. Thus we have a budget that raises OHIP premiums, which everyone pays regardless of income, while the beneficiaries of the wealthiest three

per cent receive tax relief. The Treasurer would have us believe that this kind of action is necessary in order to encourage investment in Ontario. He is wrong.

New Democrats want to build an Ontario economy that distributes income in an equitable way. We want an Ontario that distributes its wealth fairly, whether our wealth is increasing or even decreasing. We think that can be done and we would introduce budgets that would lead us in that direction.

Secondly, New Democrats want to build a full-employment economy. The social and economic costs of unemployment are unacceptable to us. We know as well that Ontario citizens will be impatient with political parties that ignore current problems while planning for and building a better future, and so they should.

That is why we accept the need for short-term measures that resolve some of our problems while we implement a longer-term strategy to rebuild Ontario. In the short run the government has an obligation to tackle our unemployment problem; 319,000 Ontario citizens, including 145,000 youths, are looking for work and this Treasurer has offered them absolutely nothing. His entire job creation program consists of 70,000 summer jobs for students.

When this government comes face to face with its own ineptitude over unemployment, how does it respond? First, we had the former Treasurer raising the level of unemployment that is acceptable; a wishful reaction that imagines away the problem. The present Treasurer at least acknowledges that there is an employment problem, but fails to create a single full-time job in this budget.

A year ago my leader laid before this Legislature a series of short-term job creation proposals. These proposals, if implemented, would create 45,000 jobs. None of them was simply a make-work project, all would have had beneficial social and economic effects, but this government chose to ignore all of them.

I would like to reiterate those proposals at this time: a shared cost program on apprenticeship training, 10,000 young people at a cost of \$40,000,000; a home insulation program, 2,300 jobs at a cost of \$10,000,000; a solar heating subsidy, 1,500 jobs at a cost of \$30,000,000 a co-operative and non-profit housing program of capital grants, 14,000 jobs at a cost of \$35,000,000; more assisted housing for families and senior citizens, 8,000 jobs at a cost of \$55,000,000; a \$25,000,000 expansion of the Ontario home renewal program, 1,500 jobs; special grants for hard services in northern Ontario, \$25,000,-

000 for 1,000 jobs; and \$150,000,000 to accelerate provincial and municipal capital projects for 7,500 new jobs.

That is a reasonable, thoughtful and immediate response to our unemployment problems. Such proposals would not only create 45,000 useful jobs, but the spinoff benefits would have added another 90,000 jobs. Such a program would not in itself put all our unemployment back to work, but it would have been a good beginning.

Thirdly, the NDP has a vision of an Ontario that has a viable manufacturing sector and is industrially more self-reliant. We believe that we can never determine our own priorities as long as the economic decisions are made elsewhere. The costs of a weak manufacturing sector and continuing dependence on imports to the Ontario economy would be devastating in both social and economic terms. At stake in the rebuilding process are several hundred thousand jobs, our massive current account deficit, the creation of good jobs for our people, a healthy, diversified tax base and industrial self-reliance when our non-renewable resources are depleted.

The task of achieving self-reliance and rebuilding our manufacturing industry, is difficult, of course, because of the US domination of our economy. It is difficult also because the problems in Ontario's economy are not cyclical; they will not go away when the value of the dollar declines or when our labour force ceases to grow so quickly. Our problems are of a structural nature and thus require a long-term economic plan.

One wouldn't think the Treasurer needs reminding that the Ontario economy is in fundamental structural disequilibrium. His own ministry prepared a devastating report as the Ontario government's submission to the federal government on the repercussions of the GATT negotiations. However, I will remind him of a few facts.

We lead the industrialized world in the duty-free import of manufactured goods. We lead the industrialized world in the importation of high technology goods—54 per cent of the market in the mid-1970s. Canada's share of world manufactured exports has declined dramatically in the five years between 1970 and 1975 from about six per cent to about two per cent. In Ontario, our value of manufacturing shipments in 1978 grew at a rate slower than any of the other provinces. Perhaps the Treasurer should reconsider some of the remarks he has made on the manufacturing sector.

The Canadian current account deficit in 1978 was \$5,200,000,000. Even though we had

a \$3,400,000,000 surplus on goods, it was not manufactured goods. The Canadian deficit on fully-manufactured end products is \$12,000,000,000, a record high, and it has risen dramatically in recent years.

Mr. Swart: What a testimonial to this government.

Mr. Laughren: Research and development in Canada has declined from 1.3 per cent of gross national product in 1969 to about one per cent in 1977, a 30 per cent reduction.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You're a gloom and doom artist.

Mr. Laughren: Today our research and development spending ranks 14th in OECD countries, just ahead of Greece and Turkey. The US industry spends 40 times more on research and development.

Ontario's manufacturing industry is 55 per cent foreign owned, with some sectors running much higher; such as chemicals at 82 per cent, rubber at 99 per cent and electrical at 74 per cent. The decline in manufacturing employment in the period 1974-77, in virtually every city in Ontario, is shocking. Recoveries in 1978, which the Treasurer is so fond of talking about, did not make up for that loss in many cases.

The New Democrats understand that without a strong government presence in the economy all our goals cannot be realized. We know that the day has gone when governments can stand on the sidelines and count on the invisible hand of the marketplace to shape events in our favour. We have seen that invisible hand shape our economy that has made us inordinately dependent upon our natural resources and foreign capital.

This Treasurer knows that our economic problems require government intervention. That is why he has introduced the Employment Development Fund, but he comes so reluctantly to the whole idea of intervention in the marketplace that his programs are apologies for their very existence.

The Treasurer has a responsibility to provide leadership and direction in the private as well as the public sector, but he has abdicated this responsibility to strike a balance between policies designed to stimulate the private sector and those designed to protect and improve the quality of life for our citizens. Thus we have a deterioration in the quality of health care. At the same time, costs to the patient are increasing while cash incentives are given to the Ford Motor Company and others.

The Treasurer's hesitant, contradictory statements and policies have allowed his

colleague, the lean and hungry Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Grossman), to move in quickly and implement programs based solely on the needs of the private sector.

We New Democrats do not believe that Ontario's interests have been well served by either its director, this government, or by the cast of characters who have dominated the economic stage for so long. That is why we must intervene. New Democrats know that rebuilding our economy will not be easy. We know that we cannot lead the world in all our endeavours, but we know as well that we must, first of all, identify the areas of the economy that offer the most potential to build upon our natural strength, to replace imports and to provide export opportunities over the long run. Until that is done, we can only flounder.

This government is floundering in its half-hearted attempts to develop an industrial strategy. This government is floundering because it does not know where it wants Ontario's economy to be in 10 or 20 years. Any such plan cannot be designed or implemented overnight, but we must begin to lay the foundation now for a healthy economic structure in the years ahead.

The NDP believes that we can achieve full employment. We believe our economy can be healthy and relevant with a major share of high-technology manufacturing. We believe that Ontario can play a major role in reducing the growing current account deficit that is directly the cause of our devalued dollar. This cannot happen as long as imports meet most of our demand for manufactured goods.

We believe Ontario can lead the way in the development and use of renewable energy sources, such as wood products, solar and wind. We are in an excellent position to pioneer a new method of home insulation as a commitment to conservation. We can also be world leaders in pollution-control equipment.

New Democrats believe that we, in Ontario, can reap the benefits from our mineral resources, and that much more processing and refining can be done here. We believe that much of the machinery used in Ontario's nickel, copper, zinc and gold mines, and the machinery used in Saskatchewan's potash mines, Alberta's oil wells and in heavy construction projects can be produced in Ontario.

We believe food processing that will reduce our import dependence can be done in Ontario. We believe that we can produce the consumer electrical products so much in

demand in this country and get a fair share of the booming electronics market.

The Minister of Northern Affairs made one of his normally irrelevant interjections a few minutes ago when he said we were the gloom and doom party. What I have just been telling you is that we have enormous optimism for the future of the province of Ontario, but not with this Treasurer in that seat.

The Treasurer knows we have problems and he knows that they will not be solved without government intervention, so he has reluctantly agreed to budget \$200,000,000 for the government's industrial incentives program.

New Democrats have never backed away from government intervention, but we condemn the way this government is proceeding. This government is prepared to give out \$200,000,000, and more over the years, on an ad hoc basis. They are giving the money without a long-term economic plan. It is quite conceivable that this government would give out \$200,000,000 worth of grants, which will be spread out over virtually the entire economy in each of the next 20 years. At the end of those 20 years we will have provided over \$4,000,000,000, and I suspect the result will not be obvious to anyone. We will still have a truncated, branch-plant economy; we will still have massive trade deficits and the deindustrialization process will be continuing.

How is it logical to provide industrial incentives to the agriculture, tourism and manufacturing sectors when you do not have any idea of what role you want those sectors to play in a revitalized Ontario?

We know our manufacturing sector is in trouble, and since we cannot possibly solve all the problems at once we want to be selective. We must select those industries that have growth potential, that are high technology, that have a high import replacement factor and that dovetail with an overall provincial economic plan.

It is outrageous to ask us to approve a budget that toys with jobs, our industrial future and the balance of trade while spending public money.

We say to you, as clearly as we know how, any incentive program must have the following guidelines:

One, an economic plan must be in place to indicate where we want to be in the next 10 or 20 years. Specific sectors of the economy must be selected and a major commitment made to ensure their growth and success.

Two, repatriation of the economy must be part of our economic plan; and incentives

must be designed and provided with this goal in mind.

Three, a central consideration must be import replacement. Replacing imports in the short run and stimulating exports in the long run should be a major consideration in any incentives program.

Four, major commitments should be made to specific sectors at any given time so that the incentives program is not dispensed in shotgun-like fashion over a number of sectors with no real impact on any of them. A sector should be selected and pursued vigorously in order to achieve the goals of self-reliance and job creation.

Five, incentives provided to the private sector should have built into them an individually-tailored planning agreement based on a combination of equity participation, job guarantees for Canadians, environmental protection, research and development guarantees, buy-Canadian commitments and reinvestment of profits in Ontario.

Six, an incentive program must not be allowed to exacerbate the lopsided development of Ontario. Regional development must be a major consideration whenever practical.

Finally, a comprehensive employment impact study must be carried out before any applications are approved.

Those are some guidelines we think make sense, and that we think the Treasurer should take and work into his employment development fund.

We in the NDP would select one or two key industries at a time and move in an aggressive, selective way, based on the criteria I have just outlined. Nowhere in the criteria for funding in the Treasurer's program is there mention of the key manufacturing industries that need to be strengthened.

[4:00]

Let me tell the Treasurer what he should be doing with the Employment Development Fund. He should select a key manufacturing sector such as auto parts, machinery, electrical products, transportation equipment, or food processing. He should select a sector and proceed to rebuild it; to replace imports, to invest in research and development, and to reinvest earnings in this country. By concentrating on one sector at a time we will begin to correct our structural deficiencies, and in the process we may even be able to do something about stimulating our underdeveloped regions in Ontario. I shall give the Treasurer some specific examples in a moment.

The Treasurer's criteria are an invitation for every branch plant, every manufacturer, indeed every business in Ontario to join a lineup at the door of the Employment Devel-

opment Board. What nonsense. The strongest and most aggressive applicants will get the grants. Most of those are US subsidiaries.

If this Treasurer succeeds in strengthening the role of US subsidiaries in Ontario it will be an ironic tribute to him; he will have succeeded in making worse a problem most of us think he should be solving.

The Minister of Industry and Tourism talks ominously of making strong industries stronger. I find that ominous because I think I know what the minister has in mind. He intends to go with winners; and they tend to be in southern Ontario, and more specifically in the golden horseshoe.

I know what that means to regional development and I know too what it means for small, innovative, Canadian entrepreneurs. Not only will the Employment Development Fund ignore small business and regional development but it is singularly lacking in its main purpose, namely to create jobs.

Mr. Wildman: That's right.

Mr. Laughren: Using the Ford incentive grant as an example—a \$68,000,000 grant to create 2,600 jobs—the government's grant works out to \$26,000 per job. Using that figure, the \$200,000,000 fund will create 7,600 jobs.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's not fair.

Mr. Laughren: It's more than fair, because I think we've used the total value of the Ford plant—the \$500,000,000—rather than the government money going into it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You didn't use the Ontario grant, you used the total grant; and you just took the end jobs in the one plant.

Mr. Laughren: The total grant, yes; that's what the grant was for.

Mr. Wildman: It's even worse if we just use your figure.

Mr. Laughren: The arithmetic is right.

Mr. Foulds: We gave you the benefit of the doubt in all cases.

Mr. Swart: You didn't include the services in that figure.

Mr. Laughren: If the Treasurer's Employment Development Fund works out the way I've outlined, it will solve about 2.4 per cent of our unemployment problem in Ontario at the present time. I think that's why the Treasurer refuses to even speculate on how many jobs his employment fund will create; he knows the sum is embarrassingly low.

If my figures are wrong, let him tell us the correct figures.

Mr. Wildman: He doesn't even know what they are.

Mr. Laughren: Perhaps even more worrisome, is the evidence that the Treasurer and the Ministry of Industry and Tourism have already decided the fund will be used to protect existing jobs in the pulp and paper and other industries. Have they established that industrial dislocations as a result of the GATT negotiations will be such that they are setting up an adjustment fund that will protect jobs threatened by reduced tariffs? If so that's fine, but they have an obligation to be honest with us on the matter. We shall be monitoring the allocation of the fund, very carefully.

The New Democratic Party is particularly concerned about the government's virtual abandonment of regional development. Unemployment figures show a very real need for a regional development policy in Ontario. In February of this year northeastern Ontario had a 9.4 per cent unemployment rate. In eastern Ontario it was eight per cent. In the Peterborough area it was 9.2 per cent. In the Hamilton-Niagara area it was 10.7 per cent. In Windsor it was nine per cent. In St. Catharines it was 14.5 per cent; and in Sudbury 12.1 per cent.

As a matter of fact, in 1978 all areas except Toronto had an unemployment rate that was worse than in 1977. The minister's response is not to create a single full-time job in this budget.

Mr. Wildman: Typical.

Mr. Laughren: Given those figures, the government's Employment Development Fund must not be implemented so as to aggravate the already substantial regional disparities in Ontario. The fund must be used to stimulate the slow-growth areas, while at the same time make a serious attempt to rebuild particular industrial sectors.

We believe the government should use the fund to solve a number of problems at the same time. We believe it can be done, and I will illustrate with a couple of examples.

It is generally conceded that Ontario needs a mining machinery industry, that the north needs a more diversified economy, and that our deficit of manufactured goods—over \$12,000,000,000 in this country last year—is too high.

A mining machinery industry located in northern Ontario would help us to meet those needs. Canada is the third largest mining producer in the world and the second largest consumer of mining machinery, but we are the largest importer of mining machinery in the world. The share of the market captured by imports was 59 per cent in 1965; it was 91 per cent in 1978. The job loss represented by these imports is staggering. Given the fact

that spin off employment results from manufacturing jobs, we estimate that as many as 18,000 jobs are being lost. For Ontario, where about 70 per cent of all machinery is purchased, that represents about 12,000 jobs.

In 1977, imports of machinery and equipment used for mining, oil and gas and excavating, amounted to \$800,000,000. There is no reason why Ontario industry cannot displace a large proportion of these imports. Other countries have done it. Sweden, Finland, Britain and Germany all have healthy mining machinery industries. It is no coincidence, of course, that 70 per cent of the Canadian machinery industry is foreign-owned, that the bulk of our imports are from the United States and that the United States has a trade surplus in mining machinery.

Let me quote from the Ontario select committee report on natural resources foreign ownership and economic development. I would remind the Treasurer that his colleagues from his party sat on that committee as well. I quote from that report:

"There is scope for the development of a significant, Canadian-controlled presence in the mining machinery and equipment industry. The committee recommends that the government actively encourage the development of Canadian-controlled firms in the mining machinery and equipment industry through the provision of loans and research assistance and through purchasing policies.

"The committee recommends that policies be developed to improve the performance of mining machinery and equipment firms in terms of exports, research and development and increasing Canadian value added.

"Furthermore, the committee is of the view that if the private sector does not respond to the policies designed to encourage the development of the mining machinery and equipment industry, it may be appropriate for the government to become involved in this area directly."

Further on, the same select committee suggested, and I quote:

"The development of an indigenous mine machinery producing industry could be assisted, for example, through the purchasing policies of a provincial mining company. Also, the provision of equity and/or working capital could provide venture funding for one or more new Canadian-owned companies."

A study done for the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in 1976 suggested the same thing. It recommended:

"Government-controlled development and manufacture of new process equipment. This could be achieved through the use of

the Canada Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology to develop new technology, with manufacturing and marketing functions done either by a crown corporation or existing equipment suppliers."

I am telling the Treasurer this but, if he had been listening to my colleague from Sudbury East these many years, he would already have absorbed that information.

The New Democratic Party believes that it is irresponsible to allow the mining machinery industry to continue to shrink. We support direct government involvement in the mining machinery business through the establishment of a machine crown corporation to be financed by a fund set aside for this purpose from the revenue accruing from Ontario's natural resources. We have called such a fund the Ontario Tomorrow Fund.

If the private sector will not or cannot move, then the government itself has to see to it that a strong domestic service industry is built up around our strong primary industries. An NDP government would not tolerate more than 91 per cent of the market for resource machinery being provided by imports. And the capital investment needed to create jobs in mining machinery is much lower than it is for smelting or refining. The NDP has promoted northern cities—Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie—as potential sites for a resource machinery complex. If the Treasurer needs any advice, the member for Algoma has a plan in his head for the development of all of northern Ontario which would put the Minister of Northern Affairs to shame.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Pie-in-the-sky.

Mr. Martel: Pie-in-the-sky? That's the trouble with you guys; you just tinker with the system, and it's in chaos now.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What have you guys done in northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Samis: Listen to the nattering nabob of negativism over there.

Mr. Wildman: It's strictly doom and gloom over there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look at the mess you made in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Martel: Look at the mess you made in this province.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could restrain the gloom-and-doom Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Samis: The nattering nabob.

Mr. Acting Speaker: I have to restrain the entire House. Order, please.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in the north is high, our trade

deficits are staggering, and regions such as Sudbury are desperately in need of industrial development and diversification. We believe that a mining machinery complex in the north makes good sense on all three counts.

The Treasurer would be well advised to concentrate his efforts on making Ontario and Canada self-sufficient in mining machinery by the year 2000 or earlier. We have the world's greatest natural laboratory in Sudbury, we have a university which could become a centre for research and development, and we have a skilled and ready labour force. What we lack is a Treasurer who is willing to confront the problem and intervene in this specific industry where his private sector friends have so obviously failed.

He knows it is safer to spread his incentives around; so he does just that and prays for a slower growth in the labour force and for a boom in the United States economy. Knowing this Treasurer, he probably also prays for a lower value in the Canadian dollar.

Hon. F. S. Miller: At least I pray.

Mr. Foulds: Is that for your sins of commission or your sins of omission?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have both kinds. I'm human.

Mr. MacDonald: Really? You're very human all right.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would give several examples of how we would run the employment development fund differently.

The building of a viable mining machinery sector is one way. The rebuilding of the food processing industry is another. Rebuilding this industry would provide jobs in the Niagara and southern Ontario regions; and if I'm lacking in expertise in this area, I would direct the Treasurer to my friend from Welland-Thorold.

For some time now, the National Farmers' Union and the Canadian Food and Allied Workers have been aware of Canada's declining position in fruit and vegetable trade as well as in other food products. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture has sounded the alarm to this government too.

The problem is not that Canada has ceased to be a food exporter, but that our exports are becoming more specialized. For years now, Canada's farmers have been pressed into producing for sale abroad more wheat, more of other grains, more oil seeds, and less of everything else, including meat, fruit,

vegetables and dairy products. Ontario now has a 42 per cent deficiency in fresh fruits, including pears, peaches, grapes and apples; for all of these latter products our dependence on imports is growing, with no end in sight. From 11 per cent in 1965, imports as a percentage of Canadian food consumption had edged up to 13.4 per cent by 1976. This results in a loss of jobs for farmers, meat packers, fishermen, cannery workers and others. It also means a growing dependence for all of us on the availability and the cost of food produced in other countries.

Some time around the turn of the century, unless we adopt a new approach to our food system, the present policy will create an overall deficit in our food trade. We have already registered an overall trade deficit on processed food products between 1974 and 1976. As a nation we will be able to breakfast on our own milk, eggs and toast with margarine, but we'll have to send out for lunch and dinner. That says something.

The deterioration in trade of fabricated goods and end food products is especially serious. These areas are especially important to Ontario and to Ontarians working in these industries. In the end products sector, only four of the 12 major foods were in a trade surplus position by 1977. Unless this government takes drastic action, the prospects are for further deterioration in the 1980s.

We want to know what this government is going to do about the fact that Canada's perpetual trade deficit in processed fruit and vegetables is \$300,000,000 and that imports account for 15 per cent of the market. We can grow 12 per cent of end products here. What about vegetable oil products, where imports capture 34 per cent of the market? Or confectioneries, where the trade deficit is \$112,000,000? Or miscellaneous processed foods, where the trade deficit is \$178,000,000.

We have estimated that imports of processed fruits and vegetables that can be produced in Canada—\$200,000,000 worth in 1977—alone are costing Ontario 2,200 direct jobs and 4,400 spinoff jobs, for a total of 6,600 jobs. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture has similarly estimated that replacing the annual 50,000,000 pounds of cheese imports with domestic production would support 1,000 additional Canadian farm families.

Mr. Wildman: Does the member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) hear that?

Mr. Laughren: Does the honourable member hear that?

Food processing is a relatively labour-intensive industry.

Mr. Martel: Repeat that; the member missed it.

[4:15]

Mr. Laughren: I will repeat it for the member for Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry: Replacing the annual 50,000,000 pounds of cheese imports with domestic production would support 1,000 additional Canadian farm families. Why doesn't the member tell the Treasurer to get off his seat and do something about it?

Mr. Villeneuve: Quota production is in Ottawa.

Mr. Samis: Don't blame it all on them now.

Mr. Laughren: A lot of the problem is here in Ontario and if the member is suggesting the Treasurer wait for those in Ottawa who presided over the decline, that is a pretty sad excuse for strategy for rebuilding the industry.

This is another industry where this government cannot try to shift the responsibility to the federal government.

Mr. Martel: Everything is Ottawa's fault.

Mr. Laughren: It is the segments of the food processing industry that are the most heavily concentrated in this province that are contributing most to the trade deficit. Ontario produces 40 per cent of all food and beverages; and produces 60 per cent of the \$1,000,000,000 production in the fruit and vegetable processing sector, the industry in most severe trouble.

The food and beverage sector employs 10 per cent of Ontario's manufacturing labour force, approximately 90,000 people. Nearly 19,000 of those are employed in the fruit and vegetable sector; and this government says the problem is in Ottawa.

I want to talk about tomatoes, a crop every Ontarian associates with southwestern Ontario, just as they do peaches with Niagara. Since 1967 there have been no significant exports of this commodity. Imports on the other hand have quadrupled since 1967; \$12,000,000 worth of tomatoes and \$19,000,000 worth of tomato paste in 1977.

By 1976 the Canadian Food Processors' Association reported that 54 per cent of the market for tomatoes was met by imports. Our projection of this trend would lead to complete elimination of the domestic tomato canning industry by 1985. The canned tender fruits, canned mushrooms, potato processing, poultry eviscerating and beef sectors are also in major difficulty.

One of the things we have been trying to impress upon this government is the negative effect foreign ownership brings to this economy. While foreign ownership is relatively lower in this industry than others at 36 per cent, certain subsectors, especially end-food products, are heavily foreign owned. It is no coincidence that a high degree of foreign ownership directly correlates to trade deficits in these particular sectors. Nor is it a coincidence that these same sectors exhibit a high degree of monopoly control.

Together, agriculture and food is our biggest industry, yet they have been thoroughly neglected by the Ontario government. Examples are not hard to find. The estimates for the agriculture ministry in this year's budget show a miserly 1.1 per cent increase.

Promotional plans in Ontario supermarkets to buy domestic produce may have turned customers on with flashy posters, but we pose the question: what good is promotion if Canadian produce is not available at the supermarket, even in season?

We know the Ministry of Industry and Tourism set up a task force in the fruit and vegetable processing industry in Ontario. It is about time. As far back as 1962 a federal government study warned that many fruit canneries, the economic mainstay of the Niagara Peninsula, were in danger. My friend from Welland-Thorold now says there is only one left and it is owned by a multinational conglomerate. Now, a decade too late, we have a task force. Where was this government when it was needed?

The Ministry of Agriculture and Food's latest food land guidelines are just that, guidelines; and I quote from them: "Municipalities are encouraged to review and update their plans."

In other words, business more or less as usual. The entire thrust of this statement is to leave a matter of province-wide concern strictly to municipalities. Meanwhile, the amount of land available for growing food continues to drop.

To sum up, the Ontario government has no comprehensive food policy. It has closed its eyes to the strategic importance of food.

Mr. Wildman: Agriculture is not even mentioned in the budget.

Mr. Laughren: The NDP would develop a food policy which would provide a guarantee for a satisfactory level of income for the farmers, and fair and stable food prices for consumers.

As a top priority we would establish self-sufficiency in all foods, raw or processed, that we can produce ourselves in order to protect

and create jobs in food processing and agriculture.

The NDP would take a public hand in food policy. The required public commitment to food self-sufficiency reaches out into industrial policy, and that is why I am stressing this particular sector to the Treasurer today.

An NDP government would treat food processing as a key manufacturing priority and move aggressively into planning agreements with food processors that would guarantee jobs, modernization and rationalization, but not more concentration. We would also do more basic crop research and explore the possibilities for alternative types of commercial food production, for example, to reduce energy use.

Two, the NDP would consider direct participation, through publicly-owned canneries for basic food commodities such as the critical fruit and vegetable processing area, especially where such canneries are nearly extinct.

Three, we would lobby against any move to enter into duty-free bilateral agreements with the USA that would further decrease our self-sufficiency in food. We would lobby for more protection where the long-term benefits in increased self-sufficiency warrant such action; for example, products such as canned tender fruit, canned tomatoes and mushrooms.

Four, the NDP would undertake moves to ensure future production. We would, through legislative action, move to reserve for farming all class one, two and three land, and special crop lands. Any alternative use of food land would be permitted only with the unanimous consent of local planning authorities, councils and provincial planning authorities, including the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

The NDP would ensure that the results of government producer initiatives were not lost in the corporate maze between farm gate and checkout counter. We would do this by reviewing the retail prices of all foods produced under government improved-income or marketing plans, and by outlawing predatory practices.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a food and agriculture policy.

Mr. Swart: By being in that government the member for Chatham-Kent moves agriculture in Canada backwards.

Mr. Kerrio: Everybody would work in the government.

Mr. Martel: He didn't mention the government, you dummy.

Mr. Kerrio: You couldn't save the country that way; use your noodle, will you.

Mr. Martel: I bet you couldn't even comprehend anything, you couldn't understand

anything. You should go back to pre-kindergarten books and learn to read.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: I mean you're out of it; you're sick.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have talked about two manufacturing sectors which need rebuilding. Both could benefit from a properly managed Employment Development Fund. They are examples of what can be done by government to rebuild our manufacturing industries.

There is another sector that is in a state of crisis. Government attention in this industry should not come in the form of tax concessions or incentive grants. I am speaking of a sector that instead—are you ready for this, Vince?—that instead needs direct public participation, a sector in which private enterprise has lost all credibility; and that sector, of course, is mineral resources.

This government's record as a guardian of our resources is simply unbelievable. For decades, the private sector has extracted the resources and done with them exactly as it pleased. In an act of hypocrisy, this government inserted section 113 into the Ontario Mining Act, stating that our minerals must be refined here. Then this government proceeds to grant exemptions with indecent haste.

Falconbridge has been mining nickel in the Sudbury area for 45 years and has yet to build a refinery there. Inco has a refinery but still ships about 20 per cent of its ores to Wales for further processing. And the Treasurer was a former Minister of Natural Resources.

As though that's not bad enough, last year this government gave Inco and Falconbridge permission to continue to ignore section 113, and as well decided to allow them to charge their offshore processing costs against Ontario operations. If ever a government was whipsawed by a couple of wealthy multinationals it is this government.

This Treasurer acts as though he is fearful of being judged harshly by the mining sector and has ingratiated himself by giving the big operators even more. He reduced the top marginal mining tax rate from 40 to 30 per cent. Only the three or four giants in the industry will benefit from this reduction. The Treasurer knows that. The Treasurer argues that he took these actions in order to encourage new exploration and development. What a joke. The Treasurer is

being snickered at in every mining company board room in New York.

Last year, Inco officials who appeared before the select committee regarding the Sudbury layoffs told us their problems were caused by world markets, not taxation rates. In fact my colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and my colleague from Algoma were on the committee and can verify that.

The mining companies say one day that the problem is world markets, not taxation; and the next day they are asking for another concession or a tax allowance.

I suspect that they saw the Treasurer coming and suckered him into yet another act of kindness. Let me tell you about how kind this government is to the mining industry, Mr. Speaker. In 1977-78 the value of mineral production in Ontario was \$2,700,000,000; yet the province received, in corporate income tax and mining profits tax, the grand sum of \$39,000,000. That is a return of 1.4 per cent on production. With that kind of management, I am not surprised that the Treasurer has put his personal business interests into a blind trust.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is a contrast. Knowing how the Treasurer likes to use examples from that fine province, let me point out that the value of mineral production there in the same year, 1977-78 was \$511,000,000, less than 20 per cent of Ontario's production. The return to the people of Saskatchewan from their resources was \$113,600,000, or 22.3 per cent of production. So with five times as much production, Ontario received about one third of the return.

Mr. Swart: Whose resources are they anyway?

Mr. Martel: A scandal. You guys should hide your heads.

Mr. Laughren: This Treasurer and his predecessors have all taken the same line, namely that tax concessions are necessary to encourage investment and protect jobs. Perhaps the Treasurer could explain why, in the last decade, employment in the Ontario mining industry has dropped from 34,600 to 25,300, a shocking 27 per cent, while the value of production has risen 228 per cent. Perhaps the Treasurer could tell us why there is more exploration and development occurring in Saskatchewan right now than in any other province.

This year, \$80,000,000 will be spent on exploration and development in Saskatchewan. In Ontario, the mining industry will spend about \$25,000,000.

Mr. Martel: They are escaping the socialists, eh Leo?

Mr. Laughren: Obviously, it is possible to get substantial revenues from the industry while at the same time encouraging mining development. The NDP government in Saskatchewan has learned how to manage the province's resources by an intelligent and fair use of the tax system and a commitment to the public ownership of mineral resources.

The New Democratic Party has a policy determined by convention and reaffirmed and refined over the years. That policy is to bring into the public sector the mineral resources of Ontario, with those resources playing a key role in an industrial strategy for this province.

We believe our resources can be used as a lever to help us regain our rightful position as an industrial province. We believe that with our resources in the public sector backward linkages will encourage the development of a mining machinery industry. We believe that forward linkages will lead to further processing, more research and development, and the development of more end products. We believe that with our resources in the public sector we can work towards the creation of a mining sector that is a model of environmental protection, industrial relations and occupational health and safety.

I would like to say a few words about the small business sector. It is a sector that sometimes gets shunted aside due to government preoccupation with enterprises that operate on a grand scale. But we should not forget that it is the small business sector that has created the large bulk of the jobs during the last 10 years.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business has done its homework and points out that between 1971 and 1977 58 per cent of new jobs in the private sector were created by small firms. I must say that while these statistics are startling a word of caution is in order. The small business sector is greatly dependent upon the state of the economy in general. As a matter of fact, the greatest stimulation the government could give to small business would be a commitment to a full employment economy. For example, a large mining machinery complex in a northern Ontario community, where there is 12 per cent unemployment would inject new life into existing small businesses and offer exciting new opportunities to new ones.

[4:30]

The small business sector can be a dynamic, vital area of our economy. However, the dominance of large corporations in our economy has made it difficult for small busi-

nesses to compete because of lack of access to sophisticated financial, managerial and technical advice. The government has not seen fit to provide this expertise and it is not usually available anywhere else. As a result bankruptcies have increased each year for the past several years. They have been highest among small business and among businesses in operation under six years, which were in need of capital and advice and got neither.

Big business corporations, such as oil companies, have been systematically eliminating small businessmen for many years now. Small businessmen and the NDP have a lot in common in their opposition to the growing concentration in our economy and their feeling that this is not the most efficient way to do business. NDP provincial governments have all taken steps to ensure the continued health of the small business sector in their respective provinces.

There are several things this government should do, and should urge the federal government to do, to help small businesses and in the process diversify our economy. West Germany, Japan and many other countries have set up vigorous trading companies which make contact with overseas businessmen, arrange contracts and allow local businesses to fill those contracts. The Export Development Corporation, which should be active in this area, has always favoured big business. The federal government should emulate the American government procurement program, in which one third of the US government's spending on goods and services is guaranteed to small business, and for which much of the purchasing has been decentralized to the local level.

Central to the problem of small business development over the next few years is the control and use of technology. If we are to de-emphasize the selling of unprocessed raw materials we must be prepared to replace the branch-plant structure of our economy with a vigorous small and medium business sector which will develop and use Canadian technology. This implies changes in all the government policies that affect small business—government procurement, taxation, licensing and use of technology, foreign investment, the availability of venture capital, and so on.

This government has done little to relieve the day-to-day aggravations that small businesses have. I am thinking of property taxes and the lack of uniform store hours as two examples.

In his budget, the Treasurer has decided that small businesses need venture capital.

He is right. New Democrats support the principle of making venture capital available to small businesses; but we think the Treasurer has gone about it the wrong way. The NDP does not think that investors should be rewarded by the taxpayers to the tune of 30 per cent. That is simply a regressive way of providing funds, because we know that only people with a relatively high income will invest in Small Business Development Corporations.

Our second problem with the SBDCs is that there appears to be no guarantee that small business will be able to obtain money from them at a rate lower than from the traditional lending institutions. Government-guaranteed loan insurance would go a lot further towards helping Canada's small businessmen raise capital. We shall be watching carefully the Small Business Development Corporations program to see if its intended role is realized and to monitor the cost to Ontario taxpayers.

Prior to the budget being introduced, I indicated that it was time for Ontario to press for the introduction of a takeover tax. When I recommended that, I was thinking not only of the potential revenues but of the small businesses in Ontario as well. The trend to increased concentration in our economy is an ominous one. Recently released figures from Statistics Canada show that Canada's 25 leading enterprises made 24.2 per cent of all profits, the 100 leading enterprises made 43.2 per cent of all profits and the 500 leading enterprises made 64.2 per cent of all profits. These figures indicate an alarming amount of concentration of economic power.

The Treasurer and the Minister of Industry and Tourism both have refused to answer a question from me as to the criteria on which they recommend to the Federal Investment Review Agency approval of applications from foreign corporations. FIRA tells us that it concurs with the recommendations of the provinces in 95 per cent of the cases reviewed. The number of takeovers allowed has risen from 33 in 1974 to 282 in 1978, and the percentage allowed from 80 to 91 per cent. So the government of Ontario is obviously in agreement with both the increased foreign control of our economy and the increasing concentration of economic power in fewer and fewer hands. It is no wonder the small business community feels threatened.

We do not support corporate takeovers that simply reduce competition or unduly increased concentration of economic power. There is something wrong with the corporate

world investing without creating a single new job. We understand, of course, that some mergers or takeovers are to be encouraged, if for example they help to rationalize an industry and allow companies to operate with greater economies of scale and efficiency. As a matter of fact we would encourage such mergers in some manufacturing sectors such as mining machinery or electrical products. We believe that the current rash of mergers and takeovers are not in our best interests. It is madness to allow large corporations to indulge themselves with investments that serve no useful purpose.

I have spent considerable time discussing the broad economic issues. I now turn to our health-care system. New Democrats have a special passion for medicare. We regard ourselves collectively as its founder. We fought long and bitter battles in Saskatchewan, as we did federally and here in Ontario. There is no issue on which we will fight harder.

The Treasurer should know that health-care costs in Ontario are not out of line with other jurisdictions. According to the Economic Council of Canada, health costs within this country have not escalated as much as they have in the United States. The share of health costs in the US GNP has risen steadily to 8.6 per cent in 1976, while in Canada it levelled off at 6.8 per cent in 1976. That is medicare here and private health care in the United States.

This government pretends that health-care costs are getting out of hand, yet as a percentage of budgetary expenditures health care is lower now than it was in the first year of the Davis administration. In more recent years the proportion of health-care expenditures paid out of Ontario's general revenues has declined in absolute terms and as a percentage of expenditures.

Mr. Martel: Hear that, Frank?

Mr. Laughren: By 1979-80, OHIP premium revenue will have risen from 22.8 per cent three years ago to 24.7 per cent of health-care expenditures, while the share paid out of Ontario's general revenues had dropped from 28.1 per cent to 19.8 per cent. This Treasurer, a former Minister of Health, should know that much of our health cost is not in the public sector. If he stopped listening to his fiscal technocrats he would be tackling the hidden problems of health care, not shifting the burden to the users by increasing OHIP premiums.

We have, in Ontario, only part of our health-delivery system in the public sector. Multi-national corporations dominate the health-supplies field and the drug industry and the

private sector dominates our medical labs, nursing homes and homes for special care. As a result, the profit motive still shapes many priorities; and that, of course, is why small communities suffer from a lack of personnel, ambulance services and nursing-home facilities.

The Treasurer should know there is already a shortage of health-care facilities in northern Ontario and that universal cutbacks make no sense whatsoever. If he doubts that he should have a chat with my colleague the member for Algoma.

The medical supplies and equipment industry, largely US-owned, is contributing mightily to our health-care costs. This government should move immediately to effective centralized hospital purchasing by establishing a crown corporation to purchase health goods in bulk for distribution to hospitals, drug stores and community clinics. A second crown corporation would produce, either jointly or by itself, the most common goods required by the entire health-services field.

If this government wants our support in controlling health-care costs it must restructure the system. We must move toward the establishment of community health and social service centres with a team of doctors, dental practitioners, nurses, social and legal workers and so forth, all of whom would be on salary. For further advice on that matter I would refer him to the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh), our Health critic, and the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta), our previous Health critic, both of whom know a great deal about the provision of health care in Ontario.

The Ontario Council of Health's recent report, *Health Care for the Aged*, indicates that nine per cent of Ontario's population are now over 65 years of age. This will increase to 13 per cent by the year 2001. Surely this government should move now to provide specially trained medical and paramedical personnel, chronic-home care service, senior citizen housing, homes for the aged and nursing homes in anticipation of this demographic shift.

A chronic-homecare program for Ontario must be implemented now all across the province, not just in a few pilot areas. Such a chronic-homecare program would enable many of our citizens to remain in their homes and communities, where they want to be. This would result in savings by relieving pressure on our nursing homes and hospitals.

It is also wrong to impose deterrent fees on chronic-care patients. That is a despicable way to raise revenue.

Raising OHIP premiums is not the answer to controlling health-care costs. Premiums should be progressively reduced until the burden has been shifted entirely to the more

progressive corporation and personal income taxes. Even the Ontario Economic Council has recommended this in its latest report. The NDP would do that, because there should be no higher priority for a government than the provision of quality health care to every citizen of Ontario regardless of financial means.

As my colleague from Parkdale says, "The fight for universal health care is a significant part of our party's struggle to equalize the distribution of wealth and income in our society." We serve notice to this government that we will never support a budget, a throne speech, a bill or a resolution that erodes universal access to health care. We believe this government is in the process of doing just that. There is no issue on which we will fight so hard; and both the government and the Liberal Party should have no illusions about that.

I would like to talk for a moment about the housing problem in Ontario. This is the final major topic.

Despite the Ministry of Housing, the Ontario Housing Corporation and property tax credits, there is a distressing shortage of housing for low- and middle-income earners. The introduction of a rent review process in 1975 provided a degree of protection for tenants, but this government has been a reluctant supporter of the whole process.

That fact is illustrated by their failure to implement a massive public housing program when rent controls were introduced. The most effective rent control should be accompanied by a substantial commitment to the construction of public housing for low- and middle-income people.

The cost of housing in Ontario has become prohibitive for people unless there are two income earners in the family. In Toronto the average price of a home is now over \$67,000. In 1971, the beginning of the Davis government years, one third of all Toronto families could afford to spend 25 per cent of their income on a mortgage. Now, eight years later, only 10 per cent of Toronto families can afford a mortgage on the average home. To buy the average home in Metro today, the average worker would have to spend half his wages on mortgage payments. This means that with a 30-year mortgage a worker must earn \$3.53 an hour just to make his mortgage payments. Over the lifetime of the mortgage the cost of the house could be \$226,800; and this does not include property taxes, heat or maintenance.

Mr. Swart: It must be the fault of your developer friends.

Mr. Laughren: Last year the budget promised property tax reform and enriched tax credits for senior citizens.

Mr. McClellan: Whatever happened to that promise?

Mr. Laughren: We have been given neither. This government continues to shift the tax burden from general revenues to tenants and home owners. New Democrats indicated to the government last year that we are prepared to support property tax reform on certain conditions. The government could have introduced property tax reform, knowing it would have had sufficient support in this Legislature. But it chose not to do so.

As a result, tax reform is taking place anyway, through the appeal process, and the burden is shifting from the commercial-industrial sector to the residential property owner.

New Democrats believe the education and social service component of property tax should be reduced and shifted to more progressive taxes, but this government is putting more and more reliance on the regressive property tax. In 1975 the government met 61.4 per cent of average education costs across the province, leaving 38.6 per cent to be paid out of property taxes. This year the government share is expected to be only 51.5 per cent, so that property taxpayers must meet 48.5 per cent of the total.

In Metro Toronto the shift is even more dramatic. The government provided 35.1 per cent of education costs in 1975, but will pay only 20 per cent this year. Property taxes had to provide 64.9 per cent of Metro's education dollar in 1975; but for 1979 they must meet fully 80 per cent of the cost.

Just as the former Treasurer reneged on the Edmonton commitment to keep assistance to municipalities in line with the growth of provincial revenues, so has this Treasurer found a way to weasel out of a commitment. Last year the Treasurer promised the municipalities that assistance would be forthcoming in accordance with the growth in provincial expenditures. When the announced increase in provincial expenditures was six per cent, quite naturally the municipalities assumed their grants would go up six per cent; but in a dazzling display of footwork and doubletalk, the Treasurer announced the municipalities would get only a five per cent increase. This Treasurer had unilaterally decided to subtract debt charges from his commitment.

Mr. Martel: He has lost all credibility.

Mr. Laughren: The municipalities have learned that what the Treasurer promises is not what he delivers, and every municipal official is braced for the Treasurer's next act of fiscal deceit.

[4:45]

I said earlier this was a budget of lost opportunities. An Ontario Treasurer has opportunities greater than those in other provinces, but this Treasurer is letting opportunities slip through his fingers. The Treasurer has neglected opportunities to create jobs for unemployed, to begin the process of rebuilding our economy, to reclaim our resources for us and to tax people according to their ability to pay.

While our suggestions for creating jobs in the short term are a beginning, the real potential lies in rebuilding and recreating our manufacturing sector. The Treasurer has an opportunity to use his Employment Development Fund for that purpose, but he indicates he has no intention of selecting one sector at a time and rebuilding it.

The job-creation possibilities of replacing imported manufactured goods with ones produced here are enormous. Jobs lost to imports are increasing. The latest figures on imports of machinery, for example, represent 132,000 potential jobs in Ontario. Electronic imports represent 102,600 jobs; electrical products 52,500; and processed fruit and vegetables, 6,600 potential jobs.

The Minister of Industry and Tourism says we shall rebuild our manufacturing sector by stimulating exports. He should know that the first step towards selling on world markets is to develop the expertise and economies of scale at home. That means serving our domestic market first. An aggressive policy of replacing imports would help us to become more self-reliant, would ensure that more economic decisions are made here and would address the severe balance of payments problems.

Rebuilding our manufacturing section by replacing jobs lost due to imports should be the linchpin of any industrial strategy; even this government's poor excuse for one, the Employment Development Fund. The Treasurer is letting that opportunity slip away.

The Treasurer has increased revenues by \$269,000,000. All but \$36,000,000 of that comes from regressive taxes. I have noted the Treasurer's tendency to quote from the Saskatchewan budget. I hope he read the table that compares the provincial tax loads of an average family. If he has, he must have noticed that the burden of provincial taxes,

plus health premiums, is lowest in Saskatchewan. For a family with an income of \$15,000, the highest tax rate in the entire country is imposed not by the socialists in Saskatchewan but by the government of Ontario.

Mr. Foulds: How come the Treasurer didn't quote that?

Mr. Laughren: Think about that. In the richest province we have the highest tax rate for ordinary working people. Even after tax credits and rebates, Ontario still imposes the highest burden on ordinary people.

Mr. Martel: You give more tax breaks.

Mr. Laughren: The Treasurer may have wondered how an NDP government was able so easily to outdistance not only this Tory government but all other provincial governments. In large part NDP governments are able to carry out progressive policies because they rely on progressive sources of revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: You have to die here to get a tax cut.

Mr. Laughren: In Ontario, an NDP government would increase taxes on large corporations across the board to 15 per cent. We would retain succession duties, increase the taxes on mining corporations and impose a capital gains tax. Our tax changes would raise more money and would be from progressive sources.

We regard this as a budget of lost opportunities.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Even Mr. Barrett wouldn't put back succession duties. He was asked that last week.

Mr. Laughren: I want to tell the Treasurer that the NDP governments that have abolished succession duties have compensated for it by a progressive tax system and by abolishing OHIP premiums. The Treasurer hasn't done that.

Mr. Swart: It was part of a package.

Mr. Laughren: We regard this as a budget of lost opportunities. We cannot support this budget. We could not do so whether a vote was to be held today or next December.

It is a budget that is not only regressive but points in a direction which we find abhorrent. The shift from progressive to regressive taxes, the disturbing suggestions that OHIP premiums increase with the cost of insured services, the callous indifference to the plight of people trying to cope with inflation and the neglect of the unemployed are all unacceptable to us.

We are angry at the Treasurer's cynical and hypocritical rhetoric, which promises but fails to deliver. The Treasurer says: "The

most important problem facing Ontario today is the need to create more jobs." He introduces not a single program to create a single new job, and he admits it. The Treasurer says: "Ontario must provide policy initiatives to reduce inflation." He does not do that in his budget. In fact his regressive measures are in themselves inflationary. He fails to establish an Ontario food prices review board to protect consumers from unjustified increases in the price of food.

The Treasurer abolished succession duties, which affected only three per cent of estates in Ontario, and says: "The continuation of this tax is hurting our economic performance and costing us jobs." That is nonsense; the Treasurer knows he cannot back it up with any evidence.

The Treasurer brags that Ontario's personal income tax rate—at 44 per cent, our basic federal income tax—is the second lowest in Canada. That is a distortion of the facts, because the Treasurer knows that OHIP premiums are a tax, whether paid directly by individuals and families or paid by employers in lieu of wages.

The Treasurer has said: "In recent years, the competitive position of the manufacturing sector has been restored." Why, then, did the manufacturing trade deficit rise to a record \$12,000,000,000 last year? Why did the machinery and auto parts deficits get worse? The Treasurer has not faced these realities in his budget.

The Treasurer says there has been no reduction in the quality of health care. Such a statement shows gross indifference at a time when hospital budgets are being slashed, extra billing and opting out of physicians is rampant and universal access to insured medical care is being eroded.

For these reasons, I move the following motion:

Mr. Acting Speaker: Mr. Laughren moves that the motion be amended by striking out all words after "that" and the following be substituted therefor: "This House deplores the government's failure to recognize the seriousness of the unemployment problems in Ontario by providing any full-time jobs; rejects the increase in OHIP premiums and other regressive taxes while doing nothing to protect consumers against rising prices; condemns the lack of commitment to rebuilding any specific industry within our manufacturing sector, and the failure to attach any performance and employment guarantees to its Employment Development Fund; opposes the continued giveaways of our mineral resources; and finally, condemns

the shift of the cost of education and social services to municipalities, and for these reasons, the government no longer enjoys the confidence of this House."

On motion by Hon. Mr. McCague the debate was adjourned.

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

(continued)

On vote 501, ministry administration program; item 1, main office.

Mr. Acting Chairman: The member for Essex North.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, on the last evening—

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Acting Chairman: I'm sorry, I recognized the member for Essex North. I'm sorry; I didn't see the member for Oakwood.

Mr. Grande: I was on my feet on the last evening, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ruston: I just wanted to follow up—is this the same thing, with Middlesex?

Mr. Grande: Go right ahead.

Mr. Ruston: I'll be brief. I want to check with the minister about the remarks by the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) and by the minister as to the Middlesex building we were discussing the other night. Would the money involved, the Ontario government's share, be coming from the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, or would it be coming from his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No, it's in the estimates. It's here in the book.

Mr. Ruston: It's in this ministry's estimates?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The honourable member will have a chance to approve or disapprove of it.

Mr. Ruston: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, are we going to follow up on this courthouse matter? I want to say something on it too but, if the other member was on his feet and talking on the same thing, fine.

Mr. Acting Chairman: The member for Oakwood had the floor when we adjourned. Perhaps we could go back to the matters raised by the member for Oakwood, and then we could deal with the courthouse matter following that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, if I might help you: You were not in the chair

the other night; we were discussing the Middlesex building. At the time we adjourned, the member for Oakwood was on his feet, but we really hadn't got away from the Middlesex building at that moment. I don't think he is interested in the Middlesex building. But I'll be glad to answer whatever is asked of me.

Mr. Acting Chairman: In view of that, would the member for Oakwood agree that we should complete the courthouse matter and then return to the matters which he wishes to discuss?

Mr. Grande: As you see fit, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, when this discussion took place last Tuesday, I was fulfilling my responsibilities in the committee considering the Ministry of Transportation and Communications estimates. I didn't realize this matter was being discussed or I would have come up to the House and participated in the debate.

I was a little annoyed at the comment made by the member for Middlesex when he indicated, in connection with this particular matter pertaining to the Middlesex courthouse, that I had just paid lip-service. I simply want to indicate to the minister that I am the type of person who does work behind the scenes. I don't particularly expect to get bold print in the papers every time I happen to contact a federal member to see if we can't get them to live up to a commitment they made, or when I attend meetings. I didn't attend all the meetings that were called, but I certainly attended the meetings I was invited to attend in connection with this particular matter. I was working behind the scenes. I'm not saying this because I want to take a great deal of credit, but because I take exception to what the member for Middlesex said, that I simply paid lip-service.

There is a lot of confusion in connection with this whole matter, and I would like to try to put it in its proper perspective.

The total cost of restoring and renovating the courthouse in Middlesex amounted to somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2,400,000. The total cost of restoring the building was estimated at \$1,600,000.

Before the title had been turned over the municipality, I believe the federal government had agreed to match the provincial government funding on a 50-50 basis, which would mean 50 per cent of \$1,600,000, or \$800,000. But, as one reads through some of the correspondence from Hugh Faulkner and others, they seemed to treat the total cost

of \$2,400,000 as the total cost of restoration, which simply was not the case.

[5:00]

Then when title was transferred to the municipality I believe federal government policy was that once the municipality becomes involved, any funding is treated on an equal-cost formula basis. That means the federal government would contribute one third to funding the restoration; the provincial government would contribute one third; and the municipality would contribute one third.

I believe Middlesex county council misunderstood what Mr. Faulkner had tried to indicate or was not knowledgeable about the federal government policy, which I believe has not changed. I believe that has been its policy for some time; that if there is going to be funding for the restoration of buildings which are declared historic, the municipalities will share equally with the provincial government and the federal government.

I am saddened to think that the Minister of Government Services would try to bring federal politics into the Ontario Legislature, as he and the member for Middlesex obviously did the other night when I wasn't here. They got up and condemned the federal government. I believe they had something to say about the federal member, Larry Condon. I believe some reference was made to Judd Buchanan.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege: I did not refer to the local member. I did not criticize the federal government. I explained the actual facts, on which you have documentation. At no time did I criticize the minister or the local member. I never mentioned the local member's name.

Mr. Riddell: If that's the case, I must apologize to the minister. I must read Hansard. There must have been some reason for my colleague, who is the critic for this particular ministry, to get up on his feet and indicate that it appeared as though we were fighting the federal election in this particular chamber.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the honourable member, I don't think those remarks were directed at the minister.

Mr. Riddell: If that's the case, I still hold the minister in the same respect I did before. I guess I can't say the same for the member for Middlesex, if indeed he was the one who tried to bring federal politics into the Ontario Legislature.

I was going to retaliate, Mr. Minister, by saying we know that you are personally

carrying a member by the name of Sid Fraleigh on your shoulders. He happens to be the opposition to Larry Condon, the federal member. We know this, but we'll let it go at that. If you didn't bring federal politics in here I won't have any more to say about that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, let the record show that he did say "the federal member"; not until after May 22.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going on further, other than to say that the municipality of Middlesex is assured of the \$800,000 which the federal government apparently committed itself to from the very beginning. I hope that sets the minister's mind at ease. I hope that sets the mind of the member for Middlesex at ease. I know it has set the minds of those on the municipality of Middlesex county council at ease. I would just like to say—and I think you'll see it in the London Free Press tonight, Mr. Minister—that the federal government member, Larry Condon, has assured the council that the \$800,000 will be forthcoming. So I expect that the provincial government will live up to its commitment of \$800,000 and that will leave the municipality with the \$600,000 renovation fund for its share.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the honourable member, I really appreciate knowing that there has been a definite clarification of the federal government's position. When we were debating this Tuesday night I read portions of letters. I don't think I misread the letter from the federal government, a copy of which I have given you; dated, I believe, August 1977. I am sorry I don't have that file with me. I had it out in the east lobby an hour ago not realizing we would be going back to it this afternoon.

The other night I read the bottom portion of page one of the letter of August 1977, and if you would look at it you will note item (a) said 50-50 sharing with the province. Item (b) suggested one third, one third, one third.

If you go over to the top of page two, it definitely makes it clear the title would have to be vested in the county or the local municipality. I am not sure if it said the city of London, but it did refer to the local municipality.

The difference in the most recent letter pointed out that in 1977 the architect's estimate was \$2,200,000. The estimate from which the Ministry of Government Services was working last October was that of the architect hired by Middlesex county. That was \$1,600,000 for refurbishing. I don't have the

architect's report of \$2,200,000 for the refurbishing in 1977.

I want to thank the honourable member for giving me the assurance the government of Canada is accepting the proposal that I put in my letter of October 1978 when I suggested the province put up \$800,000, providing the federal government put up \$800,000, making a total of \$1,600,000; and providing the county of Middlesex would complete the job at an estimated cost of \$600,000. I just want to thank him for giving the House that assurance. I can assure you we are ready. Our \$800,000 is in the vote to use when we have an opportunity.

Mr. Grande: I really have very few questions for the minister. Some of them relate to the Welcome House which the minister mentioned at the beginning of the estimates. As we have just come from the estimates of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation where we heard the decision was made to turn over the facility on University and Dundas, I wonder if the minister could let us know how long have these negotiations been going on between the Ministry of Culture and Recreation and his ministry about the movement of Welcome House from the present location on York to the future location on University and Dundas?

As the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) is next to the minister, I guess he can also fill him in on that information.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In response to the honourable member, I don't have the actual request here, but it came from the Minister of Culture and Recreation about three weeks ago. I can't say whether the same request came to me from the Premier (Mr. Davis) or not, but the Premier was well aware the Minister of Culture and Recreation had requested it.

I want to go a step further and inform the honourable member that in the present process of government, once the decision has been made it has to go before Management Board for approval, and from there back to cabinet. That part hasn't been done. So in the last three weeks we have agreed to do it but the final approvals are not completed.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, what I want to find out from the minister is an idea of what goes on in the decision-making process. We heard from the Ministry of Culture and Recreation in its estimates that discussions have been going on for the movement of Welcome House since 1976, two years back. I'm just wondering, why did it take two years for that decision to come to fruition? Were there any other plans your ministry had for that particular building at University Avenue and Dundas Street?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member, I am sure he realizes that the staffs of the two different departments certainly meet. But once they come to an arrangement it's at that stage that they come to the minister to get the necessary approvals. Now I can't answer whether or not my staff negotiated—I can find it out for you. Standing here as the minister I would say that our staff and Culture and Recreation have been negotiating, but from my position it was three weeks ago.

Mr. Grande: This obviously does not contradict the letter that we discussed in Culture and Recreation estimates from the Premier to the Minister of Culture and Recreation dated February 27. In essence, as far as I am concerned it issues a pretty stern order to both the Minister of Culture and Recreation and to the Minister of Government Services that that building at 454 University Avenue should be turned over to the Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

Let me leave it at that. It is obvious and it is confirmed then that until the Premier stepped in, Welcome House was to stay on York Street. The Premier stepped in through a letter to the Minister of Culture and Recreation and it says at the bottom of that letter: "I'm sure if you decide to do this, Lorne Henderson and his deputy John Thatcher will co-operate in every possible way." That is dated February 27 and I guess it coincides very well with what you said in terms of the decision being made three weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: If it was five weeks ago—you know how quickly time goes by when you're busy. I'm trying to answer you off the cuff—I don't have the file here—from my memory of it. I haven't been informed. I was told once that there was charges made towards me but I haven't had time to see what the charges were. I'm sitting here and I don't know what your committee learned.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Minister, all I wanted to do was to confirm that when the decision was made from your particular ministry, it was made at the same time as the Premier ordered that decision to be made. Not before and not after. That confirms some of the thoughts I have on that matter. For the time being I am satisfied with those answers that you've given me, in other words.

The next area is in regard to the approximately \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 grant—I don't know whether it's a grant or not, but anyway it's about the \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 that went from the Ministry of Government Services over to the Villa Colombo complex at Dufferin and Lawrence. It's about a year and a half ago.

At that particular time they were trying to buy the approximately 12 acres of land and facilities adjacent to Columbus House or the Villa Colombo. They did not have the money to pay—I don't remember exactly how much it was. For some mysterious reason the Ministry of Government Services got involved and coughed up between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 so that purchase could be made. I just want to find out how the ministry entered that picture, and I would like the minister to tell me a little bit of the background in terms of how his ministry related to Villa Colombo.

[5:15]

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Again, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to respond off the cuff; I don't have that file here. Before I became Minister of Government Services, I was chairman of cabinet, and I well remember cabinet approving the purchase of this property. The local people did not have the money; so cabinet authorized the minister at that time—and the member will understand that I am speaking off the cuff from my memory of what happened in cabinet with another ministry.

We authorized the Ministry of Government Services to purchase this property. My memory tells me the price was \$2,000,000; I trust the member will take it as that—we can get the actual figure, but I hope he will accept it the way I am telling it because he will realize that, not being the minister, I could make a slipup there.

At the moment, we are in the midst of selling that property to that body of people. We don't want to make any profit in selling it to the club. I don't have all the facts to assure the member that it's at the cost, less or more, but as minister I would hope that the price would be what it cost us. We think we were of service and help to the club.

Mr. Grande: All I am trying to find out is how the Ministry of Government Services got involved in that transaction. It's very strange to me that a particular group or community would come to the ministry and say: "Look, we are \$3,000,000 short"—and if my memory serves me correctly, it is \$3,400,000—that all a group has to do is come before the ministry and say: "We are \$3,400,000 short. Would Government Services buy this particular building for us?" Does the ministry do that with every other group in this province? Is it customary that the government does that as a policy?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: As I said, I am speaking of something that happened about

two years ago now, I think. I was chairman of cabinet at the time; so I remember it. The Minister of Government Services at that time—I believe it was John Smith from Hamilton—

Mr. B. Newman: A fine fellow.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. I believe he was the minister who came to cabinet and suggested the purchase of this parcel of property for so much money—the member says \$3,400,000; I will accept that. The minister recommended that we purchase Villa Colombo because it was for sale; we would purchase it outright. He hoped that Government Services would hold it and, if these people came back—and he suggested a time limit to us; I don't have the overall thing—the government would offer it back to them at the time they felt they could afford to buy it. The member says it was \$3,400,000. I will accept that. I thought it was \$2,000,000. I haven't looked into it recently, and I don't have the file in front of me.

Mr. Grande: Would the minister undertake to take a look at that particular file and get the details? Perhaps before these estimates are over, we can come back to that, perhaps under another item. I am not familiar with this minister's estimates, nor am I familiar with the votes, but perhaps we will find another time when we can come in and the minister can give us that information.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I will try to speak to that item when we go on with the estimates tomorrow morning. I am advised that it comes under vote 502, item 5.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the report of the design and construction program for 1979-80 that the former Sprucedale School site at Hagersville is slated for demolition. I was wondering what the minister has to say about that.

I know it was drawn to the attention of the city of Nanticoke and the region of Haldimand-Norfolk that this property was available. There is a good swimming pool located on the site. I realize the buildings are an old air force base going back to the 1940s and many of the buildings are old, but there is a good heating system, and water and sewage services are available and in working order at the present time. It has been vacant since the winter of 1977-78, I believe. I wonder what plans the minister has for that, and if the area municipalities will be given an opportunity of making use of that land?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Before the minister answers, I would remind the member that that question is rather a specific item which might best be dealt with somewhere else in these votes rather than a general policy matter. The question has been asked, and a great deal of latitude has been given on matters earlier, so I will ask the minister to respond. But we have been on these estimates for some time and we are still on vote 501; in fairness to the members who may be reserving their questions for a particular vote I think I should perhaps be ruling a little more sternly than I have on these matters. Perhaps you could answer that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to request a little bit more information. I am really not familiar with that one. It is the Sprucedale School at Hagersville; formerly occupied by Community and Social Services, right?

Mr. G. I. Miller: Yes. I think it is on page 36 that it indicates it is slated for demolition. It was my understanding the buildings were going to be removed and I wondered if there was any interest from the region of Haldimand-Norfolk or the city of Nanticoke.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Can the minister remember to raise that when we come to that specific vote?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: One or two seconds here. The Ministry of Community and Social Services have a consultant reviewing the property for that ministry to see if they have future use for it, or to bring in proposals for using it. At this moment it is still under their jurisdiction. Until we get the report we are not in a position to answer your question as directly as I would like to be able to answer it.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I wonder when a decision will be made. Is there any deadline or any time element there? It has been sitting there now for one year. Again I would like to point out there is a good swimming pool there and there is a good heating system. I would assume it is going to be put in mothballs. I know there are many municipalities in my riding, and probably elsewhere in Ontario, that would like to have access to a swimming pool of that type. So my concern is that it should be utilized and made available to the public.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We didn't hire the consultants, but it is our understanding they hope to report by the end of May. We can't say positively, but that is what we are told from the other ministry, that we should have something by the end of May.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The member for Riverdale on a policy matter.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands. I wanted to raise a specific question about the ministry's position with respect to the conflicting interests in the old Don Jail property.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Proceed; in view of the fact everybody else has had a great deal of latitude to this point I don't want to come down on the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I don't mind if you do; I just would like to know the appropriate place to raise it. If now is the time it would be—

Mr. Deputy Chairman: All right, the minister is prepared to deal with it now.

Mr. T. P. Reid: Can we have a vote on that now; to come down on the member for Riverdale?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Proceed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Minister, my inquiry is simply for the purpose of trying to get some clarification and not to confuse an otherwise already confused issue. The interests involved are the Ministry of Correctional Services, the Riverdale Hospital and the Toronto Humane Society. It is interesting that of the two aldermen for the city of Toronto representing ward seven, one of them sits on the board of the Toronto Humane Society and the other one sits on the board of the Riverdale Hospital.

I have had some correspondence with the executive director of both the Riverdale Hospital and the humane society about their positions in connection with it. Perhaps the easiest way would be simply to ask the minister where the matter now stands, then in the light of any comment he wants to make I can decide whether I need to pursue it further now.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer this question. I have spent a great deal of time on this particular project. Members will note I did not have to consult staff on my position on it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Would you want to answer it now?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That is right. I felt the question would give me a golden opportunity. The Don Jail, as you know, was offered to the humane society and tentatively accepted.

At the same time, the Minister of Culture and Recreation assured them \$1,000,000 for the restoration of the Don Jail. Everything was going along quite well until a Mr. Tom Wardle, who is the chairman of the Riverdale

Hospital board and a former member of this House—I use his name because we all know Tom quite well—he and the executive director and another member of the board approached me a few months ago and told me the plan of the hospital. Their real concern at that time was we were working on an agreement with the humane society which would take up the next 99 years. You can understand the concern of the hospital board on this land across the road from them which they felt they needed for future expansion.

Immediately after I met with the board I sent my architects to see if all bodies could be satisfied and if there was sufficient property. I will approach it this way: On examination of the Don Jail the property, on one side is a parking lot; the Ministry of Correctional Services requires that. As you view the site from the front, the left hand side is what the Riverdale Hospital would require, along with a portion of the front of it. They would need more than that, but the expansion they have in mind for the next 25 years would take a portion of it. As we look more deeply into it, Correctional Services needs an exercise yard for outdoor recreation.

Here we are with a piece of property of which Correctional Services needs maybe three quarters; the hospital needs about one fifth; and the remainder would be left for the humane society. The humane society is pretty well convinced, and I am too, that the portion left would not meet their needs.

Three public bodies, all serving a useful purpose, want a portion of the property. The Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Walker), the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell), the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Baetz) and myself—the four of us—have had two meetings. We have sized it up in all ways, shapes and forms. We are not in a position yet to state one body or another body will have it.

[5:30]

Our position is this: We are convinced we have to help the three bodies and satisfy the humane society. We've made a pledge to them and we've got to satisfy them first. Correctional Services have to be satisfied. I won't guarantee it, but I'm hopeful that when we come to a conclusion we will be able to satisfy the need of the hospital board. We might not satisfy their desire; their desire would be that they get the complete property, that's the way they left it with me.

We can't let them have the complete property. They don't have any approvals from the Ministry of Health for additional hospital growth, but I believe they do have money from other sources and they want to do some

building there that doesn't involve the province.

I can't answer the honourable member yet. The ministers have met and we are mulling over ideas. We haven't really come to a full conclusion, but we're hoping to satisfy all three bodies.

Let me change that "satisfy". We are hoping to meet the needs of the hospital. We're not going to try to give the hospital half the property as they would have liked, but we hope to be able to work out a method so they will get sufficient land for the development they propose.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, can the minister give any indication when the problem will be resolved? Does he really think all parties can be satisfied: given the relatively small piece of property involved; the significant interest now in restoring and preserving the exterior of the old jail building, the interests, as he has stated them, of the Ministry of Correctional Services with respect to parking and the exercise yard; the extension of the hospital services over a period of time with the funds which the hospital has and with their long term plans; and the relative urgency of the Toronto Humane Society's need because of the expropriation of the property by the government along Wellesley Street and the purchase—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Let me correct that, Mr. Chairman. The government did not expropriate the Wellesley Street property. We had a willing seller and the government bought it for \$1,000,000 in 1973.

Mr. Renwick: That's fine, I'm sorry; but it's all part of the acquisition by the government of that property. The humane society then bought the property down on River Street and as we thought were going to proceed with their new premises on River Street. At that point the Don Jail question came up and they entered into negotiations with the ministry, which appeared to indicate that, subject to terms being worked out, there would be a 99-year lease for the premises.

The hospital board members, I think, felt themselves caught unawares by the interest of both the executive committee of city council and of the humane society; they felt they should have been consulted. When they—"intervened" is probably too harsh a term—when they let their interest be known there was some concern to try to work out an amicable arrangement amongst all three of the interests involved.

Does the minister really think it's possible to work out a plan that will meet those three interests?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would prefer not to go into what my thoughts are until I have an opportunity to speak with the humane society and the hospital board, but yes I think they will all be satisfied.

My friend on my right says happy. There's no way you can make three people overjoyed, but I think they will all be satisfied. We have not gone back to them, because there are some minor details between the ministers that we want to satisfy ourselves on.

Mr. Renwick: I suppose there is no question that it's the intention of the ministry that the lessees, presumably—whoever they are—of that property, from the government will, as a condition of whatever arrangements are made, maintain the exterior of the old jail building and proceed to renovate and use the interior of the building. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the plan is that the building as such would be preserved. There are some jail walls and one small building that will have to be removed to satisfy the needs of the hospital. When you're facing the jail, there's a wall to the left that will have to be removed; it's not part of the building.

Mr. Renwick: Standing on Gerrard Street and facing north, the old building will still remain there, with whatever adjustments have to be made?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: If our proposal is accepted by all ministries that will happen; it will be maintained.

Mr. Renwick: Just a couple of more questions. I certainly don't want to upset any of these private discussions the minister is having either with his colleagues or with others. But in fact is the minister now in discussions with both the Toronto Humane Society and the hospital and his colleague in Correctional Services about the resolution of the problem? Or are these discussions about his proposed plan a matter within the government at the present time which in due course will be conveyed to the hospital and to the humane society as a proposal?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We ministers have worked out what we feel will be satisfactory. But the legwork for us is not completed yet. Once we get it completed and think it will be acceptable to all three bodies, we will contact the humane society and the hospital board and we'll put it on the table for them before we take the necessary action.

Mr. Renwick: How long do you anticipate the balance of this work will take?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I would like to say to the member for Riverdale that the minister and I might get it finalized either next week or the following week. But, to be fair, we'll try to get the message back to them within a month. We're close to finalization.

Mr. Renwick: That's what I wanted to get a sense of. The minister is saying that, by the end of May the proposal would be put forward to the private bodies?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. I would hope that by the end of May we could come back into the House with the proposal and that we will have conveyed that to the local bodies. But there are two or three things we're not satisfied with. We ministers hope to get our problems ironed out within the next week to two weeks.

Mr. Renwick: Just a final remark: Perhaps the minister would be good enough—to the extent possible in a busy schedule—to keep me advised of what progress is being made and to let me know about the matter. While it's not strictly within the riding of Riverdale, being across the street—it used to be, and on any proper redistribution will be back in Riverdale—I have a very real interest on behalf of the people in the area as to just what does happen to that property.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The honourable member could be helpful to me if he would put forth a proposal of his priorities.

Mr. Renwick: I don't have any specific position. I recognize the needs of the Toronto Humane Society, and I recognize the needs of the Riverdale Hospital. I'm not an expert who can make up his mind as to whether there's any incompatibility between the purposes of the humane society and the purposes of the hospital, so far as the care of people on the one hand and the care of animals on the other hand are concerned. I don't know whether there's a basic incompatibility that can't be resolved there.

I would assume at some point the remnants of the jail property will likely be moved so there will be more property available at some time, although it may always remain as a staging jail for the purposes of the courts in the old city hall.

I do have one concern. I'm on the side of those who believe the old structure should be maintained and restored. I was concerned when the original intention was expressed that it had so many odious recollections involved it should be demolished. I had that view about the old hospital at 999 Queen Street, but I don't share the same view about

the building there, perhaps for reasons that my grandfather and father used to deliver the groceries to the old Don Jail. I, fortunately, have never had occasion to be inside those premises myself.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We will be very happy to inform the member. I would want to thank him for his remarks and his concern about the building, about the property and about the hospital.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I'd like to go back for a moment to the item raised by the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) in relation to the Italian-Canadian Benevolent Corporation. As the minister stated previously, it seems that under vote 502 the minister is going to provide the information which was requested by my colleague. In doing so, I would like to ask the minister if, under the same vote, he will table a full disclosure of the transaction between the government and the Italian-Canadian Benevolent Corporation?

Also, I would like to ask the minister—if he doesn't have the answer I'll wait until full discussion under vote 502—if under the transaction there is any particular clause which guarantees that if the corporation chooses to buy the land they will be prevented from selling it to private individuals, companies or other people outside of the corporation. The reason I would like to have this information is to determine if the province, the minister or this government were assured at the time the transaction took place that the land to be transformed to the Italian-Canadian Benevolent Corporation will be used in the future for the benefit of the Italian community as a whole. If the minister has such information, I'll wait until vote 502 is dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: When we deal with vote 502 I will have the documentation here to answer the question. I don't have it here now.

Mr. Grande: My intent in raising this now is that the you table that documentation ahead of time so that at the time the vote comes up we could have a discussion? Would you table that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You realize how much time I've got left on my estimates. I would expect we will be in that vote tomorrow morning and I will have it with me tomorrow morning. I don't know how I can table it ahead of time.

Mr. Grande: Just send it to us.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will have it with me tomorrow morning.

[5:45]

Mr. Makarchuk: I notice that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Wiseman) comes under your ministry. I have had some dealings with a previous Minister without Portfolio in Brantford who is currently selling licence plates. Would you kindly outline to us just exactly what you are spending \$145,000 for, what are the duties and functions of the present Minister without Portfolio, and what has he been performing?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I had hoped I would be asked this question. Last week I asked the Minister without Portfolio to outline for me his interpretation of his duties. I also asked if he would be available if you people wished him to be, and he will be available.

I have a letter dated March 29, 1979, addressed to the Honourable Lorne Henderson, Minister of Government Services. It is about the duties of the Minister without Portfolio. It says: "Firstly, he is chairman of the regulations committee which meets two hours at least every week. He sits on the legislation committee, chaired by the Honourable Lorne Henderson, which meets twice per week, sometimes sitting from four to five hours per week."

"We meet every Monday afternoon at 3:30 and we go on through to six or 6:30 or seven o'clock. If we don't get our work wound up on that day we come back Tuesday afternoon for a similar session.

"He sits on the Board of Internal Economy, which meets every week or every second week. A meeting usually lasts three hours. Plus there is preparation for all the foregoing committees.

"Tuesday at 8 a.m., (he is at) Management Board (which is) usually going through until 12 noon. This varies when the estimates are going through. (The) sitting (is) two or three times a week or whenever necessary. Wednesday, (is) cabinet."

Cabinet meets each Wednesday morning at 9:30 and the odd day. Yesterday the Premier (Mr. Davis) was out of town and we didn't deal with policy but just with regular business. We were through at 11 o'clock. But the usual Wednesday meeting is from 2:30 to four.

"(On) Thursday, he sits on the justice policy field for approximately two or three hours." He does see delegations. "(He is) chairman of the agency review committee. This committee meets with the Clerk, the secretary of the committee, as well as with the committee members and staff. Time of the meetings varies according to the availability of members, et cetera.

"(He fulfils) speaking engagements for ministers when they are unable to attend."

Here is the main one: "Looking after constituents and being in the Legislature."

Mr. Bradley: How much money does he get?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Whip is after him every day because he's not in the Legislature. Then it says: "(He fulfils) regular duties that any member has regarding constituents."

That's the letter. It's signed by the Honourable Douglas J. Wiseman, Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, after listening to that recital of rather onerous duties, I wonder what is the difference. Each member sits on committees. We have our members who sit on the Board of Internal Economy. We have our members who are part of the justice policy committee and other committees and everything else. These are the normal duties that members perform.

There is absolutely nothing in the list you read that is any different from what the ordinary member performs in this House. Yet it is costing the government \$145,000. I don't know whether that includes the car and chauffeur or not or whether that's an added cost.

It seems to me this is a waste of money. For \$145,000 you're not getting your money's worth. Probably it should be something the provincial auditor should investigate. After all, he has been empowered by the new Audit Act to see if we're getting value for our money. What the minister has read out are exactly the duties of a member. In fact they're less than the duties of a member because he has more assistance and more help in his office, than a member has with the limited supply of assistance he has at this time.

I want to know who directs him. Who tells him what to do if there are any duties? Does the direction come from you or from the Premier or the cabinet or from whom? Where does the direction come from?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I would have to disagree with the honourable member's remarks. Firstly, committees of cabinet are set up by cabinet.

Mr. Makarchuk: Just like committees of caucus are set up by caucus. That also is a profound statement.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Again, I would have to disagree with the honourable member. Management Board has certain responsibilities.

ties. The board meets, as he suggested, every Tuesday morning and generally goes through to noon. The Board of Internal Economy, as he knows, is appointed by order in council. The chairman of the regulations committee is appointed by cabinet. The chairman of the committee looking into regulations again is an appointment of cabinet.

The justice policy field meets every Thursday morning. I sat on the justice policy field, but it was for only two or three months. The resources policy field, as I remember, used to meet at nine o'clock Thursday morning.

Mr. McClellan: Where?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: They meet now over in the Whitney Block; the three policy fields all meet over there.

Mr. Breaugh: That's not the one in the Park Plaza?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No. No justice policy field meets at the Park Plaza.

The three boards all meet Thursday morning. I don't sit on any of the three—

Mr. Makarchuk: We meet Thursday morning in public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Okay; so the committee meets while the House is sitting Thursday morning.

Mr. Makarchuk: No, it doesn't sit Thursday morning.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No, but while the House is in session.

Mr. Breaugh: Which one meets at La Scala?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That, I understand, is a very important committee.

Mr. Breaugh: Which one is that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It is the committee that keeps the body going.

Mr. Breaugh: Whose body?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Whichever person might be there.

Mr. Makarchuk: Are they warm bodies?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member would have to be there at the right time to know.

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, basically what the minister is saying is that he goes to meetings. If you ask any member, they all go to meetings. Everybody has meetings Monday mornings, Tuesday mornings, Wednesday mornings, and Thursday mornings; some of us meet on Saturday mornings and some Saturday afternoons, and some of us have meetings on other days. I am sure he has meetings out there.

What I am trying to point out is that what he does is nothing out of the ordinary from

what every other member does. What bothers me about this is that we are spending an extra \$145,000 for this person who goes to a meeting. That's great. But what does he contribute? I have never seen anything. We spend \$145,000 to set up a whole complex up there, and I can't see any results. I can't see any advantages.

I don't see any difference between him and a member who gets a normal salary and does not cost an extra \$145,000 to be able to attend meetings. Unless we give him some specific responsibilities that are visible and put him in a position to make some decisions et cetera, I suggest it might be an idea for this government to abandon that position.

Does the minister remember Dick Beckett? He used to be Minister without Portfolio from the city of Brantford. The citizens of Brantford used to wonder what he did; they wondered for so long that, when he ran for re-election, he came third. I think that is a reflection.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That was the member's fault.

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes, it was my fault; no question about it. I made sure. But that is a reflection on the magnitude of the office of Minister without Portfolio.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister about his policy on temporary employees filling in when extra help is needed for short periods. I understand the government did set up its own temporary employment agency called GO Temp and it has people on call for that agency. In addition, I understand it also uses some private temporary employee agencies.

I would like to know how much was spent in the last year on the private temporary employee agencies and how much was spent on GO Temp in the three categories of stenographic help, clerical help and data processing and keypunch help. I have the feeling it may be that the government is using private employment agencies as part of its effort to appear to be keeping the civil service down in numbers.

The private employment agencies' charges do not show up as salaries for civil servants but they certainly cost the government at least as much, and probably more, than if it hired its own GO Temp employees for all these temporary jobs. Obviously, the private employment agency has to take a profit out of the fee paid for supplying temporary help.

I'd like to know how much was spent in the last year on GO Temp and how much

was spent on private employment agencies? What are the plans for this coming year for using the outside temporary employment agencies?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, firstly in response to the honourable member, we are not aware of any other agency. We want to qualify it when we say that, since there may have been a director or somebody who was in a real bind for a day. We use GO Temp on a regular basis, that's our usual source of extra help. Standing here, I'm not aware any other agency was used. My staff will try and find out for the next sitting of the committee; but at this moment, to the best of our knowledge there was no outside agency used. We admit there may have been one or two occasions, but we're not aware of

it here. It's not our practice anyhow. We do use GO Temp.

Ms. Bryden: That's good news, Mr. Minister. I did have one person who was on GO Temp staff, in the data processing field, who reported that she understood when she was available work was given to an outside private employment agency in this field of data processing. She felt she should have been called instead.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That helps us when you tell us it was in our data processing department.

Vote 501 agreed to.

On motion by Hon. Mr. McCague, the committee of supply reported a certain resolution.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
23	997	1	26	Mr. Foulds moved first reading of Bill 60.

APPENDIX

(See page 1078.)

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
ON NOTICE PAPER

LEARNING-DISABLED PERSONS

111. Mr. Blundy: For the year 1977-78, how many learning disabled children and how many learning disabled adults applied for services through the vocational rehabilitation branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services? How many children and adults were declared eligible and feasible for vocational rehabilitation services upon first application? How many cases were appealed? What was the result of completed appeals? How many appeals are still in progress? What is the full range of services provided to eligible applicants? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Norton: Information on applications for provision of basic educational services under the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act of the Ministry of Community and Social Services made by learning disabled children and adults, is collected by academic year.

Information for the 1977-78 academic year is as follows:

Total number of applications, 192; number approved by VRS, 118; number of cases appealed, 58; number of appeals granted, 38; number of appeals denied, 17; number of appeals in process, 3.

The full cost of tuition and books and supplies are provided under the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act if the application and the program are approved.

Supplementary services may be provided under the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Act if required to enable the client to take full advantage of the program. These include travel expenses for the client, overnight accommodation and meals during travel and incidental academic costs such as field trips.

If a residential facility is requested, clients may make application for a maintenance allowance under the Family Benefits Act to assist them with the cost of room and board and other personal expenses.

The foregoing relates only to applicants requesting basic educational services, i.e. those services which ordinarily are provided by the public educational system in Ontario.

FRAUD TRIAL

112. Mr. Nixon: What was the cost of the trial and retrial in the county of Oxford involving the matter of fraud? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Regina v. Foster et al: Dates of trial, November 1, 1977-December 16, 1977 (holiday break); January 16, 1978-February 10, 1978, date of mistrial.

Witness fees (includes travel and accommodation), \$9,373.92; jury fees and mileage, \$18,304.20; total \$27,678.12.

Dates of retrial: Trial commenced January 15, 1979; verdict reached March 25, 1979; sentenced on March 30, 1979.

Witness fees, \$1,776.97; jury fees and mileage, \$21,605.05; total \$23,382.02.

Total cost of trial and retrial, \$51,060.14.

Note: In July, 1978, Ontario Regulation 949/94 was amended. The amendment provides for a juror's fee of \$40 per diem to be paid for each day of service after 10 days. A fee of \$10 is paid for each day of service up to and including 10 days.

HERITAGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

114. Mr. Bounsall: As the provisions in the 1979 general legislative grants will generate a significantly reduced amount of provincial funding per classroom hour of instruction in Heritage Language Programs, is it the intention of the ministry that local school boards pay their increased share of the costs by raising property taxes? If this was not the intent of the ministry, outline other specific courses of action open to school boards. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: More time is required to respond to this question. A final answer will be available on or about May 15, 1979.

FARM TAX REBATES

121. Mr. Ziemba: Would the Minister of Revenue table the names of property holders receiving farm tax rebates during 1977, giving the number of acres upon which the rebate was paid, the assessment, the property tax levied and the amount of farm tax rebate paid in each case? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Wells: Payments to property holders under 1977 farm tax reduction program: The large volume of material—some 20 binders totalling about 13,000 pages—and the resultant cost makes it impractical to table this information in the Legislature.

The information, however, is available in the subsidies branch of the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and arrangements can be made to examine the records during regular office hours. This should be done through the director of the branch.

SCHOOL BOARD STATISTICS

115. Mr. Bounsall: Will the ministry extract from its 1974, 1976 and 1978 September board reports the following information for each Ontario school board: (1) Total number of teachers as defined in the report by type of duty; (2) number of principals; (3) number of vice-principals; (3) number of regular teachers; (5) number of other; (6) number of department heads; (7) number of students. For each board give the PTR according to the definition used in Education Statistics. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

See sessional paper 36.

STUDENT DROPOUTS

116. Mr. Bounsall: (a) Will the ministry provide details about the percentage of the total students who drop out of the Ontario elementary and secondary schools and who cease formal education before graduation? (b) Will the ministry, please, break down the statistics by: (i) school board; (ii) elementary/secondary; (iii) native people/others; (iv) male/female? (c) In each case, will the ministry provide data for the last 10 years? (d) Is the ministry satisfied with this present level of student retention? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: We require additional time to prepare our response to the above question. The answer will be ready for tabling on or about Friday, April 20, 1979.

EDUCATION RESEARCH

117. Mr. Bounsall: Will the ministry provide a complete list of all research undertaken by the ministry or local school boards on student retention and student dropout since 1971? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Attached is a list of studies bearing in whole or in part on the question of student retention and dropouts.

Ministry of Education contracts: OISE, Drop Out Study, Watson, 1974/75; Chedoke Hospital, An Experimental Secondary School Program for the Rehabilitation of Dropouts, Anderson, 1973/74; Chedoke Hospital, An Experimental Secondary School Program for the Rehabilitation of Dropouts, Anderson, 1974/75; OISE, The Effects of the Teachers' Strikes on Secondary Students, Brison, 1976/77; OISE, Projections of Student Enrolment and Teacher Requirements, Watson, 1971/72; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1972/73; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1973/74; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1974/75; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply,

Watson, 1975/76; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1976/77; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1977/78; OISE, Projections of Enrolment and Teacher Supply, Watson, 1978/79.

Ministry of Education, grants in aid: Carleton University, Survival of a Grade 8 Cohort: A Study of Early School Leaving in Ontario, 1977—Porter, Blishen; North York Board of Education, Evaluation of the North York Alternate and Independent Study Program, 1973—Virgin, Shecter; OISE, A Study of the Characteristics and Needs of Franco-Ontarian Children in the Ontario Educational System, 1977 and 1975—Ellis; Ottawa Board of Education, A Four-year Follow-Up of Entering Grade 8 Students, 1975—Morrison; Queen's University, Innovative Strategies Designed to Improve the Effectiveness of the Credit System, 1974—White; North York Board of Education, High School Drop-Outs: Characteristics of Their Post-School Learning and Their Perceptions of Why They Left—Virgin, McCatty, Cressy.

School Board Research, (Boards with Research Units): Hamilton Board of Education, A Report on Pupil Retirements From the Secondary Schools of Hamilton, 1974 and 1975—Staples; London Board of Education, Interview Follow-Up of Graduates of, and Dropouts from, the Grade 9 Occupational Classes of 1969-70: Focus on Non-Vocational Areas of Functioning—Small, Stennett, Wilson; London Board of Education, The Grade 9 Class of 1965-66: A Follow-up of Those Who Left School After Four or Five Years, 1971—Stennett, Isaacs; London Board of Education, The Grade 9 Two-Year Occupations Classes of 1970-71: Follow-Up and Comparison with Eligible Students Who Elected Other Programmes, 1972—Smythe, Stennett; North York Board of Education, Dropping-Out: A Review of the Research and Literature, 1973—Peebles; North York Board of Education, Drop-Outs in a Secondary School 1971-72, 1973—Wright; Scarborough Board of Education, Comparative Statistics on Pupil Retirements: Scarborough Secondary Schools—1974-75 and 1968-69, 1971—Dilling; Scarborough Board of Education, Characteristics of School Leavers, Their Expressed Reasons for Leaving School and Their Recommendations—Wideman; Toronto Board of Education, A Follow-Up Study of Special Vocational and Special High School Students, 1972—Reich, Zeigler; Toronto Board of Education, Patterns of Dropping Out, 1974—Young.

In progress: Toronto Board of Education, A Study of Contact School—Larter; Toronto

Board of Education, A Study of Returning Students—Larter; Toronto Board of Education, Returning Students: Characteristics, Opinions, and Attitudes of Schools to Their Return—Larter; York Board of Education, The

Process of Leaving School: Characteristics, Two reports—Archer; York Board of Education, A Survey of High School Drop-Outs in Two Schools in the Borough of York, 1971-72—Stobo.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

118. Mr. Bounsall: Will the ministry provide a list by year and school board of all schools that have been closed since 1975? For each school give details of either the present use of the school or if the school is no longer in the hands of the board of education, give details as to whom it was transferred or sold and a breakdown of the revenues generated from such school closings. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The following is a list of schools closed since 1975, by year and school board.

1975

Board	School	Disposition
Ottawa Bd. of Ed.	St. Joseph's Sec.	
Carleton RCSS	St. Gabriel	
Ottawa RCSS	St. Joseph's	
Renfrew Cty. Bd. of Ed.	Braeside	
Fort Frances RR RCSS	St. Michael's	Leased to the town of Rainy River Jan./77
Sudbury RCSS	Holy Redeemer	Public Tender June 19/78
Sudbury RCSS	St. Alphonse	Town of Rayside-Balfour May/77
Kapuskasing Dist. RCSS	St. Donat	To the Municipality of Foquier March/78
East Parry Sound Bd. of Ed.	Sprucedale	Twp. of McMurrich July/75
Kirkland Lake Bd. of Ed.	Kirkland West	
Elgin RCSS	St. Joseph	
Huron County Bd. of Ed.	North Ashfield	
Brant Bd. of Ed.	Alexandra	
Simcoe City Bd. of Ed.	Bell Ewart & LeFroy	
Haliburton Bd. of Ed.	Lakeview Centre (TMR)	
Durham RCSS	St. Bernard	
Scarborough Bd. of Ed.	Hillside	
Hastings Bd. of Ed.	Marsh Hill	Public Tender Sept./78
Hastings Bd. of Ed.	Centenary	
Hastings Bd. of Ed.	Foxboro	Twp. of Thurlow Dec./78 (Community use)
Northumberland and Newcastle Bd. of Ed.	Shaws	

1976

Ottawa RCSS	St. Gerard's	
Renfrew Bd. of Ed.	Forester's Falls	Public Tender April/77
Kenora Bd. of Ed.	Central	Town of Kenora
The Werner Lake DSA	Werner Lake	
Fort Frances-Rainy River Bd. of Ed.	Atwood Central	Public Tender Sept./77
North Shore Dist. RCSS	St. Lawrence	
Sault Ste. Marie Dist. RCSS	Christ the King	
The Woolrich DSA	Woolrich	
Chapleau Bd. of Ed.	Chapleau (TMR)	

1976

Board	School	Disposition
Sudbury Dist. RCSS	St. Jacques	Town of Valley East Aug./77
Sudbury Dist. RCSS	St. Paul	
Cochrane-Iroquois Falls Bd. of Ed.	Holtyre	Public Tender Dec./77
Cochrane-Iroquois Falls Dist. RCSS	St. Joseph	Public Tender Dec./77
Muskoka Bd. of Ed.	Bala	Public Tender May/77
Muskoka Bd. of Ed.	Cognashene Bay	
Nipissing Bd. of Ed.	Trout Mills	
Lambton Bd. of Ed.	Oakwood	
Bruce Bd. of Ed.	Penetangore	
Oxford Bd. of Ed.	Princess	
Wellington Bd. of Ed.	Sunnydale (TMR)	
Lincoln Bd. of Ed.	Bethel	
Niagara South Bd. of Ed.	Carl McNeil	Port Colborne Assoc. for the Mentally Retarded May/77
Niagara South Bd. of Ed.	Burnaby Road	
Wentworth Bd. of Ed.	Fruitland 2	
Hamilton Bd. of Ed.	McIlwraith	
Halton RCSS	St. Francis Xavier	
Peel Bd. of Ed.	Gordon Graydon	
MSSB	Sacred Heart Village	
Etobicoke Bd. of Ed.	Crestwood	
Durham Bd. of Ed.	Henry St.	
Durham Bd. of Ed.	Green River	
North York Bd. of Ed.	Norman Ingram	
Peterborough Bd. of Ed.	Lakefield	
Peterborough Bd. of Ed.	Ridpath	Real Estate Multiple Listing March/77

1977

Ottawa Bd. of Ed.	Brighthope (TMR)	
Carleton RCSS	St. Thomas	
Ottawa RCSS	N.D. du Bon Conseil	
Ottawa RCSS	Ducharme	
Ottawa RCSS	O.L. of Mount Carmel	Public Tender Nov./78
Ottawa RCSS	O.L. of Perpetual Help	Public Tender Jan./79
Ottawa RCSS	Queen of the Angels	
Ottawa RCSS	Genest	
Ottawa RCSS	St. Christopher	
Ottawa RCSS	St. Pierre	City of Ottawa Jan./78
Ottawa RCSS	Ste. Jeanne d'Arc	
Lanark Bd. of Ed.	Harper-Condrie	Public Tender May/78
SD & G Bd. of Ed.	Williamsburg	Twp. of Williamsburg April/78
SD & G RCSS	Notre Dame des Anges	Public Tender July/78
Sudbury Bd. of Ed.	William MacMillan/Welland	S. Gemmell
Sudbury RCSS	St. Jean Baptiste	
Nipissing RCSS	St. Anne	
Nipissing RCSS	St. Theresa	Public Tender July/78
Essex Bd. of Ed.	Selkirk	
Windsor Bd. of Ed.	J. O. Cahill	Lease to Windsor Assoc. for Cerebral Palsy June/78
Windsor Bd. of Ed.	Sandwich East	Public Tender March/78
Essex RCSS	Ste. Bernadette	
Middlesex Bd. of Ed.	Quad County (TMR)	Quad County Assoc. for the Mentally Retarded

1977

Board	School	Disposition
Grey County Bd. of Ed.	Happy Heights (TMR)	
Oxford RCSS	St. Anthony	
Lincoln Bd. of Ed.	Lady Churchill	
Lincoln Bd. of Ed.	W. J. Robertson	
Lincoln Bd. of Ed.	Mountview (TMR)	Public Tender June/78
Niagara South Bd. of Ed.	Black Creek	Public Tender Jan./79
Niagara South Bd. of Ed.	Snider	Public Tender May/78
Lincoln RCSS	St. John Fisher	
Hamilton Bd. of Ed.	Brantdale	
Hamilton Bd. of Ed.	Mohawk Trail	
Halton RCSS	St. Joseph's	
Toronto Bd. of Ed.	Sackville	
Etobicoke Bd. of Ed.	Morfudd Harries	Public Tender Oct./77
Etobicoke Bd. of Ed.	Cloverdale	
Front L & A RCSS	Howe Island No. 1	
North of Newcastle Bd. of Ed.	Maple Grove West	
North of Newcastle Bd. of Ed.	The Solina (TMR)	Public Tender Nov./77
Peterborough Bd. of Ed.	Rays	Public Tender Sept./77
Peterborough Bd. of Ed.	Mildred Corke	

1978

Prescott & Russell RCSS	Christ Roi	
Renfrew Bd. of Ed.	Schillhart (TMR)	
SD & G Bd. of Ed.	West Front	
Kenora Bd. of Ed.	Rabbit Lake	
Kenora Bd. of Ed.	South Ward	
Kenora RCSS	Father Moss	
Lakehead Bd. of Ed.	Francis St.	
Lakehead Bd. of Ed.	Jumbo Gardens	
Sault Ste. Marie Bd. of Ed.	Central	
Sault Ste. Marie RCSS	St. James	
The Franz DSA	Franz District Area	
Manitoulin Bd. of Ed.	Robinson 1	Sold to the Silverwater Recreation Centre Board Inc.
Sudbury RCSS	St. Hubert	
Nipissing Bd. of Ed.	Kiosk	
Nipissing RCSS	Pie XII	Township of Springer
Windsor RCSS	St. Joan of Arc-Precious Blood	
Windsor RCSS	St. Joseph	
London Bd. of Ed.	Chesley Ave.	
London Bd. of Ed.	Princess Anne	
London Bd. of Ed.	Riverview	
Brant Bd. of Ed.	Oakland Central-Scotland	
Waterloo Bd. of Ed.	Riverside	
Waterloo Bd. of Ed.	Martins (TMR)	
Lincoln Bd. of Ed.	Eastwood/Lakeshore	
Niagara South Bd. of Ed.	Bowen Road	Public Tender Jan./79
Lincoln RCSS	St. John	
Wentworth Bd. of Ed.	Maple Lane	
Hamilton Bd. of Ed.	Onteora	
Hamilton Bd. of Ed.	Vincent Massey	
Norfolk Bd. of Ed.	Doans Hollow	
Norfolk Bd. of Ed.	Forestville	

1978

Board	School	Disposition
Norfolk Bd. of Ed.	Lynndale	Town of Simcoe July/78
Halton Bd. of Ed.	Palermo	
Halton RCSS	St. Mary's	
Peel Bd. of Ed.	Cooksville	Sale by Public Tender Feb./78
Etobicoke Bd. of Ed.	Green Meadow	
Etobicoke Bd. of Ed.	Kipling Grove	
York Bd. of Ed.	George Bailey	
York Bd. of Ed.	Elm Grove (TMR)	
North York Bd. of Ed.	Etienne Brule	
North York Bd. of Ed.	Multi-Age Grouping Unit	
North York Bd. of Ed.	Wilmington	
North York Bd. of Ed.	Magu Secondary	
North & Newcastle	Carrying Place	
North & Newcastle	Harts Corners	
North & Newcastle	Salem	

The information as to the present use of the closed school, where such information is not provided in the above list, is not available at this time.

Prior to 1977, revenue to school boards from the sale of schools and sites is as follows: 1975, \$3.7 million; 1976, \$2.8 million. Information with respect to 1977 and 1978 is at present being collected.

FRENCH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

119. Mr. Bounsall: As the federal government intends to cutback its support for French language instruction by 20 per cent per year for the next five years, will the ministry explain how this will effect the financing of existing programs of French language instruction in Ontario? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Instruction in French as a second language and the provision of education in the French language continue to be priority programs of the Ministry of Education. In 1979 the ministry will continue to provide the same level of funding to school boards for these programs as in 1978. The future level of funding for these programs will depend on the allocation of funds to finance education in the province.

SALE OF SCHOOL PROPERTIES

120. Mr. Bounsall: What financial benefits accrue to the province through the closing of schools, and the sale of school buildings? Will the ministry estimate the value of such benefits for each year since 1975. What provincial benefits accrued to the province through the sale of school sites prior to the current policy (which expires December 31, 1979) of waiving negative grant rights on the sale of such sites. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: No financial benefits accrue to the province through the closing of schools except that the ministry ceases to pay grant on any outstanding debentures.

Where a school board sells a school building the ministry imposes a negative grant on the sale of such buildings in accordance with a formula that reflects the "depreciated value" of the building at the time of the sale.

For the three years prior to 1977, negative grant on the sale of sites and buildings was not calculated separately and is estimated to be: 1974, \$1.6 million; 1975, \$0.9 million; 1976, \$1 million.

Information concerning the benefits from the sale of school buildings and the negative grant waived on the sale of school sites in 1977 and 1978 is presently being collected.

LAB BILLING ERRORS

122. Mr. Ziembra: Would the Minister of Health indicate the amount billed OHIP in error by private medical laboratories, giving the name of the medical laboratory, the principals, the business address, the amount found billed in error in each case and the amount recovered in each case? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Our response to the above question reads as follows: Because of the number of questions that are now being worked on by my ministry, this question will be answered on May 15, 1979.

LEGAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

123. Mr. Ziembra: What are the names and business address of lawyers who performed contract work for the government last

year and how much was each paid? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Contact has been made with all ministries and the offices of the Official Guardian and the Public Trustee, and the collection and collation of the material required for the answer to question 123 is proceeding, and should be ready to table on or about May 18, 1979.

Reference is made to the response to question 137 tabled on December 15, 1978, which detailed the retention of outside counsel by the Ontario government, for the fiscal years of 1976, 1977 and that portion of 1978 ending on October 31, 1978.

When the information referred to in paragraph one has been received from the ministries, a final report covering the period from November 1, 1978 to December 31, 1978 will be tabled.

MINING ACT EXEMPTIONS

124. Mr. Foulds: Will the ministry provide a listing of the applications, by name of company and mining location for exemption to section 113 of the Mining Act for the years 1975 to the present? Will the ministry also list the exemptions granted and those refused? [Tabled April 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Auld: 1. Applications for exemption from section 113 of the Mining Act for 1975 to present: Agnew Lake Mines, North Espanola, three export contracts (see note d); Algoma Steel Corporation, Wawa, one renewal application; Belmont Magnetite, Belmont Township, one new application, one renewal; Consolidated Canadian Faraday, Bancroft, one export contract (see note d); Denison Miner, Elliot Lake, one export contract (see note d); Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Sudbury, two renewals; Inco, Sudbury, four renewals; Mattabi Mines, Ignace, one renewal; Noranda Mines (Geco Div.), Manitouswadge, one renewal; Rio Algom Mines, Elliot Lake, eight export contracts (see note d); Selco Mining Corporation, Uchi Lake, one renewal; Sturgeon Lake Mines, Sturgeon Lake, one renewal; Texasgulf Canada, Timmins, two renewals, one withdrawal; Willroy Mines, Manitouswadge, one renewal.

2. The above list represents 30 applications formally submitted. One exemption was cancelled in 1975 (applied for in 1974). One application was withdrawn after submission.

Notes: (a) Companies find it expedient to consult with ministry staff before formally submitting an application. As a result, only applications with some degree of validity are formally submitted. (b) Alternatively, where companies have not had prior consultation

with ministry staff before submitting an application, subsequent dialogue results in suitable modification or in withdrawal before formal presentation to cabinet. (c) Reasons for granting of exemptions are summarized in pp. 31, 32 of the mineral resources branch discussion paper The Ontario Metal Mining Industry—Present and Future dated 1977 and attached as Appendix "A". (d) The relatively large number of applications for the uranium mining companies is due to the fact that, for uranium export monitoring purposes, they are required to seek a separate exemption for each export contract.

Appendix A: Further processing; the policy of the government of Ontario is that minerals produced in the province shall be processed to as advanced a degree as is reasonably possible before being exported from Canada. An advanced degree of processing increases the income to Canada from the minerals exported and results in more skilled employment for Canadians.

This policy has been followed for over 60 years with considerable success and in recent years about 65 per cent of Ontario nickel production, 90 per cent of copper production and 40 per cent of zinc production has been processed to the metal stage in Canada. Gold and silver production from precious metal mines is now fully processed in Canada. Gold and silver produced as a by-product from base metal mines is shipped as a constituent of the base metal concentrates and therefore has a similar distribution as far as processing is concerned. More iron ore is consumed by Ontario steel mines than is mined in the province. Uranium is fully processed to the fuel form needed for reactors of Canadian design. Investment in an enrichment plant to produce fuel suitable for foreign reactors cannot be justified at this time. No Canadian refinery as yet exists for platinum group metals.

Further processing policy is implemented by two methods. Section 113 of the Mining Act provides a legal basis for the government to insist on processing to the metal stage in Canada. The Mining Tax Act provides for tax incentives to encourage it.

From the time of the passage of the original version of section 113 in 1917, it has been recognized that passage of a law does not automatically make economic sense out of economic nonsense and that in some cases 100 per cent processing in Canada is not a sensible objective. Provision was therefore made for exemptions by order in council. Exemptions currently existing were obtained for one or more of the following reasons:

(i) Where no further processing facilities exist in Canada and the benefits obtainable appear to be too low, in relation to costs, to justify construction; (ii) Where inadequate further processing capacity exists in Canada and funds for construction are not available at this time; (iii) Where inadequate further processing capacity exists in Canada and ore reserves are insufficient to justify construction; (iv) Where quantities of semi-processed material exported are too small to justify construction of a Canadian processing plant; (v) Where the semi-processed material is not acceptable to Canadian further processors due to impurities which interfere with refining of other metals. Quantities involved are insufficient to justify modifications to Canadian plants; (vi) Where the semi-processed material is not acceptable to Canadian further processors due to impurities causing environmental pollution. Quantities involved are insufficient to justify modifications to Canadian plants; (vii) Where foreign customers are unwilling to accept fully processed material and are able to obtain their requirements from other sources if denied Ontario supplies; (viii) Where export of semi-processed material is necessary until new Canadian plant construction, now in progress, is completed.

Section 113 serves as a useful monitoring device and enables the government to regularly review the situation and to ensure that as much processing as is economically feasible is carried out in Canada. The tax incentives under the Mining Tax Act are more positive

and therefore more effective in that they increase the economic advantages for industry of building processing plants in this country. Additional incentives are offered for construction in Canada and especially northern Ontario. These incentives, and particularly the increased processing allowances, have been instrumental in inducing major new investments in northern Ontario, such as Inco's strip mill and the Texasgulf copper refinery.

FOREST REGENERATION

125. Mr. Foulds: Will the Ministry of Natural Resources provide a listing of the number of acres of forest that has been cut over and regenerated for the most recent 12 month period possible? Will the minister detail the cutover and regeneration figures by sub-category, as contained in ministry annual reports? Will the ministry further provide the above mentioned information by ministry district as well as region? [Tabled April 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have prepared a table showing the number of acres cutover by region (appendix I); and a table showing the acres regenerated by region for the year ending March 31, 1978 (appendix II).

I will table comparable tables for the year ending March 31, 1979 as soon as they are available, approximately by mid-June.

Because of the cost, and staff time required to compile this information by district, I would be pleased to obtain, on request, the data for any particular district or districts.

(Appendix I)

CLASSIFICATION OF CUTOVER BY REGION IN ACRES
IN YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1979

	Available for Regen. Treatment	Natural Regen. Without Treatment	Not Available for Regen. Treatment	Total
Provincial				
Clear Cut	161.682	75.286	64.329	301.297
Selection Cut	—	65.353	—	65.353
Partial Cut	—	—	97.868	97.868
Total	161.682	140.639	162.197	464.518
North Western				
Clear Cut	25.678	4.001	13.440	43.139
Selection Cut	—	—	—	—
Partial Cut	—	—	7.330	7.330
Total	25.678	4.021	20.770	50.469
North Central				
Clear Cut	46.342	20.968	15.942	83.252
Selection Cut	—	—	—	—
Partial Cut	—	—	18.217	18.217
Total	46.342	20.968	34.159	101.469
Northern				
Clear Cut	67.574	22.460	29.952	119.986
Selection Cut	—	40	—	40
Partial Cut	—	—	—	—
Total	67.574	22.500	33.991	124.065
North Eastern				
Clear Cut	12.099	4.733	3.993	20.825
Selection Cut	—	17.346	—	17.346
Partial Cut	—	—	35.855	35.855
Total	12.099	22.079	39.848	74.025
Algonquin				
Clear Cut	5.612	17.954	1.002	24.568
Selection Cut	—	21.181	—	21.181
Partial Cut	—	—	20.574	29.574
Total	5.612	39.135	21.576	66.323
Eastern				
Clear Cut	4.377	5.050	—	9.427
Selection Cut	—	3.943	—	3.943
Partial Cut	—	—	1.153	1.153
Total	4.377	8.993	1.153	14.523
Central				
Clear Cut	—	100	—	100
Selection Cut	—	4.200	—	4.200
Partial Cut	—	—	10.700	10.700
Total	—	4.300	10.700	15.000
Southwestern				
Clear Cut	—	—	—	—
Selection Cut	—	18.643	—	18.643
Partial Cut	—	—	—	—
Total	—	18.643	—	18.643

(Appendix II)
REGENERATION BY REGIONS
AREAS IN ACRES IN YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1978

	North		North		North		Algonquin		Eastern		Central		South		Total
	Western	Central	Northern	Eastern	Algonquin	Eastern	Central	Western	South	Western	Central	Eastern	South	Western	
Planting Nursery Stock	3,298	13,922	18,750	4,633	2,375	7,499	6,324	2,754	59,555						
Planting Container Stock	—	496	4,839	325	—	286	—	—	5,946						
Direct Seeding	24,240	12,988	16,869	4,922	1,055	—	—	—	60,074						
Seeding with Site Region	6,082	420	3,776	793	—	—	—	—	11,071						
Scarification	2,110	6,928	295	2,304	—	25	—	—	11,662						
Strip Cutting	606	3,530	2,764	1,322	51	28	—	—	8,301						
Seed Tree Cutting	10	2,284	6,157	3,816	2,037	—	—	—	14,304						
Shelter Wood Cutting	—	—	—	1,632	18,239	1,338	—	—	21,209						
Clear Cutting	—	—	1,658	1,082	2,434	288	—	—	5,462						
Total Regeneration	36,346	40,568	55,108	20,829	26,191	9,464	6,324	2,754	197,584						

Includes Crown and Patented Lands

NUCLEAR PLANT SAFETY

105. Mr. Cassidy: Will the Minister of Energy tell the Legislature what the permissible dose to the general population of (a) whole body radiation, (b) radiation to the thyroid would be, under the existing Atomic Energy Control Board licensing criteria and according to the revised criteria which have been proposed by the Inter-Organizational Working Group, in the event of each of the following dual-mode failure accidents: (i) a loss of coolant accident accompanied by a loss of containment; (ii) a loss of regular coolant accompanied by a failure to shutdown; (iii) loss of regulation plus failure to shutdown? Since the permissible exposures under the proposed revised criteria are based in part on the probability of the accident in question, would the minister table in the Legislature the assumptions and calculations used to determine the probability of each of these types of accident for the purpose of calculating permissible exposures? [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

107. Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister table in the Legislature all studies and evaluations done by or for Ontario Hydro on the potential environmental effects, specifically the possibility of widespread radioactive contamination of lake waters, in the event of a major nuclear reactor accident in any generating plant located on the shores of Lake Huron or Lake Ontario. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

108. Mr. Cassidy: Will the Minister of Energy table in the Legislature all the Pickering Generating Station Quarterly Technical Reports produced by Ontario Hydro up to the present time. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

109. Mr. Cassidy: Will the Minister of Energy table in the Legislature all the Bruce

Generating Station Quarterly Technical Reports produced by Ontario Hydro up to the present time. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

110. Mr. Cassidy: Will the Minister of Energy table in the Legislature the Pickering Loss of Coolant Accident Report (October 1978) produced by Ontario Hydro. [Tabled April 5, 1979.]

126. Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister table in the Legislature all technical documents and calculations produced or used by Ontario Hydro in assessing the probability of fuel melting in a Candu nuclear reactor in the event of loss of regular cooling accompanied by failure of the emergency core cooling system (ECCS)? What is the probability of fuel melting in the event of such an accident? [Tabled April 6, 1979.]

127. Mr. Cassidy: Since the vacuum building is an essential part of the containment system at the Bruce and Pickering nuclear generating stations, will the minister tell the Legislature for how long negative pressure can be maintained in the vacuum buildings at those generating stations without having to pump any air out of the vacuum building? If air had to be pumped out of the vacuum building how could it be purified to remove all radioactive contamination? Would the minister table in the Legislature all technical documents and reports produced by and for Ontario Hydro when he answers these first two questions? [Tabled April 6, 1979.]

Hon. Mr. Auld: Additional time is required for the Ministry of Energy and Ontario Hydro to prepare the answers to these questions. It is anticipated that answers will be available for tabling in about one month, that is by about May 17, 1979.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 19, 1979

Death of Dr. Robert Jackson, statement by Miss Stephenson	1061
Training school closures, statement by Mr. Norton	1061
GO Transit ticketing facilities, statement by Mr. Snow	1063
Organized crime, statement by Mr. McMurtry	1063
Reed Paper Company, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Foulds	1064
Hydro uranium contracts, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. S. Smith, Ms. Gigantes	1066
Hospital bed allocations, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cooke	1067
Apprenticeship programs, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. B. Newman	1069
Great Lakes pollution, questions of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Gaunt, Ms. Bryden, Ms. Gigantes	1070
Election expenses, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon	1072
Bell Canada case, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell	1072
St. Lawrence Starch dispute, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Mackenzie	1073
Training school closures, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Cureatz, Mr. Eakins, Mr. McClellan	1074
Attack on union official, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. di Santo	1075
Eastern Ontario development, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Sterling	1076
Re point of privilege on nuclear plant safety, Mr. Auld	1076
Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Philip	1077
Report, standing social development committee, Mr. Gaunt	1077
Motion re committee travel to Kingston, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1077
Simcoe Day Act, Mr. G. E. Smith, first reading	1077
Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading	1078
Tabling answers to questions on notice paper, Mr. Welch	1078
Budget debate, continued: Mr. Laughren	1078
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. McCague, agreed to	1093
Estimates, Ministry of Government Services, continued, Mr. Henderson	1093
Recess	1103
Erratum	1103
Appendix, answers to questions on notice paper	1104
Learning-disabled persons, questions of Mr. Norton: Mr. Blundy	1104
Fraud trial, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Nixon	1104

Heritage language programs, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1104
Farm tax rebates, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Ziemba	1104
School board statistics, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1105
Student dropouts, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1105
Education research, question of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1105
School closures, question of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1106
French language programs, question of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1109
Sale of school properties, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall	1109
Lab billing errors, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Ziemba	1109
Legal services contracts, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Ziemba	1109
Mining Act exemptions, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds	1110
Forest regeneration, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Foulds	1111
Nuclear plant safety, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Cassidy	1114

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C.; Minister of Energy; Minister of Natural Resources (Leeds PC)
 Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
 Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
 Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
 Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
 Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
 Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
 Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
 Campbell, M. (St. George L)
 Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
 Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
 Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC)
 di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
 Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
 Edighoffer, H., Chairman (Perth L)
 Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
 Gaunt, M.; Acting Chairman (Huron-Bruce L)
 Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
 Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
 Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
 Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
 Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
 Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
 Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
 MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker and Deputy Chairman (Humber PC)
 MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
 Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
 Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
 Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
 McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
 McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
 Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
 Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
 Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
 Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
 Norton, Hon. K.; Minister of Community and Social Services (Kingston and the Islands PC)
 Parrott, Hon. H. C.; Minister of the Environment (Oxford PC)
 Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
 Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
 Riddell, J. K. (Huron-Middlesex L)
 Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
 Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
 Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC)
 Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
 Snow, Hon. J. W.; Minister of Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
 Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Education (York Mills PC)
 Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
 Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
 Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
 Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
 Timbrell, Hon. D. R.; Minister of Health (Don Mills PC)
 Villeneuve, O. F. (Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry PC)

Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)

Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)

Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)

Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)



No. 26

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament
Thursday, April 19, 1979
Evening Sitting

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1979

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. MacBeth moved resolution 7:

That, in the opinion of this House, Ontario should seek more distinctive separation of responsibilities and powers between the federal and provincial jurisdictions in future federal-provincial discussions concerning the British North America Act; that, while recognizing the need for provincial equalization payments, exclusive fields of taxation should be defined so that each government may finance its own responsibilities without subsidization from another; and further that provision should be made for this principle to be extended to municipal governments.

Mr. MacBeth: My main purpose, Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, which is a matter that I have spoken to on a number of times before in this House and a matter in which I have some personal interest, is to provide the members who are here and those who, I hope, will assemble in the next few moments an opportunity to speak on what I consider to be one of the major issues in our country today. It is not necessarily the major issue but one of the major issues and certainly a major issue for the future of our country.

Under many of the pictures of the Fathers of Confederation, one will find the caption: "They builded better than they knew." That is the theme of the proposition that I put before the House this evening. What we have in the BNA Act is a good concept. It is not in need of any kind of revolution nor is it in need of any kind of a replacement, but rather of renewal with a few modernizations to keep in step with the spirit of the times. I say "renewal" because I believe we have departed from some of the original concepts and our country would be stronger if we returned to those original concepts.

I believe most of us in this House this evening consider ourselves first and foremost as Canadians and not as Ontarians. The latter nomenclature does not even have a proper ring to it. Likewise, I am bold enough to

consider myself first and foremost a Canadian, but being Canadian does not mean that we must all be cast in the same mould.

I think we are no less Canadian because some of us believe that the strength of this country can best be maintained by a reasonable exercise of provincial rights. I think, rather, the reverse: Our strength as a country is in our diversity and our glory is in our infinite variety.

Maybe we, as taxpayers here in Ontario, have been somewhat remiss in standing up for our provincial rights, and our country today might be stronger if we had not allowed the encroachments that have taken place. In this respect I pay tribute to Quebec, because they at least know where they stand on this issue; they stand firmly for exercising the provincial rights as originally given to them under the British North America Act and, because they do so, I do not think that makes them any less Canadian.

I would like to quote for a minute from the report of the Task Force on Canadian Unity, and that is a document which I think should receive more attention, both in this House and at all levels of government as well as from the press, which to a great extent has ignored that report. Quoting from page six:

"Not only must we learn to accept the fact of diversity, but we must also discover how to cherish and embrace it. If we can learn to believe that our neighbours' differences are not a threat to us and what we stand for, but a part of the neighbourhood within which our own identity finds free expression, we shall have moved a long way towards understanding what the Canada of tomorrow must be about."

Section 91 and section 92, as well as other sections, of the British North America Act set out the separation of powers to be exercised by the federal government and those that should be exercised by the provincial government — a true federal system, each supreme in its own distinctive field. Section 91 and section 92 are commonly referred to as the "separation of powers" sections, and the word "separation" to my mind is an important one: not the combining of power, not the sharing of power, and

not co-operation in the use of power, but the separation of power. This separation of supreme powers is a principle which has become lost through a variety of circumstances over the past 112 years of our Confederation.

Some argue that because we are a dispersed nation we must be held together by strong lines of central power. All honourable members have heard the story of the railway that linked us together but, because it was such a tentative thing and our settlements were so separated over these 112 years, many have argued that we need to keep this country together by stronger power centrally and so cement it. The argument, I suppose, has some validation to it.

Then, again, times of war led to the provincial surrender of direct taxing powers to the central authority; those powers, even in times of peace, have not been federally vacated. The financial depression of the 1930s brought about amendments to the BNA Act to provide for unemployment insurance, and there were other amendments along the way that also added to the central government's power.

To my way of thinking, many of the judicial decisions that have come about, although they have gone both ways as to provincial and federal rights, on balance and, I think, in later days perhaps because of the composition of the Supreme Court of Canada, have for the most part favoured centralization of power. So we have experienced a gradual growth of central power—not by way of any clear-cut transfer of power, but by way of encroachment and dilution.

The most insidious encroachment on provincial power has been by way of income tax, a source which, true, is open as a means of direct taxation not only to the federal government, but also to the province. Yet until recent years the pot of income tax was so drained by the federal siphon that there was little left for the provincial sponge. This enabled the federal government to invade almost every field of provincial power by offering grants for education, for highways, for health, for buildings and for building senior citizens' homes and other types of buildings, but they have all been given conditional upon doing it their way. That is the way of the federal government.

The encroachments however, have not been all one way. In fairness, while Ottawa has been building parks in Toronto—and I don't know why Ottawa should be building parks in Toronto—Ontario has been building airports throughout the province and trying

to out-CBC the CBC. It is no wonder the country is somewhat confused.

What is good for the Maritimes is not necessarily good for the Prairies, but regrettably the rules are the same.

Mr. Gaunt: The Joe Clark of the Legislature.

Mr. MacBeth: What might go over and be very suitable in British Columbia is not necessarily the suitable way to do it in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Kerrio: You wouldn't dare be a PC in BC.

Mr. MacBeth: I did not get the significance of that. Over in this corner I am a little deaf, I'm getting a little old, so I do not hear all these clever remarks. However, let me return to my subject.

The rules are the same throughout the country because to get these grants you must comply. While provinces are encouraged to spend a dollar of provincial income to get a dollar of federal income, the resulting value may only be \$1.50 for the \$2 that are in fact spent. Only the Canadians are the losers.

Mr. Speaker, I am not meaning this to be a speech geared at the political time today, because when the Conservatives were in power in Ottawa there was little change in this regard. The Conservatives were not ready to change the rules at that time either, but I am saying these rules must be examined now because only the Canadian citizens as a whole, are the losers.

Where one level of government in 1967 might have been able to build a road or a school, it now takes co-operation among three or four levels. Co-operation is a great ideal and one that we all look on with favour in the same way as motherhood, but this matter of co-operation is a great hindrance to public achievement. It is the bureaucrat's delight.

Some years ago, I had the good fortune to take a series of lectures in political science from Robert MacGregor Dawson. I am trying to curry a little favour with the Liberals at this point, because Robert MacGregor Dawson was one of the editors of the diaries of William Lyon Mackenzie King. If he could handle that, I think he could handle a great many other things. I do put a great deal of faith in the maxim he used to try to teach us when we were students under his guidance. His theory was simply this: Responsible government is dependent upon the spending power being the taxing power, and likewise, the taxing power being the spending power. Through these

112 years we have departed a long way from that principle, yet, I think that was one of the basic principles of the Fathers of Confederation.

I have seen fit to enter my resolution. I believe we need a return to distinctive fields of power, as conceived by those who built better than we give them credit for building, who had a keener eye for progress and a truer understanding of Canadian unity than many of today's theorists. They realized the need of equalizing payment. My motion, you will note, provides that equalized payments should be continued. There is no reason why the wealthiest province should receive a nickel from the federal government to pay for those items its own provincial government could supply if it had the tax source to do so.

[8:15]

The same principle applies to municipal governments. I know there are certain problems with municipal governments where they don't have access to taxes and I see some difficulty in giving them access to taxes; but I think that can be overcome by unconditional grants. But I would prefer we try to find some way whereby they themselves could tax that money, rather than depend on a handout from the provincial level. But, in theory, I think the principle I am putting forward applies at their level as well as to the provincial level. They should not be "poor cousins" but should have enough fields or access to money—certainly, if there is no other way, by conditional grants so that they, in turn, can look after their own responsibilities.

I am sorry that time does not permit more elaboration on this but I simply mention it in passing: that, if it applies to the provincial level, it applies likewise to the municipal.

Our present position on taxation is in inverse relationship to the services rendered. The federal government, with the greatest power to tax, is charged with providing the least costly services. For example, defence. This is probably the heaviest matter that the federal government is charged with looking after under the BNA Act.

It is charged with monitoring the financial system. That in itself should not be a very heavy expenditure. It is charged with such matters as external affairs and running a post office and things of that nature. They are not the big items of expenditure yet they are the ones that have the greatest source of expenditures. Whereas the province is charged with looking after the real heavy expenditure items: health, education, highways and welfare.

In fact, sir, it is my contention that, if Parliament Hill in Ottawa should disappear tonight—I am not advocating it—it would be

a month before we missed it. If Queen's Park disappeared tonight—

Mr. Kerrio: That's what will happen if Joe Clark gets in.

Mr. MacBeth: You'll like the next line. If Queen's Park disappeared tonight, the people might miss us in a week. I'm hoping my wife might miss me before that but the people generally might not miss us for a week. However, if any of our municipal governments disappeared tonight and the water was not in the taps tomorrow morning, disaster, as we know it, would have struck.

In closing, I draw your attention to the following recommendations of the Task Force on Canadian Unity. On page 15, beginning with item 30, there are these recommendations which, I believe, support the resolution I have put forward:

"The present distribution of legislative and executive powers should be clarified and adjusted to contemporary needs and realities." To that I agree.

"37. The use of a list of exclusive powers for Parliament and a list of exclusive powers for provincial legislatures should be retained in a new Canadian constitution." And I say three cheers for that.

"38. Concurrent jurisdiction should be avoided, wherever possible, through a more precise definition of exclusive powers. Wherever powers are concurrent, a federal or provincial paramountcy should be stipulated."

Then, finally, 39, and I'm not advocating this one but I think it's of interest: "The residual powers should be assigned to the provincial legislatures." That I'm not buying and I certainly don't buy all of the report of the Task Force on Canadian Unity. But I'm suggesting to this House that this document deserves more study than it has received. Many of the recommendations in it I find are in support of the position I hold personally—not all of them and I referred to 39. I don't go so far as to suggest that residual powers should be provincial. I think they're fine where the Fathers of Confederation put them.

So I am saying that the BNA Act is not such a bad document. I couldn't care less whether it is patriated or not. I know that is a major issue to some people; to me, it is peripheral. I think there is much need for looking at it again and updating it; but more by way of a return to it as it was, rather than the way we have interpreted it. I hope, when our government again sits down to discuss this at a provincial-federal conference, that it will take some of the thoughts I have expressed tonight into consideration at that time.

The document that has been produced by Mr. Pepin and Mr. Robarts, among others, is a commendable document. It speaks about a future together. I think if we adopt some of those recommendations and give some serious thought to how the constitution of our country can be updated and improved, rather than dealing with some of the other matters we seem to be tied up with in the political sense, we will indeed have a bright future together for the next 100 years to come.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Humber has two minutes remaining. Does he wish to reserve them?

Mr. MacBeth: I would rather share them with somebody else.

Mr. Sweeney: I would begin by complimenting the member for introducing such a resolution, given the present sense of disunity in our country today, at the two levels which he so aptly identifies—between federal and provincial on the one hand and between provincial and municipal on the other hand. It is well that we do take some time in this Legislature, to re-examine what our own feelings are about these types of relationships.

I would also compliment the member for clearly pointing out the areas where we should direct our attention. On the one hand, he talks about a clear separation of responsibilities and powers among the various levels of government. I'm a little bit hesitant about the use of the word "separation"; I very much like the distinctive aspect of it. Unfortunately, in our country today that word "separation" has too many negative connotations, and I feel a little bit uneasy about it. But I think I understand what the member has in mind. I think he's made his point pretty clearly as to what he meant by it.

I also want to compliment him for identifying the fact that even though there will be some distinct powers more clearly identified and more clearly recognized than what they are now, he still recognizes there needs to be the continuing principle of extended equalization among the various parts of our country. We can't cut them so fine that we leave everyone out there floating on their own and doing the best they possibly can with whatever resources there are available to them. The member continues to recognize that's not how a confederation works.

Finally, I want to compliment him for taking that next logical step. I would say for a member of that government, particularly a former minister of that government, it

takes courage to take that next step and say: "Look, fellows, it also works the next step down. Just as the federal government may not always play ball the way we want with the provinces, it is equally true that the provinces—this province being one of them—don't always play ball the way the municipalities would like it to be done."

I think the member will probably recall from time to time the interjections that come from this side of the House, when the Premier (Mr. Davis) in particular draws a bead on the deficiencies of the federal government with respect to its dealings with the provinces. We can usually identify some parallel situation where the provinces—

Mr. Kerrio: Grossly unfair.

Mr. Sweeney: —haven't really been all that fair with the municipalities. For these reasons—for identifying the issues and for taking it all the way—I would certainly compliment that member.

I stand in support of this resolution. The principle behind it, the guiding spirit behind it, is one I can clearly identify with.

The reason for supporting it is because in our society today I think one of the main problems we face is a muddying of the waters. Far too often we have arranged things at the government level and at the various social levels where no one is really responsible. There are so many people who have their hands in the pot. There are so many cooks in the kitchen that it's very difficult to identify who is responsible. That, of course, is not something that has been deliberately designed. As the member has so clearly pointed out, it's something that has happened over the last century.

It is certainly difficult for us to go back to 1867, to 1864, when the British North America Act was being drafted, and to see into the minds of the Fathers of Confederation; to begin to appreciate the state of the country as it was at that time; to recognize the social conditions, the economic conditions, the vast transportation problems, simply being able to communicate with one another, that existed at that time, and then try to transpose that kind of mentality many years hence into 1979. It just couldn't have been done. We have to appreciate the fact that many of the things that have happened have just happened. As the expression sometimes goes, they "grewed", like Topsy.

We recognize that. We recognize that far too often the various levels of governments are unintentionally, I would say in most cases, interfering with each other's jurisdictions. So we should do anything which will more clearly identify who is responsible for what—

number one. Secondly, we should make it much more possible for the level of government responsible for providing a service to also be responsible for raising the necessary funds to pay for that service.

I find it increasingly ludicrous to see these transfer payments flowing back and forth between the various levels of government. Just take, for example, the ones between the provincial government and municipal government. The local property taxpayer has to fund a number of what I would call human services—services for education, services for parts of health, services for various welfare programs or social services programs. At the same time, the local municipality has to provide for what we call the hard services—the road, the police, the sewers, the fire departments, these kinds of things. And there's money flowing back and forth between them.

It would seem to make so much more sense if we could clearly identify it by saying this is your area of responsibility and you use your local tax base to provide the funds to pay for those responsibilities. The same thing should be told the provinces instead of having money flowing back and forth from the federal to the provincial government.

The member himself has clearly recognized that's not going to work in all cases. All levels of government don't have equal access to taxing sources, and we have to take that factor into consideration. But surely we can clear the muddled lines a great deal more than what they are at the present time.

I also think it would clear up some of the present problems in terms of what the money is used for. It has already been raised in this House on two different occasions that in this year alone the federal transfer funds to Ontario—first of all for post-secondary education—has not been used for that purpose. Neither was the federal transfer of funds to the province for health services used for that purpose.

I think members on this side of the House can quite legitimately complain about this. The people who are operating our post-secondary system and the people who are operating our health system are concerned because they don't have enough money to provide the services they have been told they should be providing. One of the reasons we complain is that we see dollars coming from the upper level of government to this level and not being used for the original purpose.

I think the government of Ontario leaves itself open to criticism when we have that kind of transfer arrangement and we use those dollars for other purposes. If the province were to raise its own funds for those

areas for which it is responsible—health, social services, education, all the way through—then we would have less concern with that kind of problem.

I think we would also need to clearly recognize—this is the point that we referred to a few minutes ago—that there are inequalities in this country of ours. I want to go on record as saying very strongly I believe in the need for a strong, well-endowed, central government. I do not believe you can have any kind of a federation or any kind of a confederation if you do not have a strong central government.

There is a very distinctive difference between the type of federation we have here in Canada and the one they have down in our sister country in the United States. There, as the member has drawn to our attention, the residual powers in the United States rest with the states. That's the way their fathers designed their program. On the other hand, our constitution clearly gives the residual powers to our central government.

I think that was a wise move. Our countries are different. In no way do we compare with the United States. We are stretched from sea to sea in a relatively long, thin line. Our economic problems, because of our climate, because of our distribution difficulties, because of the manufacturing runs we can have, are very different. Our resource base is very different. Therefore, wisdom was shown many years ago when our Fathers of Confederation gave the residual powers to the central government. I think that wisdom has been borne out.

[8:30]

I was very pleased to hear the member indicate he would not support changing that because it is through that mechanism that we have the opportunity to take a look at other parts of this country which are in greater need than Ontario, which are less well off than we are and, through that mechanism, provide the necessary assistance and help they would not be able to fund by themselves. That is what is going to keep this country together, as it has in the past.

In closing, I want to indicate I do support the spirit of this. I support the distinctiveness of identifying programs and identifying their financing with, at the same time, a spirit of co-operation between all levels.

Mr. Breaugh: I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate because I feel this is one area where duly elected politicians in this House have not exercised their prerogative to discuss something of national importance. I cannot support this resolution, not

because I am basically against the notions described in here, but for some rather important reasons upon which I would like to elaborate.

This House has not given its members the opportunity to discuss at any length what should happen in the constitutional reform program which will be carried on, in some form—whether anybody likes it or not—over the next decade in Canada. That is a shame because that is saying only members on the government side—and I dare say that, even over there, it will only be a very small number of people—will contribute input to federal-provincial constitutional meetings.

There are members on this side of the House. There are backbench members on the Tory side of the House who have contributions to make about the shape, size, form and format of this country. If we are serious about this, then we should at least be prepared to listen to one another.

I do not see, frankly, a sharp consensus forming about where this nation is going and what it will look like, or how it will function, ten or 20 years from now. I hope there is, at least among those elected to public office in Canada, a concern about it and a desire to express opinions and to exchange thoughts.

The reason I can't support this resolution is pretty simple. The process of keeping the nation together and the process of changing the rules of the game are matters of rather delicate negotiation. None of us will be able to sit down and write out a new constitution for Canada which does exactly what we want it to do in exactly the way we want. It will be negotiation between the federal government, between the provincial governments in Canada and, I would also hope, a matter at least of consideration, if not negotiation, among the people of Canada. There are a lot of things which have to be done before we get to that stage and I am not prepared to go to the bargaining table with one locked-in position.

There are some small deficiencies in this resolution which I would like to discuss—at least a little bit. The strength of the resolution is barely this. Each member of this House now has an opportunity to express an opinion and, in private members' hour, a personal opinion. I think such opinions are sadly lacking.

There is a need, regarding this one issue, to set aside those things we call political parties and to speak as Canadian citizens and more importantly, as politicians in the Canadian political system, because we do have a different perspective on that.

I am concerned, and it is happening again in this federal election campaign, that the political process itself works against a sensible and rational extension of the discussions, debate and negotiation about constitutional reform.

A basic problem in this kind of resolution is to say we could find a simple answer that says the provincial governments will do this, the municipal governments will do this, and the federal government will do that. Those are the roles, the responsibilities of each of those levels of government.

I am the first to admit the thing is now without question, a "dog's breakfast." In Canada, one can't look at a road project or a post office or an arena, or virtually any kind of government activity in the broadest sense, without finding almost all levels of government participating in that in some way, sometimes funding, sometimes exercising control powers and sometimes blocking. I think that is in part the string of truth that holds this resolution together and makes it certainly worth the consideration of the House. That does need to be sorted somewhat. To suggest it could be handled so simplistically as to sort them all out so neatly and cleanly would be to deny there are parts of this country that don't have the population base or the taxing power or the financial support that, for example, Ontario has.

To say that Ontario could utilize a sorting system because it has eight million people and a financial base as strong as most countries in Europe, and to say what's right for Ontario is right for Prince Edward Island, is not fair and is not being realistic.

There are needs in other parts of the country and the basic requirement, in my mind, for keeping this country together as a unit is to recognize that there are differences, very distinct ones, very different needs and very different abilities from one end of this country to the other, and that there is great potential here to be realized. But if it's to be realized by Canada as a nation, we have to be a little more sensitive about it than this resolution would allow me to be at this time.

I beg forgiveness of the mover. In normal circumstances, if this was just private members' business and we weren't dealing with a country that has some very definite problems, I would be less concerned. We have a formally elected government in power in a major province in our country saying, officially at least, that it wants to break away from the rest of the country. That's a very difficult thing to try to digest

when one believes, as I do, that one is a Canadian above all other things.

I believe I am different from other people in the world and that my culture, my arts, where I work, how I work and the conditions under which I work are unique in the world. They aren't the same as the Americans'. I would be the first one to say that though my culture may be very heavily influenced by American media, I want it to be distinctly Canadian. I want people in Canada to recognize that for a variety of reasons, some economic, some cultural, some having to do with linguistics and some having to do with the lifestyle we live, I'm happy to be what is now called a Canadian.

I'm a little concerned that the other people who live around me haven't come to that realization or at least don't want to talk too much about it. I want that. I believe a strong federal government is vital to this nation. It can't function, as other nations in the world can, with a disunited and disjointed system of government.

This country began in the very first instance because there was a crying need to put together people who live a long distance from other people who were Canadians. That's still true today. It differs in many contexts and mass communications and mass media have changed many aspects of that, but that fundamental truth still derives. We are still in many senses a frontier nation, clustered together in places like Ontario in the southern-most part of the province, with that vast potential for resource development, for expansion of our economy and for expansion of our culture to develop a Canadian identity left pretty much in isolation in the northern part of this province and in the northern parts of this country.

I don't pretend to be a hard-nosed negotiator on this. I wouldn't negotiate sovereignty-association with Rene Levesque because he hasn't bothered to explain to me what that means. I'm not prepared to say that this province, this country or any one of us should take a hard and fast position on any of these things until we have discussed what exactly we're putting on this bargaining table. What are we negotiating? What are the ramifications? If I can't get my personal viewpoint accepted around that bargaining table on any given issue, what other issues are there available to discuss that might be negotiable?

I think that this is, brief though it might be, an important debate in the history of this House. I might congratulate the member for providing during private members' business

that opportunity for even a limited number of us to talk even for 10 minutes about this particular issue. I can't accept his suggestion just now. I appreciate the opportunity to engage in that debate. I think this House will be well served if we as other private members put in resolutions of a similar nature to provide the forum for that discussion. I am not prepared to leave that to the media. I am not prepared to leave that to other politicians in the middle of a political campaign.

I am crying out for a need for members of this House, in the absence of a political campaign and without the hindrances sometimes of party obligations, to speak as individual members of our own political system, to offer our own personal, political and just Canadian points of view and to let that long and involved process of negotiation, discussion and dialogue take place because I think that this country of all the countries in the world has a potential for greatness that has never been realized.

Our constitution, to me as a politician, creates great problems that perhaps my brothers and sisters making trucks for a living don't see. It's my obligation to point out some of those things. I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate. That is probably the most important opportunity that members of this House will have perhaps even during this session.

I am not prepared yet to say that this House ought to adopt hard and fast decisions on any given aspect of that. The Premier has made his point quite clear. He's not prepared to accept any hard and fast decisions on debating or accepting sovereignty negotiations. That's fine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Breagh: Could I just end on one note, Mr. Speaker? I would ask that other members of this House in future private members' hours provide other occasions when as individual members of this House we can take part in this ongoing discussion.

Mr. Cureatz: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure and an opportunity for me at this time to take part in this debate. As the member for Oshawa has indicated, this should be an ongoing discussion, especially at the time of turmoil that is taking place within our confederation system.

Tonight let me express some of my thoughts in regard to the resolution and also my support of this resolution. I should say it is easy in theory to support it and avoid discussion of concrete proposals that might tend to shift this country toward extremes of either decen-

tralization or centralization. Regardless of how a division of powers is fashioned, there is a need to add more definition to what is at present a big constitutional framework.

I do not think it is at all difficult to establish this need. One can also safely say that a feeling shared by many is that Canada should continue to have strong governments at both the federal and provincial levels. In the broadest sense, the fact that we have a balance of powers in this country is not a matter of choice. Clearly, we are too large a country with too many regional differences to have either a unitary government or one with highly centralized power. Besides, unique cultures such as our francophone population obviously require a large and effective local or provincial government to ensure their protection.

There is a limit to decentralization which would be encountered if our central government were weakened to the point where it was unable to manage the national economy or provide for defence or where citizens cease to identify with it as a government of all Canadians. We can conclude that a strong federation requires this kind of balance or sharing of powers, but the precise definition of that balance is an enormously complex matter.

The principle of avoiding overlap of powers has merit from two standpoints. Firstly, and very simply, it is essential that some areas not be overlapped through legislative authority as even the limited use of power at one level would negate or undermine existing interests. This is what I believe has prompted the member's resolution. Overlapping of power can result in frustrations between various levels of government and it can cause conflict as well as resentment on the part of the government which has not achieved paramountcy. Also, as has been mentioned, duplication and unwarranted growth in bureaucracy are tremendously costly and sometimes lead to difficulties in ensuring that government accountability is maintained.

While I strongly endorse what I feel is the intent of this resolution, that is, to reduce overlap and burdensome red tape, there is an argument to be stated for not assigning exclusive powers to either level of government in a constitutional reform. The feeling has been expressed that exclusive power results in rigid interpretation of certain legislation. Certainly there have been periods in Confederation when Canadians have experienced just this kind of rigidity.

However, the extended use of federal-provincial spending powers, a delegation of

administrative powers, some widening of concurrent fields of government power and also more flexible judicial interpretations of the constitution have led away from compartmentalization. Consequently, a stricter definition of "powers," or the assigning of exclusive powers, or indeed a shift away from concurrence in powers, is not a measure that will cause us to lose our highly valued flexibility. Indeed, I have no difficulty in supporting a resolution calling for more distinct separation of responsibilities.

[8:45]

However, I do not feel that total separation of powers is possible. Canada is a nation made up of competing viewpoints but not necessarily always conflicting. We are diverse and we are regional. Interests are not always consistent, nor should they be, and it would be unrealistic to expect otherwise. It is, therefore, also unrealistic to form the belief that any one model for a strict division of powers would be acceptable to each province and to Ottawa as well. For this reason, too, I would think it unreasonable to assume that we can or even should eliminate all areas of concurrent jurisdiction. Canada's need for compromise, tolerance and flexibility would undoubtedly overshadow attempts to neatly and consistently define the broad range of powers in which each level of government has an interest.

The Canadian Bar Association's committee on the constitution made the obvious but pertinent observation that even at very basic levels cultural considerations impinge on national economic policy. Education, one of the so-called guarded provincial cultural powers, we all know has, through its effect on labour skills, a profound impact on the performance of the labour force. As the committee on the constitution stated, "Local matters should be provincial but when, in our interdependent world, is anything purely local?"

That committee pointed out also that Canada as a nation and as a particular cultural unit must at the federal level seek to assure the preservation of cultural ties if we are going to remain distinct in any way from the very influential culture to the south of us.

These two statements serve to illustrate the constitutional committee's opinion that while the traditional viewpoint of economic-cultural division of power is not wrong, it is very parochial.

Most situations can be looked at from several perspectives. This is certainly the case when we discuss matters of taxation. When the broad division of powers we think

about today was incorporated into the British North America Act, it was generally held that the costs of education, welfare and administration of justice could largely be met through limited taxation or, where necessary, through constitutional subsidies. It was for this reason that provincial taxation powers were restricted to what we call direct taxation.

History, of course, has charted the changing revenue needs of the three levels of Canadian government. In 1946, almost 72 per cent of government expenditures were made at the federal level; by 1975, this figure was reduced to 43.7 per cent. Provincial and municipal expenditures account now for well over half of the Canadian spending. The point has been made, therefore, that the actual allocation of taxing resources should be broad and overlapping in order that changing needs can be met with shifts in the distribution of taxes.

The Canadian Bar Association's committee on the constitution suggests a rationale for ascribing such broad taxation powers to both the federal and provincial levels. In its own words: "The federal government must have the resources to respond to whatever eventuality the country may face, and it must not be forgotten that federal taxing power is needed not only for the purposes of raising revenue; it is essential for economic policy. Finally, it is the only government in a position to redress the economic balances among the provinces—balances flowing in no small measure from the creation of a single country. It is evident, too, that the provinces need the financial resources to meet their own responsibilities which, in a federation as decentralized as ours, are indeed very broad as well.

"This is not to say that the tax fields cannot be better defined. We certainly have matters to clear up, most notably the question of avoidance of multiple taxation and provincial limitations to taxing within our provinces. There is no doubt a need during constitutional revision to search for mechanisms that will ensure a balance of powers but at the same time reconcile competing interests. Limiting federal spending powers through provincial consensus would be one such example."

Mr. Lawlor: Are you saying that the provinces should not have indirect power?

Mr. Cureatz: The distribution of power or the role of government, if you will, now more than ever require definition if Canadians are going—

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, he is reading. Are you saying—

Mr. Cureatz: —to live in a harmonious and constructive manner. I, therefore, commend the member for Humber for his introduction of this resolution.

I am so pleased that the member for Lakeshore has interjected on my speech. If he would bear with me, I might read passages from his wonderful book that he gave me—

Mr. Lawlor: Don't do that; don't do that.

Mr. Warner: Read his book.

Mr. Lawlor: Stick to the business of the House.

Mr. Cureatz: —but I will not intrude on the member for Humber's wonderful resolution at this time; I will forgo my time to the next speaker.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I first of all commend the honourable member for Humber for introducing this particular resolution. I do so because I think it is very important that we have people within provincial legislatures across this country who show interest and concern for questions of a national nature. There has been a tendency in recent years for many, particularly those who serve at the provincial level, to view all matters in the provincial context and not to look beyond the horizons of the provincial scene. The fact that a member of the provincial Legislature has a concern about the national unity question and about constitutional questions as they relate to the country as a whole, I think is commendable. Certainly, he should be complimented by all member of the House for that. I do see some cause for concern.

Mr. Lawlor: You would have to be pretty backwards not to. Does he live in the same country?

Mr. Bradley: My remarks will be similar to those expressing the concern of the member for Oshawa who found some fault with the resolution. The circumstances I see at the present time across this country are such that I see an assault on the powers and responsibilities of the federal government, powers and responsibilities I feel are very much required if we are to deal with problems that beset this country in a cross country manner and in a national manner.

The provincial premiers, particularly those who have very good resources, resources which are often related to energy and therefore can be marketed at a very high price, are naturally jealous of retaining responsibility and control over those particular resources. However, I recall very well the speech—I believe it was on the last speech from the throne or a budget speech—made by the member for Kent-Elgin. He listed some of the resources and some of the assets this

country has as being national assets. I recall his speech in which he talked about the fish of the Maritimes being the fish of Canada; the Prairies meaning every bit as much to a person from Ontario as they would to a person, from the prairie provinces; Alberta oil being Canadian oil; hydro-electric power produced in the province of Quebec should be Canadian hydro-electric power, and so on. He was emphasizing the responsibility of those of us who believe in a strong national government and, indeed, believe in the future of this country, to ensure there is the necessary mechanism for the federal government to legislate in these particular areas.

We have had a situation evolve over the last several years where provincial premiers have now probably reached the point of great power. We certainly had this with the major provinces, and in almost all of the provinces. The provincial premiers are now viewed as people with much greater powers, with much more responsibility, with much more prestige than federal cabinet ministers. There was a time in this nation's history when many felt the cabinet minister or cabinet ministers from various provinces were those to be looked up to to speak on behalf of those provinces. I think this has changed substantially. The federal-provincial conference, in many ways, has replaced the cabinet meeting as being an important area, at least of public discussion, if not of bringing about solutions to problems.

There is a natural tendency for provincial premiers to see things in the provincial context. I am very concerned when I see resolutions coming forward looking for precise definitions in the context of times when many people, particularly those of the vocal majority at the present time, advocate more and more exclusive provincial powers. It is my view that national goals may be reached or attained only with participation of the federal government.

The problem that arises, and the member for Humber has pointed this out very well and others recognize this in this House, is the same problem that exists in the relationship between the provincial government and the municipal government. That is, funding in the initial stages of any particular program that may have a good deal of merit is often rather lucrative. When the crunch comes, when there is a need for restraint, it is always restraint at somebody else's expense. It is easy for the national government to indicate it is slashing budgets as long as the budgets it is going to slash are those which are going to affect provincial jurisdictions.

We see a similar situation from time to time at the provincial level when the Minister

of Intergovernmental Affairs, or the Treasurer, indicates we're going to have a program of restraint in this province and we're darned well going to do it on the backs of the municipalities.

Therefore, this problem has existed in the past and I am sure it is certainly part of the reason for the member for Humber advocating a resolution of this kind; to have those kinds of definitions, to try to avoid those kinds of problems, by placing the right to taxation in the hands of the various levels of government to have the ability to look after their own financial problems, those that lie within their jurisdiction.

As I said, I do see problems when we have an assault on the federal powers when defining these precisely, because there are times and circumstances in a nation's history when the federal government must act, and there must be sufficient flexibility within a constitution to allow the federal government to act. To define these powers too precisely, to talk about exclusive control over areas, would remove that kind of flexibility and would, I am afraid, to use an overworked term, tend to balkanize this country.

The member has talked about the need for the continuation of equalization payments which I'm happy to hear, as a member from a province which we consider to be a have province—at least we have in the past and I think most of us at the present time, by our own definition consider us to be a have province, a province blessed with some of our own natural resources, with industry certainly, and with the capital necessary to carry out programs that are very useful and beneficial to our population. So I would agree with that. I think it goes almost without saying if we believe in national unity that we must have a continuation of equalization payments.

I don't think we will ever reach a situation in this country, however, where each level of government will be able to finance its own responsibilities without subsidization from another level. That is always going to be necessary if we wish to achieve national goals, whether those goals be in terms of education, the social welfare field, transportation or other areas. There are certain national goals which can only be achieved with the financial participation of the federal government and the possibility of the federal government having at least some jurisdiction in that area.

I do think we have a need, however, for long term commitments from the federal government in relation to the provincial government, from the provincial government in relation to municipal governments, so that there can be a planning process, and so that

programs which are set in place be allowed to continue for a long period of time and not be discontinued without meaningful consultation with the other level of government. I think that would be a difficult goal to reach, nevertheless a goal we should be seeking.

It seems to me that at the present time, looking at the national picture, there are only two areas in this country where people feel they are genuinely benefiting from Confederation, where people feel they are Canadians first and provincials second. One area, of course, is in Ontario where we are very favoured because the national capital is here, the financial capitals of this nation are here, where we have everything in central Canada, so it is natural that we in Ontario, I suppose, feel Canadian first and Ontarian second.

The other place in this country, I think, would be in the Maritimes where they are often very dependent on equalization grants from the federal government for many of their financial resources. Other parts of the country don't have that same feeling perhaps and we can instil it only with a strong national government.

I would hope that the feeling would be in Alberta, for instance. I view with some concern that if we were to allow Alberta—and I don't wish to look at personalities so much in this case—to have exclusive control over oil, that would be fine if you were in Alberta, but for the people of Ontario to know that Alberta would have exclusive control over its oil, that it would be a provincial resource to be marketed at the world price as we market, I suppose in Ontario, some of our goods at the world price—and we certainly can be subjected to criticism in certain areas—would be an abhorrent situation for the people as a whole.

Therefore, I am once again concerned at precise powers being given exclusively to a provincial government in an area as important as resources development.

Mr. Lawlor: Not another country in the world does that. You get your gasoline cheaper in Colombia or Venezuela. They don't sell domestically on the same basis.

[9:00]

Mr. Bradley: I think the member for Lakeshore makes a very valid point. This is one of the few countries where that goal would be a goal of any person within the country.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on

this resolution. The resolution, as it appears on the paper, is one which is very difficult not to support, particularly inasmuch as it's been proposed by the member for Humber, who has an undoubted reputation for honesty and sincerity in everything he does in this House. I have never found a time in which that has ever been doubted.

Mr. Bradley: He is putting that in his brochure next time.

Mr. Bounsall: After having said all that, I hate then to add my "but." The "but" isn't a very big one and it is a conditional "but" as well. But the member cannot, in a simple resolution, in an hour and a quarter's time of debate, treat with the whole subject of how we may revise the British North America Act. He's picked a small portion dealing with taxation, and he's confined himself in his remarks to the tax-sharing situation and the distinct separation of powers that would accompany that.

The only problem is once you use the term "discussions concerning the BNA Act," the whole field opens up to your mind. Despite oneself—although one is attempting to think only of what's written in the resolution—all these other concepts start coming into play and one finds it difficult to agree with what's written because that will affect some other area. That's really the only major drawback I see with the resolution.

We take one small part of what needs to be discussed to keep this country together or to have a redefined act under which we and all the provinces would operate in the best interests of one country, and we leave out via this resolution all the other things which come to mind. I cannot disagree that there should be a distinct separation of powers. We get into problems when we don't. Certainly in terms of cleaning up the areas of what is taxable by one jurisdiction vis-à-vis the other—particularly the member's continued recognition in his resolution that equalization payments should continue—speaks to the area of national unity. This is certainly something which must be maintained if there's any hope of that continuing. And certainly I applaud his recognition that we must do the same thing with our municipalities in terms of defining where their tax base is, where their taxes will come from, and implying thereby what is very desperately needed—that there should be a larger tax base for the municipalities, a re-defined one, which does not leave them so wholly dependent upon the very regressive property taxation system we have now. The implication that will occur is all positive in the member's resolution.

However, what also comes to mind are some examples of this in the past. I believe it was in the spring of 1972, in a provincial-federal conference, the federal government—in terms of doing what this resolution would do—more clearly define one area of taxation—said to the provinces: “We will give you exclusive jurisdiction over succession duties. We will step completely out of the succession duty field so the provinces may have that jurisdiction completely.”

What do we find seven years later? Ontario, having been given that area of taxing power, steps out of it entirely by abolishing succession duties in the province at the very time when only three per cent of the population has an estate—when they pass away—of \$300,000 or more. It's therefore not a very onerous burden on the general population of Ontario, but we decide to abolish it.

There's no doubt a philosophical difference between the member for Humber and me about whether we should tax moneys that pass from generation to generation. I strongly think we should. We are all born, or should be born, equal in this world. One does not need, or should not have, a silver or gold spoon in one's mouth or hand, in order to continue.

Mr. J. Reed: I wonder what they're saying about you in Milton tonight? The high school will never be the same.

Mr. Bounsall: The real means of equalization, in terms of equal shots at opportunity, which is a good free-enterprise concept, should be one in which one starts out financially equal as well. The way you do this is to have succession duties. This is one area the federal government gave to the provinces. Ontario has now opted out completely.

On the other hand, there are advantages in more clearly defining the taxing power of each jurisdiction because, in the shared programs we have, we now see the federal government backing out. The health field is clearly within provincial jurisdiction. In order to get the national health plan which came in in 1967, the federal government entered into a rather straightforward agreement with the provinces about how much it would pay in order to get that health plan established. Some few months ago, we had the federal government saying it was going to decrease those payments to the provinces in a systematic way—I believe over the next five years—only some 12 years after instituting it. The provinces are now left holding the bag financially for the health system worked out in agreement some 12 years ago.

So, in retrospect, that's the way the central government operates in terms of such a well-

defined area. And we, as a province—and all the other provinces—went into that agreement in all good faith, expecting that it would continue. Now we find that the condition we desperately need, the sharing of finances, will not continue in the form it started. It's that kind of separation which we very desperately need in this province, as embodied in the member's resolution.

The same thing is happening, of course, in the field of education. The federal government, in view of discussions of different tax sharings and different tax clarifications on who does what, and in the absence of clear delineation and definition, has passed along various grants in the field of education. Only we find, in this particular year, that now it's backing out on one quarter of the French-language education grants which it has provided in the past.

When I see this happening, and the ability of the federal government—the power it has—to change its mind on what it will cost-share with the province, the more I agree with the member in his resolution that those areas should be clearly defined. If there's an agreement on certain moneys to be transferred in view of a strict definition of the taxing power, then changes should not be allowed. The federal government should not be able to make changes unilaterally, as it has in the financing of our health system and in the grants to education; particularly in its decreased grants for French language instruction in this province which had just nicely come into effect.

It's hard, as I say, with a resolution dealing with the British North America Act—even though it deals with distinct separation of powers and, particularly, tax powers—not to get into the whole general area of the British North America Act. I feel very strongly that we need a strong central government in Canada and are running into danger in our definitions of balkanization of our provinces; we act as 10 different entities. This resolution could lead to that, although, of course, it doesn't specifically put any emphasis there.

We're just saying: “Let's define it more clearly.” I can't be against that, of course. I just wonder if this doesn't lead to a bit of balkanization because I, probably like the member for Humber, am a believer that Alberta's oil, Ontario's uranium and Ontario's hydro-electric power should be national resources; perhaps even more so than they are provincial resources. We need a government federally which will work out honest, fair arrangements that will cause this to occur.

I might just end by saying I was rather appalled that the Prime Minister of our coun-

try in the first week of the election campaign came out trying to make national unity an election issue. It is an area in which Canadians need calm, cool thought at all times and, above all, the ability to sit down and work out the arrangements that will keep this country one, rather than sloganeering at election time.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Bounsall: I was particularly affronted when he indicated that Canadians who didn't think national unity was an issue in this campaign were traitors. I would just say that for the first time in my life I feel most comfortable in my traitorous feelings, which I sometimes have.

INNOCENT PERSONS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Stong moved second reading of Bill 28, An Act to protect the Reputation of Innocent Persons from Untimely Publicity.

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, in proposing this Act to Protect the Reputation of Innocent Persons from Untimely Publicity, I recognize the fact there are certain time constraints and restrictions on private members' bills, and I would like to reserve for myself the last five to seven minutes for the rebuttal of any arguments which may be proposed in opposition to my bill.

The bill itself is wholly adequate and required. I might say it arises out of a concern I have had for some 12 years now as a defence counsel practising before the courts and defending those who can be considered to be in the lower echelon of our society and those who find themselves confronted with, and perhaps in opposition to, the law, but at least those who find themselves before the due process of law.

The bill recognizes as inherent the proposition that each and every citizen of this country, of this province and of this city, stands innocent before the due process of law before the courts until he is proven, beyond all reasonable doubt, to be guilty. That is the prime and very fundamental principle of this bill.

In paying recognition to that premise, the bill also goes on to ban the publication of the names of those persons who find themselves charged with offences, whether they be provincial or federal offences, until the trial commences, and only until the trial commences. When the trial of an individual commences by way of a plea of guilty or a plea of not guilty, then the media can take over and report the actual occurrences and events in the courtroom.

The protection of a fair and open trial is in no way interfered with by this bill. This bill protects the reputation of an individual who finds himself before the courts charged with an offence.

The bill also sets out offences and punishments in the event of a conviction of an offence against this bill.

This bill has been attacked on grounds of constitutional validity. In my respectful submission to this House, there is no greater interest in any individual of this province or of this country than his own reputation and the protection of his own innocence. That is wholly within the civil rights aspect of each and every member of this country and this province. That is protected by the jurisdiction of the British North America Act and is guaranteed and relegated to provincial authority.

In my respectful submission, this bill is not unconstitutional and is not ultra vires this House; it falls wholly within the protection of the civil rights aspect of my reputation, Mr. Speaker, of your reputation and of everyone's reputation out there on the street. In that regard this bill is intra vires.

[9:15]

There is a concern that this bill curtails the freedom of the press. I submit to this House that the real issue to be concerned with here, and the real issue with which we are confronted in this bill is simply a recognition of the innocence which we uphold of every individual. We pay lip service to it daily before our courts and our laws are founded on it. It is a recognition of the innocence of an individual before the courts, when confronted with the due process of law and the freedom of the media to market the news, to sell the news, to sell newspapers and to sell broadcasts. That is the real issue as I see it, and that is what we must decide on.

There is a conception that the common good overrides that of the individual and there is some misconception, in my respectful submission, that the common good, being the mass of organization and the mass of people out there, has some overriding concern over individual concern.

Mr. J. Reed: Only the NDP can do that.

Mr. Lawlor: The NDP and the Pope.

Mr. Stong: I would like to refer to a lecture that was given by a well-known philosopher and humanitarian, Jacques Maritain at the University of Toronto as long ago as 1940.

Mr. Lawlor: He was one of my teachers.

Mr. Stong: I'd like to quote from that. He said: "The end of society is its common good, the good of the body politic."

Mr. Lawlor: You're telling me.

Mr. Stong: "But if one fails to grasp the fact that the good of the body politic is a common good of human persons as a social body itself, as a whole made up of human persons, this formula may lead in its turn to other errors of a collectivist or totalitarian type."

Mr. Lawlor: It's possible.

Mr. Stong: "The common good of society is neither a simple collection of private goods nor a good belonging to a whole, which draws the parts to itself as if they were purely means to serve itself alone. The common good is the good human life of a multitude of persons. It is their communion in the good life. It is, therefore, common to the whole and to the parts on whom it flows back and who must all benefit from it. Under pain of being itself denatured, such a good implies and demands the recognition of the fundamental rights of the person. It involves as its chief value the highest possible accession of persons to their life as persons."

As early as 1940, our humanitarians, our eventual lawmakers, those upon whom our jurists rely in determining law have indicated that it is the individual who is important in society because, without respect for the value, the importance and the dignity of the individual, we can never have a strong and respected community. It is only in that respect and upholding the freedoms and the dignities of the human being, the individual, that we can possibly hope to have laws that pertain to the common good, meaning the entire society. Society is structured on the individual.

Mr. Lawlor: Maritain would be ashamed of you.

Mr. Stong: I quoted right from Maritain from *Scholasticism and Politics*, 1940.

Mr. J. Reed: The member for Lakeshore has got to support this bill.

Mr. Stong: In my respectful submission, we must concern ourselves about this. In fact, all of our law is oriented and based on the fact of the recognition of the value of the individual human being in determining and protecting his freedom before the law, his freedom before us, his freedom before that giant branch of government which is the judiciary.

It is in that sense that I present this bill and say that it protects the individual. The paramount consideration is not the freedom

to sell the news and not the freedom to market events, but to protect the rights, the dignity, the freedom and the reputation of each and everyone of us here and each and everyone of us out there. That's what this bill is all about—nothing more and nothing less.

It is simply a recognition of paramount consideration, of priorities. Where are our priorities as legislators? In my respectful submission, they lie in the protection of the individuals who make up the community and on whose back the community is formed.

This bill probably will be challenged tonight on the basis that it interferes with this freedom. I ask what is freedom. Do we recognize freedom? Is it licence? I respectfully submit it is not licence. No one has the right to play on the hardships of others and make a profit on it. No one has it. There isn't one in this House that would hold to that principle.

Is freedom such that it ought to tolerate irresponsibility or does freedom carry with it a demand which would guarantee the preservation of the individual and individual self-respect and the furtherance of common decency? To me that is an important part of freedom. That freedom does not pertain to the sale or the marketing of events or news. The paramount consideration is the individual.

This bill is not new; it is not foreign to our law. It is found in the *Juvenile Delinquents Act*, where the juvenile delinquent is protected from being named—not just before the trial, but right through his trial.

And there are other mechanisms built into the *Criminal Code* that permit a judge to ban the publishing of names and events as they occur in the court room and that is not foreign to our law either. Another example is the protection of an individual from any information arising out of his bail hearing or from any information arising out of a preliminary hearing.

I cannot take credit for it. It already exists in certain circumstances. But this law simply indicates that we must protect the individual prior to his trial. There are other mechanisms that are available. There are libel, slander, defamation of character suits that are available for any of those who are worried about rumours that may arise pending trial. This bill protects the individual prior to his trial.

I know the time is running on but I do have some other things that I would like to include. There are aspects of this bill that do not concern others—for instance, the secret arrests that may arise. This does not

allow secret arrests or the clandestine incarceration of individuals. We have protections built into our law right now to abolish that and to protect an individual from being held unnecessarily. There are laws that govern that situation right now in existence that can be enforced and are enforced on a daily basis. Everyone is subject to this law.

Briefly summing up my argument, the side effects of this bill can be regarded—I did not introduce this bill for this purpose alone—but we all recognize that deterrents to crime are early detection and early trial. One of the side effects of this bill could very well be the pressure built up from the media themselves upon our judiciary to have early trials and not delay trials.

Those who want to sell the facts, those who want to have the facts known and reported to the public, can put pressure on our system to have early trials so that they can be on top of the situation. There is that possible side effect to guarantee there will be less time between the time of apprehension and charge and the time of trial at which full reporting can be made.

As late as yesterday, the Right Honourable Lord Justice Denning, Master of the Rolls of the House of Lords, speaking to the Advocates Society in Toronto, described lawyers as the backbone of upholding the law and order and the rule of law in a nation. They maintain the freedoms of the individual. He spoke to the Advocates Society and the Criminal Lawyers' Association of Toronto, and I might say that the Criminal Lawyers' Association has referred a letter to all the members in support of this bill on the grounds set out in it; and I don't have to reiterate them or dwell on them, because they are self-evident.

Mr. Lawlor: Yet they find your bill defective.

Mr. Stong: They find it defective, but not in principle; they would like to extend it farther.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the last five minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the member for York Centre for having presented to us this evening a bill on an extremely important matter of substance which, unfortunately, we do not often have an opportunity to debate in this assembly. It brings to us the opportunity to debate the very delicate balance between fair trial and freedom of the press, a balance which has been described through the ages.

I would like to begin by quoting from Samuel Johnson's *The Life of Milton*, when he wrote:

"If every dreamer of innovations may propagate his projects, there can be no settlement; if every murmur at government may diffuse discontent, there can be no peace; and if every sceptic in theology may teach his follies, there can be no religion. The danger of such unbounded liberty and the danger of bounding it have produced a problem in the science of government which human understanding seems hitherto unable to solve."

So the member brings to us something which we have not yet been able to solve but with which we must wrestle from time to time, as we are doing tonight and no doubt will do for many years to come.

As we try to weigh the balance between fair trial and freedom of the press, it is only fair to remember that there are many reasons for an unfair trial. In addition to the chance that the press will not assist, we often have the problems of coerced confession, absence of competent counsel, racial prejudice, clogged court calendars, various economic discrimination, shabby conduct by attorneys in court on occasion, archaic attitudes sometimes by those who are sitting in judgement, sometimes political pressure or community prejudice and, unfortunately in some cases, simple corruption. There are many pressures upon the courts; not just the press. I think it is wise for us to keep that in mind as we try to decide what bounds, if any, should be placed upon the press.

There are obviously many jurisdictions which have approached the subject, and two in particular I found interesting. One was the state of Oregon, which issued a very lengthy statement of principles. What the state of Oregon attempted to do was to outline principles which it felt had to be adhered to if the media were to cover trials. They are too lengthy to read into the record tonight, but they did start off by saying, "The news media have the right and the responsibility to print and to broadcast the truth." That in itself may pose a problem, but at least they recognized that was the starting point.

They then went on to list, on several pages, guidelines for disclosure and reporting of information on criminal proceedings, guidelines on photography, guidelines surrounding juvenile court proceedings—they went into quite a few details. They saw fit in the state of Oregon that they should have these kinds of guidelines for the media to adhere to. Similarly, the state of Washington drew up similar guidelines; there were some variants to Oregon's, but again they

felt the guidelines were extremely important.

[9:30]

I was interested to note that in a little document called *Advice to the Press* they put forward several items which they felt were important for the media. It suggested the media should have open access. However, the media must recognize the implications of the fair trial; free press issues for larger issues of censorship. Making a legal trial possible is an important social interest but it is not the only or even the most important social interest. The press should not confuse winning issues with losing ones. It should not confuse a claim to access with a right to publish.

By the same token, the press should not submerge the tough right to publish in a wishy-washy slogan of the people's right to know.

Mr. J. Reed: Are you going to support it or not?

Mr. Warner: You are just going to have to wait.

An hon. member: This is a very temperate speech.

Mr. Warner: The media should always ask their lawyers to stop winning battles in ways that lose wars and learn enough themselves to tell one from another.

An hon. member: Down with the media.

Mr. Warner: The media should stop thinking of constitutional freedoms as something to be protected only by courts.

What I am attempting to point out to you, first of all, is through the years many jurisdictions, many individuals, have attempted to draft some code of behaviour or code of ethics for the media. Obviously, in some cases they have tried to gag the media in some way or other.

Mr. Kerrio: Do you think you can gag Claire Hoy?

Mr. Samis: Control yourself, Vince.

Mr. Kerrio: Would you like to try to gag Claire Hoy?

Mr. Warner: Not entirely; he has been the one verbal member in favour of beer in the ballpark.

Mr. Samis: Bring on the guzzle.

Mr. Warner: An interesting comment on the press in a book called *Crime and Publicity* appears on page 255: "With distinguished exceptions, crime reporting in the American press compares lamentably in thoroughness, sensitivity and responsibility with its increasingly expert coverage of other

subjects. Quite apart from any considerations of prejudicing fair trial, its coverage of crime is coarse. If it debauches nothing else, it debauches the high standards the media proclaim and in other fields uphold."

In this book, as I read it through, the conclusion is generally reached that the press should be allowed to have pretty free range in reporting on trials, although it recognized carefully that in many cases the press does a disservice. On balance, the disservice was not that frequent.

Mr. J. Reed: We want to know what you think. Anybody can read out of a book. What do you think?

Mr. Samis: Where does Vince stand on this?

An hon. member: This is the Harold Ballard bill, isn't it?

Mr. Bounsall: He warned you he was doing research on this.

Mr. Warner: Those who do not get the opportunity to participate in the debate are the most vocal hecklers. I have always noticed that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kerrio: What about those who are debating?

Mr. Warner: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, on balance—

Mr. J. Reed: Here it comes.

Mr. Bounsall: Here it comes.

Mr. J. Reed: On balance we are ready. We would like it to be your thoughts.

Mr. Warner: Are you ready for this? The freedom of the press represents in measure our freedoms. If we attempt to curtail the freedom of the press, too soon we lose our own freedoms.

An hon. member: There is your answer, Julian.

Mr. Bradley: That is going to be etched on the wall.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member has one minute.

An hon. member: We will take on Harold Ballard.

Mr. Warner: Thank you. I have more than that, but just one minute tonight.

An hon. member: No beer in the ballpark.

Mr. Warner: The press act as the gatekeepers to the courts. They report in an honest and fair way often—most times.

Interjections.

Mr. Warner: I will rephrase that. I retrieve that one.

An hon. member: Occasionally, sometimes.

Interjections.

Mr. Warner: They do make an honest attempt to report as fairly and accurately as they can. Obviously, on occasion not all is done perfectly.

I must in good conscience oppose the bill. This will come as a shock to some members of the assembly but for once, Mr. Speaker, and maybe for the only time, I will support the status quo.

Mr. Sterling: I, too, would like to add my congratulations to the member for York Centre for bringing this issue to this forum. I think it is indeed an issue which merits discussion.

However, I must express some disappointment in the fact it's not placed in the form of a resolution, which I will allude to later in my remarks.

Mr. J. Reed: You are only angry because it is not a Tory bill.

Mr. Sterling: I understand the concern of my colleagues and the public in relation to this problem, as one of the very bases of our justice system relates to the innocence of the accused until he is proven guilty. Should a person who is accused be exposed to publicity before he goes to trial?

Mr. Kerrio: On a point of order. Do you think it's proper for you to sit in the chair? Don't you have a conflict of interest tonight?

Mr. Acting Speaker: Certainly not on this particular item and I expect to be out of this chair long before any votes are taken on anything.

Mr. Sterling: I know only too well the problems related to publicity and the results of that publicity to men who have been charged with offences and have been later proven innocent. I know how important this can be to, or how severe the effect can be on, the family. I know how damaging the suspicion created in a community can be to the individual.

I am sure this feeling has generated the support of the Criminal Lawyers' Association to this bill. However, I must express some surprise that in their letter, which most members or all members of the Legislature received this morning, they wanted to extend this not only to the pretrial period but until the trial was disposed of.

Mr. J. Reed: That's not the bill.

Mr. Sterling: I realize that's not the bill.

Mr. J. Reed: You're out of order. Speak to the bill.

Mr. Sterling: Balanced against this unfairness to the individual is a very important issue that is basic to our judicial system. That principle is it is inherent in our courts that

freedom of information on the court proceedings should be available to all members of society. There are, of course, exceptions to this, and the member for York Centre mentioned some. They have been set out in both provincial and federal legislation.

There are other powers inherent in the court to see that scandalous and extremely embarrassing matters should not be made public. Most of these exceptions are in place to ensure a fair trial takes place.

It should be noted that within the Criminal Code of Canada there are seven separate sections dealing with exceptions and dealing with the publication of information resulting from a trial procedure. The Juvenile Delinquents Act, the Child Welfare Act, the Family Law Reform Act and the new Provincial Offences Act all have sections which deal with the publication of information relating to the trial.

Judges of the Supreme Court now possess an inherent power in their discretion, in appropriate circumstances, to order that the identity of the accused be withheld from the news media. I am not misleading the Legislature; I would point out a justice of the peace does not have this power at this time.

Mr. Kerrio: You're just confusing us.

Mr. Sterling: Why is an open court necessary at this time, and why should Bill 28 not be supported?

First, I submit that to eliminate publicity as to the name of the accused is to make the trial have some secret connotation. An open trial is needed so all matters relating to the judicial process will be open to public scrutiny. J. Wigmore, in his classic treatise, *Wigmore on Evidence*, explained the importance of publicity when he stated: "In all experience, secret tribunals have exhibited abuses which have been wanting in courts whose procedure was public." In other words, once you put a shroud around the process, you invite abuse.

Mr. Kerrio: Somebody accused Clark of being a politician.

Mr. Acting Speaker: Order.

Mr. Kerrio: And he's not guilty.

Mr. Eakins: And they put it on the front page of the paper.

Mr. Sterling: He also points out that in the pretrial stage, publicity is needed so that informed persons will bring forward evidence. There is a possibility that a third party who had witnessed the incident, or in fact had seen the accused, would not know that a trial was taking place.

How does the public control abuse by either the prosecution or by the police? Would such a law raise unfair criticism of

police practices in small centres? Would the rumours surrounding the charges be more damaging than the actual charge which would be published?

Mr. J. Reed: The uncrowned Attorney General of Ontario.

Mr. Sterling: The policy of openness and publicity is intended to ensure the legitimacy and acceptance of the law and the institutions charged with the responsibility of enforcing it. Openness is of critical importance to ensuring that the presumption of innocence in our law does not become a dead letter.

May I say that in researching some of the papers within our province we have found that few papers actually have a policy in relation to this matter. I do not condone this, and I hope many of the papers would formulate policies as a result of this debate.

While I truly sympathize with the accused persons, I cannot support this bill on principle, in that an open court must be the rule, and not the exception. Having said that about the principle of the bill, I would also point out that there are serious problems with the constitutionality of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Kerrio: No, there isn't. We checked that part. It's okay.

Mr. Sterling: The key question is whether Bill 28 is a law in relation to property and civil rights or in relation to the administration of justice in the province and, therefore, *intra vires*. Or is it, on the other hand a law dealing with criminal law or procedural and criminal matters and therefore *ultra vires* this Legislature?

The answer to that question can be determined by asking two further questions: What is the object or purpose of the bill? Second, what is the effect of the bill?

It is interesting to note from the prohibition under section 1 that this bill would apply, for example, in a case where a Manitoba resident who was charged with murder in Manitoba could be released on bail, and, if he visited Ontario, it would prohibit the papers within Ontario from publishing the name of that individual.

By referring to the preamble of the bill and section 1 of the bill, it is clear that the purpose is both federal in the criminal law procedure and provincial in protecting the reputation of the individual, as the member for York Centre has put forward.

One of the effects of the bill is to supplement and duplicate some of the statutes of Canada respecting publicity bans. I have mentioned before that there are seven sections within the Criminal Code of Canada

which already deal with publicity and the banishing of publicity.

In order for this bill to achieve its declared purpose of protecting the reputation of innocent persons, the bill has been designed to alter the public policy reflected in the Criminal Code of Canada in terms of the criminal procedure which governs from the moment that the criminal process has been set in motion. This public policy at the federal level is one of openness and publicity. It is intended to ensure the legitimacy and acceptance of the law and of the institutions charged with the responsibility of enforcing it.

Mr. Acting Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. J. Reed: And he has almost expired.

Mr. Sterling: I would therefore conclude that it is the view of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) that this bill is unconstitutional in its form.

Mr. Blundy: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of the bill that has been put forth by our colleague from York Centre.

Mr. Bounsall: You are getting quite a workout tonight with two private members' bills.

Mr. Blundy: I believe he has shown a great deal of foresight and, particularly, he has shown a lot of thought for his fellow human beings in bringing forth this bill.

I speak in favour of the bill as a non-lawyer. I am not going to get into matters of law. I am going to speak from the standpoint of what this bill could do in the way of protecting the ordinary citizen out on the street. Every one of us has seen what has happened before in cases in which, in my opinion and in the opinion of many others, people have been tried and convicted in the press long before they ever came for trial. This has been done long before they ever get to court. Some of these people have been proven to be guilty, but some have been proven to be innocent. The effect this has had on each of them has been the same.

We all know people who have lost their job, their family, their position in the community, their assets and everything from having all this publicity about an offence to which they have not yet pleaded guilty or been found guilty. For the protection of the ordinary man, the ordinary citizen, we ought to support this bill.

Another thing that I have thought of in my mind is that in some of the more bizarre or very unusual cases the reports are carried in the various media for weeks and

weeks. I've often wondered how they could ever pick a jury of 12 people who could honestly say they had not formed an opinion in their minds already from what they had read in the paper, seen on television, or heard on the radio. This is a thing that ought to be thought about.

I'll bet you two cents, Mr. Speaker, that they will have a tough time finding a jury to try Jeremy Thorpe. This case has been before the media of the world for months now, but the man has not yet come up for his trial. I'm sure that most of us have already formed in our mind some kind of an opinion on the innocence or guilt in that case.

A lot of people will say, and some have said to me, "What about the freedom of the press and the media?" I am the last person to say anything should be done to keep the media from covering events to do with politics, our way of life, our community, our corporations, our unions—anything. They can talk about that. But when you get down to talking about one individual and one problem in his life that individual may have or may not have been involved in, then I think we have to weigh the freedoms that we stand for.

Are we going to opt for freedom of the individual to support his civil rights, opt to support the individual in the eyes of his peers until such time as it is shown that view is uncalled for, or are we going to opt for the freedom of the newspapers and television and so forth to sell their newspapers or sell their programs on the back of what is possibly an innocent citizen? When I have to weigh the taking away of those freedoms, I have to opt to support the individual to see that he is given his civil rights in this life. If he is innocent, then he will have benefited by our view. If he is guilty, then nothing we have said or done here tonight is going to change the situation; he is guilty and he will be sentenced for whatever he has done.

Much good can be achieved, in my view, for the individual in our society by ordering the press not to report all the supposed evidence and so forth before the trial. We have much to gain by supporting this bill and supporting the individual in our society.

I am interested in a letter received from the Criminal Lawyers' Association in which they quite obviously are supporting the bill put forth this evening by the member for York Centre. I note they are willing to go even further than this bill. They would extend it from the beginning of the trial to the end of the trial—to the rendering of a verdict. The

bill which has been proposed here tonight by the member for York Centre does not go that far. I believe it is a reasonable bill and I believe it can help to save the lives of many people whose lives would otherwise be so severely damaged that in some cases they have committed suicide, they have had to flee the country and so on, even though they were innocent.

With those few thoughts from a political person, a person who is interested in the people and from someone with no legal training, I would like to submit my case.

Mr. Lawlor: I would say to the member for Sarnia, that's not what the bill is about. I think his colleague will say one doesn't suppress the details of substance and procedure prior to trial. One is only concerned about somebody's name being disclosed and their reputation suffering before trial.

Mr. Stong: That is what he is basically saying.

Mr. Lawlor: The only backing the honourable member has out of a very large number of parties, all the way from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association to the British Press Council, to the Ontario Press Council, to the John Howard Society, which are all "agin ya," are the criminal lawyers.

Mr. Stong: No.

Mr. Lawlor: I have the text of the statements here. He produces the one from the criminal lawyers. What do you think the criminal lawyers are going to say, Mr. Speaker? They defend accused persons. They would be the first ones to say they didn't want names disclosed to protect their clients. That's what they're paid for.

I do want to point this out. They come down and they kind of give some niggling assent to what the member for York Centre contends and they say the objective should be that the individual be protected whether the charge be under provincial or federal laws. This association would prefer to see the protection extended beyond the beginning of the trial to the end of the trial.

In his wishy-washy, fence-sitting, half-articulate way, the member stopped half-way. He goes up to the time of the trial. If he really believes what he says, why shouldn't the name of the accused be protected to the end of the trial? Then if he's adjudged guilty, maybe he might consider letting somebody know he has been subject to this. If he's acquitted then so be it and bless him and he ought not to be pilloried. Maybe in his seven precious moments—I hope it's moments—he will tell me just why he stops in midstream and drowns.

Mr. Stong: Five minutes.

Mr. Lawlor: They find the bill defective on another score, as there may be occasions where an individual might wish to highlight police harassment or an unjust prosecution. They would appreciate an amendment in committee, which of course it will never get to, to change the whole bill and make it something sensible. I think, by and large, the present law is adequate to the intent and need to this. In preliminary inquiries, the first step in a criminal process, he's completely protected under the terms of the Criminal Code sections 467(g) and 465(j) where the court can exclude witnesses, exclude all the press, exclude everybody from the courtroom and proceed with the case in desirable circumstances. Surely, that's adequate protection.

In jury trials, the jury may be sequestered, sealed off from publicity so it won't be affected in this particular way. There are instances where this has happened, particularly in the United States. Remember the case of Dr. Samuel Sheppard, who was greatly prejudiced by a press, a scandalous press.

There are things called defamatory libel. There are charges and methods of attacking the press on these things. If they bring people under a shadow in this particular way these methods should be ventured upon rather than venturing upon a new mode of procedure which has hidden defects and can lead—shall I say it?—to Star Chamber proceedings in the court. Take Jeremy Thorpe. Take Jeremy.

An hon. member: You take him, we don't want him.

Mr. Stong: He hasn't even been tried yet and everybody says, "You take him." This bill is necessary.

An hon. member: The good Liberal.

Mr. Lawlor: Nevertheless, he's holding himself up for election. I make no judgement on the man. I trust he's not guilty. He has had an outstanding career; he's a very brilliant and witty man. It pains me to see him pilloried in this way, but, surely, he has been accused of a fairly serious matter and he's running in an election.

I think the public has a right to know. They may make their own judgements on this. Under this particular bill, they would not. It would be all suppressed. It would all be hidden and, Mr. Speaker, you could hold yourself out as holding one set of opinions when you're under criminal charges with respect to the exact contrary. Take Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Lee Harvey Oswald, Jack Ruby, any number of people who, under this kind of legislation would be protected ab initio. That is not desirable. The public,

in most circumstances, has the right to know throughout the whole proceedings, not just when one of the parties begins to introduce evidence at the trial.

[10:00]

I agree with the Attorney General of Ontario. This legislation is unconstitutional in any event. We have the provisions under the Criminal Code; if I have a moment, I'll read one, section 442:

"Any proceeding against an accused that is a corporation or who appears to be 16 years of age or more shall be held in open court, but where the presiding judge, magistrate or justice, as the case may be, is of the opinion that it is in the interest of public morals, the maintenance of order or the proper administration of justice to exclude all or any members of the public from the courtroom for all or any part of the proceedings, he may so order." So what does my friend want?

Mr. Stong: That doesn't exclude publication either.

Mr. Lawlor: No. But it goes a long way to protecting the reputation and position of the accused. In any event, they have set out what their protection is. The field is occupied, and we can't move in with our own legislation in an area that has already been pre-empted by the federal government; it's a well-known doctrine in criminal law.

This matter should be handled by the Ontario Press Council. There has to be a press code. That's the British solution to the matter. The solution in the American states is to have a deal between the bar and the press; it's done in Nebraska, in Oregon, in Washington. Half of the states in the United States now have set up codes as between the bar and the press in which they set out the terms, and these are honoured by the judges. Voluntary relationships of that kind are far preferable to the kind of thing the member is putting forward at this time.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate this evening on this particular bill. In so doing I would like to say at the outset that there is one basic fault I find with this bill, and that is simply that it has been too late in coming to this assembly.

Mr. Stong: I agree.

Mr. Williams: It is a matter that should have been brought forward in the form of legislation long before now, and it is unfortunate that the members of this Legislature and its predecessors have not seen fit

to enact this type of legislation long before this.

The principles enunciated by the sponsor of the bill this evening are fundamentally important to our democratic way of life. There can be no greater freedom than that of the individual; it is not only a fundamental right of the individual, but also the fundamental consideration in our free society, that the individual must have his freedoms preserved and protected, and those freedoms include the fundamentally important right of the person's reputation. Any act or undertaking that would impair, prematurely judge or prejudice the reputation of an individual in this society has to be properly controlled by an orderly and legislative means.

At no time is this type of individual freedom and the vulnerability of the individual greater than when a person has been publicly singled out as having a charge laid against him for some act or alleged criminal act. At no other time in that person's lifetime can he feel more vulnerable and more devastated from what has happened, and it only contributes to and greatly impairs the rationale of the individual when the whole incident is reported in the news media.

What concerns me is this. I think there has been some distortion of what this bill is about because this evening the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere has wrestled with the two principles he sees in it; the principles of preserving freedom of the press and of ensuring a fair trial. But the whole point of the bill is that it speaks to the pretrial period, not to the trial period. In fact, it doesn't in any way inhibit the press from reporting the trial period.

Mr. J. Reed: That is the best thing you have ever said in a speech.

Mr. Warner: Now, convince me I am right.

Mr. Williams: I think, if the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere had simply read the bill, he would have understood that it is preventing the news media from prematurely labelling a person as having committed a crime; because the public at large does not always make the distinction, Mr. Speaker, between the fact that a person has been charged but has not yet been convicted. The only way the public can understand that it's in doubt is when the trial is going on and being reported.

A case in point is the ongoing Lorenz trial. The press has had a field day with it and yet the public understands that the man's innocence or guilt is still in doubt and is be-

fore the courts. On the other hand, when a charge is laid against a person, the public, by and large, does not distinguish between the fact that the person has simply been charged but not yet necessarily found guilty. Sometimes they find a oneness in the two and this is how the reputation of the individual charged is imperilled.

Another case in point is the Demeter trial with which the press had a field day. I understand and I respect the need of the press to report important issues in which the public will be interested. The news media reports sensationalism and they do it well, but it should not be at the expense of the individual's reputation and it is imperative that the timing be controlled.

There is no suggestion in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that the press be denied the right to report a trial fully, just as they did in the cases I have cited, the Lorenz trial and the Demeter trial, or any other trials that come up. They will have free access to the courts; they will have free opportunity to report every whit of evidence they feel is juicy enough for the public; they will not be curtailed in any way whatsoever.

It is imperative, however, that an individual's reputation be preserved until he comes to trial, because the time period from when the charge is laid until the trial actually begins may be days, weeks, or months. In the meantime, that person lives in persecution through public exposure in the press. If the members don't think that reputations, lives and families are destroyed because of this premature publicity, I cite the example of a noted radio columnist and TV personality, one Alan Spraggett. His particular career has been decimated because of the publicity given the charges laid against him.

As recently as this week, Mr. Speaker, on the front page of the Toronto Star it was reported that a well-known developer was charged with bribing a politician. It made the front page; he got his picture in the paper; there was a big news story on page two. It was preceded by a report in the Star two days earlier about the same developer being charged with bribing a municipal councillor. But what adds to the tremendous trauma that individual must be suffering is the way in which it was reported at the time. It just added confusion to the situation because of the lack of information forthcoming when it was reported.

For instance, the story said Chief Bruce Crawford refused to name the politician because his men were still investigating the case. Then the article goes on and says: "He would give no details except to say that the

councillor had reported an incident." So, it left the public guessing.

Obviously, that was the lead article for the big one that came out two days later where the individual was shown coming out of the courtroom with his lawyer. What kind of freedom preserves that man's reputation when this kind of pretrial publicity is given?

I think that the freedom of the individual is far more important than giving the press a premature opportunity to publicize his or her plight. They will have lots of opportunity when the case comes to trial and that is simply what the sponsor of this bill is asking. That is why I think it is imperative that we support this type of legislation. It is not imperilling the freedom of the press whatsoever. Without this type of legislation, because of the desire of the press to be the first paper to come out with the story, it will continue to imperil people's reputations when they have yet to be proven guilty of a crime for which only a charge has been laid against them.

We must clearly distinguish what this bill is trying to accomplish. Some speakers this evening have suggested that it is a question of the battle between the freedom of the press and the right to a fair trial. It deals with the pretrial period, and I cannot stress that strongly enough.

I note that all of the speakers this evening have quoted a number of jurists, philosophers and other noted authorities on the subject. I do not intend to do that; I am simply speaking from the point of view as I see it.

The one document I will refer to, which was referred to earlier, is the Criminal Lawyers' Association letter that was sent to all members of the Legislature. They wanted to take the matter further through the trial period, which was the point the member for Lakeshore spoke to. In that instance, they would be locking out the news media totally until the verdict was rendered.

Mr. Kerrio: Irresponsible.

Mr. Williams: The bill is not suggesting that at all. What really pulls the rug out from under the validity of the criminal lawyers' submission, however, is the second last paragraph where they want to have it both ways. They say: "As there may be occasions where an individual might wish to highlight police harassment or an unjust prosecution, we would appreciate an amendment in committee to provide that the accused may expressly authorize the publication of his name prior to verdict."

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Williams: They cannot have it both ways. We have to preserve the rights of the

individual and we cannot make that type of exception. For the reasons I have stated, I support the bill that is presented this evening.

Mr. J. Reed: That is the best speech you have ever made.

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill presented by the member for York Centre. It is a bill which addresses itself to a problem recognized by those who are vulnerable to the adverse publicity that could be generated by being accused or those who have experienced trial by the media in the past.

We assume in this country that there is innocence until guilt is proven. However, the publication of the identity and the charges against an individual before a trial begins often makes him guilty in the public eye ahead of time. There may be circumstances where he may have been subject to false arrest or where a mistake may have been found that removes the necessity for a trial or charges may be withdrawn because of lack of evidence.

The consequences for the individual and the family have been well outlined by members of this Legislature. They include the family itself suffering in terms of its standing within social groups; the children in the school being subjected to abuse by other children who are making judgements based on the publication of charges and the individual's name; the unnecessary effect on those in the family who might be ill; the guilt by association that the family feels; attacks of a verbal or physical nature, telephone calls and things of this kind, all of which are suffered unnecessarily if the charges are withdrawn.

The accused himself may face mental and emotional instability, may perhaps contemplate suicide, may face the loss of a job or a chance for promotion, his reputation may be destroyed and he may be unwanted in service organizations and other organizations which he may wish to join.

Those in political life and, I suppose, the clergy, those in business and in union executive positions and others in positions with high profiles would recognize their vulnerability to the judgements made by the publication of their names and the charges against them, while there is no reason to believe at that time that the charges can be substantiated or indeed that the matter will even go to trial.

The member for York Centre has mentioned the safeguards that are necessary and are in place. He has mentioned the existing situation as it relates to juveniles. It seems to me with the support of the Criminal Lawyers' Association and other members of this Legis-

lature that this bill offers the merit that is deserving of the votes of the members of this Legislature. I very proudly support this bill and think it identifies and will bring about a solution to a problem that exists.

[10:15]

Mr. Stong: Very briefly in rebuttal, I believe the member for Oriole has rebutted as well as I could the remarks made by the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere. He just simply and clearly missed the point. The point does not deal with trial, it deals with pretrial procedures and pretrial matters, and does not affect at all a fair trial.

Of course the press is free to cover a trial because that guarantees not only a fair trial but an open trial and it protects the system of justice and our laws as such. The bill does not deal with anything in that respect.

The member for Carleton-Grenville dealt with those acquitted, but this bill goes beyond those acquitted. It goes to those who are found guilty after a trial of a much lesser but maybe included offence which would not even have been reported if it had been laid initially. It deals with not only those who are acquitted, it also deals with those whose charges are withdrawn prior to trial. We are familiar with the newspaper story recently in Toronto in which a 16-year-old girl was charged with purse-snatching and robbery of a 74-year-old woman who was knocked down and injured. She was charged and publicity followed—her family suffered even to the extent of a brick through the window. Two weeks later the charge was withdrawn.

That's the type of individual we're trying to protect. That's the type of individual who is paramount. We all have types of information and examples such as that.

This bill does not curtail freedom of information. The press is free to report a factual situation such as an individual charged with trafficking in drugs—whatever. It can report the factual situation. It cannot identify the individual until his trial commences. That's simply it.

The member for Carleton-Grenville is concerned about rumour surrounding the matter coming to trial. There are built-in protections in law, as the member for Lakeshore has pointed out. We have defamation of character suits, we have libel and slander suits. They are available already.

The member for Lakeshore talks about self-interest groups and that this bill doesn't have the support of the media. Perhaps this bill does have the support of the media—

I don't know how my friend from Lakeshore can make such a blanket statement.

But there are self-interest groups and he takes on the Criminal Lawyers' Association. The Criminal Lawyers' Association is a self-interest group and if there was ever a group that ought to deny this bill that is the group, because it thrives on publicity. Lawyers need publicity; the more publicity the case gets, the better it is for the lawyer. The lawyers have taken the opposite stand because they're in the courtroom daily, defending people, innocent people. We are throwing innocent people to the wind if we follow what the member for Lakeshore says.

The member for Lakeshore also referred to open trial. There is a confusion. The member for Oriole quite clearly designated that this bill does not deal with trial procedures.

The members for Lakeshore and Carleton-Grenville read off the protections built into our law dealing with procedures during trial. Of course, they're built in. There is no law—except the Juvenile Delinquents Act which deals with this type of situation in relation to juveniles—that protects the innocence of the individual before his trial.

The argument of that well-known jurist, Oliver Wendell Holmes, was that it is better that 99 guilty persons are acquitted than one innocent person is convicted. If we adhere to that principle in our law as the basis, then this bill is simply an extension of that principle prior to trial.

Mr. Speaker: Will all honourable members take their seats, please?

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. Speaker: Mr. MacBeth has moved resolution 7.

Resolution concurred in.

INNOCENT PERSONS PROTECTION ACT

The House divided on Mr. Stong's motion for second reading of Bill 28, which was negatived on the following vote:

AYES

Blundy, Bradley, Campbell, Cunningham, Eakins, Haggerty, Hall, Kerrio, McCague, McGuigan, Miller, G. I., Newman, B., Norton, Pope, Reed, J., Reid, T. P., Stong, Sweeney, Williams.

NAYS

Auld, Baetz, Belanger, Bernier, Bounsall, Breaugh, Bryden, Cooke, Cureatz, Davison, M. N., Drea, Edgihoffer, Epp, Gregory, Havrot, Johnson, J., Lane, Lawlor, Lupusella,

MacBeth, Mackenzie, Maeck, Martel, McCaffrey, McNeil, Newman, W., Philip, Sterling, Taylor, J. A., Turner, Villeneuve, Warner, Watson, Wiseman.

Ayes 19; nays 34.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I would like to bring the House up to date on what is going to happen in the next week.

Mr. T. P. Reid: In your ministry you don't know what is going to happen tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: I will remember that the next time you come over for a favour.

Mr. T. P. Reid: The last favour you did was to Rainy River and they are Manitobians.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Pursuant to standing order 13, I wish to indicate the business of the House for tomorrow and next week.

Tomorrow, at 10 o'clock, the House will be in committee of supply considering the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services.

On Monday, April 23: House in committee of supply to finish the estimates of the Ministry of Government Services and begin the estimates of the Ministry of Northern Affairs.

On Tuesday, April 24: legislation in the

afternoon; Bills 41 and 25 for second reading; then committee of the whole House on Bills 8, 41 and 25. Then Bill 53 for second reading, if there is still time available.

In the evening: Bill 19 to begin at eight o'clock, then we continue with Bill 53 if it hasn't been finished before six in the afternoon, followed by Bills 56, 54, 55 and 57, in that order.

On Wednesday, April 25: the resources development committee, administration of justice committee and general government committee may meet in the morning. That hasn't been cleared up completely. I understand there are still negotiations going on.

On Thursday, April 26: in the afternoon, ballot items numbers seven and eight. In the evening, order number 35 now on the Order Paper, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the March 29 report of the standing procedural affairs committee regarding the change in order of estimates. Then, we will continue with legislation which hasn't been finished on Tuesday evening.

On Friday, April 27: budget debate.

The House adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 19, 1979

Private members' public business, resolution re federal-provincial responsibilities: Mr. MacBeth, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Cureatz, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Bounsall	1121
On second reading, Innocent Persons Protection Act: Mr. Stong, Mr. Warner, Mr. Sterling, Mr. Blundy, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Williams, Mr. Bradley	1133
Resolution re federal-provincial responsibilities, concurred in	1143
Adjournment	1144

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Blundy, P. (Sarnia L)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bradley, J. (St. Catharines L)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Cureatz, S. (Durham East PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H.; Deputy Speaker (Perth L)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Acting Speaker (Humber PC)
Maack, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sterling, N. W. (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Williams, J. (Orillia PC)



No. 27

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Official Report (Hansard)

Third Session, 31st Parliament

Friday, April 20, 1979

Speaker: Honourable John E. Stokes

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

CONTENTS

Contents of the proceedings reported in this issue of Hansard appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of the speakers taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is \$15 per session from: Sessional Subscription Service, Printing Services Branch, Ministry of Government Services, Ninth Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Buildings, Toronto M7A 1N3; phone (416) 965-2238.

Published by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario.
Editor of Debates: Peter Brannan.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1979

The House met at 10:04 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. S. Smith: What ministry? Only a third of the cabinet is here.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. S. Smith: Are any of the ministers expected later, Mr. Speaker, may I ask? One third of the ministers of the crown are here at the moment. Will the House leader tell us who is coming?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Don't you like us?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Premier (Mr. Davis), the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Brunelle), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott), the Minister of Health (Mr. Timbrell), the Minister of Energy (Mr. Auld) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Auld) will not be here today. All other members of the cabinet are expected.

Mr. Kerrio: Is Joe Clark in town today?

JOB CREATION

Mr. S. Smith: I will ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Can the minister tell us, in view of the fact that the Premier is still making jaunts to the United States begging for more foreign capital for more branch plants here in Ontario—exactly what we don't need—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Get that recorded.

Mr. Swart: What a conversion! What do your Windsor members think of that?

Mr. Martel: You have left me speechless.

Mr. S. Smith: —what he has done with regard to a very large and significant pool of Canadian equity capital, namely, that in the hands of Brascan? Has the minister spoken at all to the people at Brascan, who now seem intent on using this very large pool of potential risk capital to buy out the F. W. Woolworth Company in the United States? Has the minister even spoken with Brascan

to try to persuade them to use their capital here to create jobs in Canada and in Ontario, instead of going on bended knee to the United States and Japan to hope they will give us some money from foreign off-shore interests to build more branch plants in Ontario? What has he said to Brascan?

Mr. Turner: Sit down and start over again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When it first became apparent that Brascan would have a fair amount of cash at hand as a result of their sale of Brazilian Light and Traction, we did contact Brascan and urged them to consider Canadian and specifically Ontario investments as they were considering the next steps in their corporate strategy.

They indicated at that time that they were considering very many Ontario opportunities. In the event that our assistance was required, we indicated it was available and they indicated they were absolutely determined to look at Canadian opportunities. We did act, and I might say we did that some two or three months ago, immediately upon the \$200 million or \$300 million coming out of Brazil.

Mr. MacDonald: And you see how well they responded.

Ms. Gigantes: Did they ask your advice?

Mr. S. Smith: I am pleased that the minister was speaking with Brascan when he realized the fund of capital was there. But given the fact that Brascan now seems interested in using these hundreds of millions of dollars to acquire an American outfit, has the minister been back in touch with Brascan to remind them of the first conversation and to find out why it is they seem unable to find good investment opportunities in this province, which has been under this government's direction for the last 36 years? Why can they not find opportunities here in Canada? Why do they have to be seeking the F. W. Woolworth Company in the United States?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's the province of opportunity, you know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might say I'm not prepared to answer for the corporate decisions of Brascan. I think it was clearly our obligation as a province to make the call we made

to make sure they were aware of all the opportunities. In fact, with their corporate abilities and connections throughout Canada, I'm sure they would be well aware of many of them. We can invite them and we can encourage them, stopping short of perhaps legislating them into having to do that, which I haven't heard the Leader of the Opposition advocate yet, but he probably will in a couple of weeks.

Mr. S. Smith: I didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In any case, we have had that first discussion. We've been in touch with them a couple of times since then. I don't know what else the Leader of the Opposition would like us to do. If there's something specific he would like us to do, then that's fine. I'm not prepared to apologize for the corporate decisions Brascan makes, which are related to a whole host of things, of which he's well aware.

Mr. Martel: He left it to the next guy.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Has the minister made any representation to the federal government concerning the rash of mergers and takeovers which has a danger of restricting competition? In view of the federal Liberal Party's endorsement of the Bryce commission reports on corporate concentration in this country, in which they said there was no problem and, as a matter of fact, they would encourage more of it—that was the Liberal position—has the minister made any representations to the federal government that there should be a restriction on these kinds of takeovers that create not a single job in all of Canada, let alone Ontario, and has he given consideration to suggesting to them that there be a takeover tax to discourage this kind of thing?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is no to the last part of the question.

Mr. Mackenzie: In other words, you don't intend to do a darned thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The response to the earlier part of the question is that what we've been seeking from the federal government is a more rational response to the whole question of mergers than we've seen previously. For a long period of time, as the Leader of the Opposition well knows, there has appeared to be no real policy on mergers. Most of them were able to carry on as they wished. With the recent spate of mergers and attempted acquisitions, Mr. Allmand indicated they were suddenly going to come down with both feet on mergers, which is something I suspect the Leader of the Opposition might be more comfortable with. At least he raised the

spectre, to be more accurate, of coming down harder on mergers.

I think our policy has been a more practical one. It has been to indicate that the world isn't built into neat little categories which say all mergers are good or all are bad. Rather, we are seeking a more realistic assessment, to be made pursuant to perhaps some new federal legislation—I don't know—which would give us the opportunity as a province, for example, to meet with firms that occasionally consider closure or layoffs or rationalization, and have the merger as an opportunity open to them to save some employment or expand their opportunities.

On the other hand, there are situations in which mergers don't create jobs and in fact operate against our best interests. We think the manoeuvrability ought to be there to move in in those circumstances.

Mr. di Santo: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since most of the minister's colleagues seem to laugh at the idea that Brascan is investing \$200 million to \$300 million in the United States, and since the minister said he is ready to assist the company, is he really saying he is ready to give Brascan a grant in order to invest the money in Canada in the same way he did with Ford?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. There's been no discussion on that whatsoever.

Ms. Gigantes: By the time you get to it, there'll be one company left.

Mr. Martel: It will be called Grossman's.

LEAD LEVELS

Mr. S. Smith: I wanted to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Parrott) who came in after question period last day and who is not here today. But I'll ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs whether he's had any representations from the city of Toronto or from the board of health of that city regarding the way in which the Ministry of the Environment seems to wish to deal with information given to the public. Has he received any kind of representation concerning the ministry's statement?

I will read the first paragraph of an article in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*: "Residents with property containing lead levels higher than that recommended by the Ontario government have not been told about it because it would only upset them, an Ontario Environment ministry official said yesterday."

What is the minister's opinion of this way of dealing between levels of government and dealing with the residents of Toronto?

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Wells: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any representations made to me. There could be some letters in the mail that I haven't seen. I would not agree with that kind of stance. I believe the public should be told if there are any levels that are detrimental to it and that we should practice an open information policy as much as possible. I think the member should really ask my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, the full details about that statement.

The member has asked whether any representations about it have been made to me. To the best of my knowledge, none has.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: Would the minister speak with his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, when he is here on some occasion, and explain that opinion he has just given to this House? Also, would he ask the minister to report to this House as to who is going to pay for the cleanup of those yards? Is it once again going to be the public of Ontario through the lottery fund that has to pay for that cleanup? Or will we finally come to the situation the minister has been promising, namely, to make it very clear that the yards are to be cleaned up and the polluter will pay for the cleanup?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, my colleague will read that question and will respond. I'm sure he has the matter in hand. I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition, from long experience, knows it is probably not a good idea to take all one's facts strictly from a newspaper story where some ministry official may have one sentence taken out of context. The Ministry of the Environment, I'm sure, has the whole situation completely under control and will handle it well.

The minister had to be away today for some urgent problems of another nature because we had arranged some meetings with the Provincial-Municipal Committee to discuss some of his concerns. He wasn't able to be here today but he is busy on provincial business, as are all the ministers who are not here.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that General Motors is advertising for 350 skilled workers in Britain for its transmission plant in Windsor, can the Minister of Labour say how many of the 500 skilled workers that Ford will be requiring for its engine plant in Windsor will be found in Canada? What action will the government take in order to ensure that any of those workers found in

Canada aren't found at the expense of smaller companies?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the member appreciates, the speech from the throne indicated that in the future the Premier (Mr. Davis) will be asking the Minister of Labour to assume some guiding and co-ordinating role with regard to manpower activities within the province. To date, we are at present in the process of gathering the information we feel the Premier should require in order to make that decision and in order to designate the terms of reference more completely.

I am, therefore, not cognizant of the details of the question the member has put to me, but I do know he put the question to another member of cabinet yesterday. I want to assure the member I share his concerns that skilled tradesmen should be trained in this country for the skills that are required. Whether or not there are some short-term and immediate needs that have to be filled from outside the country is a matter to which I have not had any access so far.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Will the minister, with his new responsibilities, bring the House into his confidence and let us know just who were the 30 companies that have used the selective placement services to advertise in foreign countries for skilled workers in Ontario over the past year? Will he table which companies, how many jobs and what skills are being looked for abroad? Will he say what the government is doing in terms of upgrading qualified or nearly qualified workers in this province so that those immediate needs can be met and not just the needs for skilled workers five or 10 years down the line?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: When I have that information in my possession, and exactly when that will be in terms of when the Premier decides to designate it as my role, I will be pleased to discuss that matter with the member and with the House. At the moment, I do not have that information. If the member would like me to find out which particular ministry is involved in those present activities that he has referred to, if they are going on, I'll be pleased to do so.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: When I raised this matter a number of months ago in so far as Hydro's importing of English skilled workers to work at Douglas Point was concerned, I was told by the then Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) that he and some of his federal colleagues were meeting to try to resolve this matter. What has happened since that time?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, I'm always interested in discussing what might be available to me, in terms of knowledge of the activities that are going on and have gone on, when they have become my responsibility. Until that time, I would suggest the member ask the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson) about the details.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker: I'd like to ask the minister if he's aware that yesterday the Minister of Education said one of the main problems was that there weren't enough young people who wanted to go into apprenticeship. Yet, according to her ministry official, Al Dumouchelle, in Windsor, this morning, there are more applicants to get into apprenticeship programs in Windsor than there are positions.

Mr. McClellan: What do you know, she was wrong again.

Mr. Cooke: Secondly, is the minister aware that in the General Motors transmission plant in Windsor they have at present only 20 people in apprenticeship programs? None of the Big Three is represented on the task force recently set up in Windsor to try to overcome the problems of skilled trades, and yet, again—

Mr. Speaker: Was there a question there?

Mr. Cooke: Yes, there are a couple of questions.

Mr. Speaker: Would you please put them?

Mr. Cooke: I would like the minister to respond to the very real concern of the members of our party that his government and the federal government gave Ford Motor \$68 million and there will be a need for 500 skilled tradesmen, yet the present needs can't even be met. How are we going to get all the jobs for our \$68 million?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The indication in the speech from the throne that the Minister of Labour in future will be asked to have some role in guiding and co-ordinating the manpower activities of the government, more than gives a firm commitment of our role and underlines our concern about the question of skilled manpower in this province.

Mr. McClellan: Yes, get it away from Stephenson.

Mr. Cooke: Concern is not enough; we want answers.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I appreciate that your own member has trouble getting his question across. I seem to be having trouble getting the answer across.

Mr. Mackenzie: You haven't answered the question yet.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: The response to the question the member has put will have to come at this time from one of the other ministers.

Mrs. Campbell: Which one would you suggest?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: In particular, I would transfer the question, if it's your wish, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not concerned about the adverse effect on the small manufacturer and on small industry that the new developments in the Windsor area will have? Their skilled employees are going to be stolen away. Would the minister not consider contacting a lot of these industries and finding out if they could take on additional help—I would assume assisted by the government—so that at least by the time the new Ford plant is opened we would have additional numbers of skilled tradesmen?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Clearly I have the same concerns the member has, and clearly, when the Minister of Education was in Windsor recently to open the employer-sponsored training program there, she demonstrated the same concern.

Mr. Cooke: The Big Three aren't even involved in it.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: I would again ask the member to put his question to the minister who has been involved with that project.

Mr. McClellan: She's incompetent in everything.

Mr. Warner: She's advertising in England.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister assure the House that within a month he will take over the duties of minister of manpower and make that a reality, or is this just another Conservative promise that will not be met by any effective action out in the province?

Hon. Mr. Elgie: Mr. Speaker, once again I would ask if you would consider allowing the involved minister to respond to the question. I might just say that I think the member for Ottawa Centre should know that the ad hoc advisory committee, with representatives from all segments of society—management, labour and education—shares a concern with me that there is no serious commitment—there is a serious commitment to manpower and I have a commitment to it.

Mrs. Campbell: A Freudian slip.

Hon. Mr. Elgie: He shouldn't play that sort of game.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Labour has continually referred to a

redirect to the Minister of Education, may I ask her a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Sweeney: Thank you. What specific programs are now in place in the Windsor area, particularly at St. Clair Community College—and in other places in the province where it's appropriate—which would prepare people for specific job openings the minister now knows are going to occur in a year or two years?

Mr. di Santo: Don't lie now.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, under the direction of the employer-sponsored training program in Windsor, there has been developed a community industrial training committee with representatives from labour, from management, from the educational institutions, from the boards of education and from representatives of the general population in Windsor.

An hon. member: But none of the big auto companies.

Mr. Warner: The government should advertise for cabinet ministers. Put an ad in an English paper.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The community college in Windsor has been working diligently—in fact on shifts—in order to accommodate the requirement for educational training programs in areas related specifically to the machine tool industry.

In addition to that, just about four weeks ago we inaugurated a new program of employer-sponsored training in the Windsor area which will, within the next 12- to 18-month period, involve 2,000 individuals in training programs specifically related to the increased requirements of the automobile industry in the Windsor area.

These trainees have already begun and they have begun in the smaller plants in Windsor because we feel very strongly that these small plants in that area should not be jeopardized by increased demand for skilled workers at the Ford plant when the Ford plant opens.

We are moving in this direction in several other communities as well and I believe by September there will be 17 communities in which employer-sponsored training programs will be in active progress by the fall of this year.

Mr. Swart: You are doing tomorrow what you should have done years ago.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: In addition to that we are attempting to upgrade with some speed the program of apprenticeship in a number of areas specifically related to skilled

trades in terms of requirements, computerizing the recording program, shortening the length of time necessary, hopefully, and co-ordinating that more effectively with the secondary school system and with the college school system.

Mr. Foulds: That's why the numbers are plummeting.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: This too is an initiative that is being carried on vigorously right at this time.

Mr. Cassidy: We have heard the words too many times before.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: We are working with the task force committee established now under the authorization of the Minister of Labour to define those areas in which we have acute and specific needs, in order that we can begin to move as accurately in those areas as well.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, a point of order: In this last exchange of questions, I believe on three occasions the Minister of Labour suggested the question be redirected. Could you advise the House as to the procedure expected in this matter? When redirection is suggested by one minister, is the minister to whom that redirection is suggested expected to answer, or is the person asking the question expected to direct it by himself or herself to the other minister, or shall the direction come from the chair? It would appear there is some uncertainty as to just who should answer and on whose suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: There is no uncertainty in the mind of the person who occupies this chair. It is up to the questioner to direct the question to the minister who the questioner thinks is appropriate. As long as it is within the purview of the minister in question, he or she can answer in any way he or she chooses. I see no reason why anybody shouldn't redirect the question, but it is not up to the chair to do it; it is up to the questioner.

Mr. Cooke: Regarding the various questions I asked, the Minister of Labour could not answer them and tried to redirect them. I tried to get the attention of the chair to redirect them. I wonder if the Minister of Education would attempt to answer, since the information she gave yesterday to our party leader was completely and totally inaccurate.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The honourable member for Windsor has just said that the information I gave yesterday was entirely inaccurate. I would like to know what it is he is talking about.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order

Mr. Cooke: She said there were no interested young people and that is clearly inaccurate.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the original point of order, if I might: You have indicated it is up to the member to redirect the question. You do realize, I am sure, that requires standing on one's feet again, getting the recognition of the chair in a supplementary and asking for redirection. Given the very reasonable but strict limitations put on the number of supplementaries, you recognize the difficulty this imposes.

[10:30]

I hope you'll take that into consideration in deciding how we should deal with these redirect problems. When one minister suggests redirection to another, perhaps it might not be out of line to consider that the other minister might complete the answer given by the first minister rather than demanding another supplementary from each person. The member for Huron-Bruce, for instance, had a clear situation which should have been redirected but had no opportunity to do so, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I disagree completely with the Leader of the Opposition. When the member for Huron-Bruce got up he specifically asked a supplementary of the Minister of Labour. He had every opportunity to redirect, as was the case with the member for Kitchener-Wilmot. It was a very legitimate request and I acceded to it for the very reasons suggested by the Minister of Labour. I see no problem whatsoever.

[Later (10:44):]

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a point of privilege in that yesterday the Minister of Education in this Legislature made the following statement:

"However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the honourable member opposite that while the places for training are there, it is not the position of this government that we would go out and coerce people into the training program."

Yet this morning when I asked a question of the minister and reminded her that yesterday she said there were not enough young people to go into these programs in the Windsor area, she said she had not said that yesterday. Mr. Speaker, it is about time we got straight answers from this Minister of Education.

[10:45]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I do not think my answer could have been straighter yesterday. It is the informed opinion of many people who have examined the problems that we have with skill training in the province of Ontario that recruitment to skill training has been impeded by a lack of enthusiasm on the part of our young people.

An hon. member: That's just your opinion.

Mr. Mackenzie: You don't know what you are talking about.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I am sorry, I am not reporting my opinion. I am reporting the opinion of knowledgeable individuals who have examined this problem over a period of time from many areas, including the teaching professions, those who employ such skilled workers and some representatives of trade unions, all of whom confirm that it has been difficult to recruit young people into the skilled trades as well. Those who attended the Skills for Jobs conference last June would, I think, have supported that statement without any question at all.

Mr. Warner: It would be nice to get some straight answers from you here.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: There has been a decrease in the total number of places in apprenticeships over the last decade, for reasons which have to do with changes in the industrial program within the province of Ontario, but there have also been places which have been unfilled because recruitment has been difficult. I did not specify the Windsor area at all, and I had no intention of doing so.

Mr. Cooke: This minister is a total disgrace.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Therefore, I believe that I did not in any way mislead the honourable member opposite.

Mr. Martel: You are a disaster waiting for a place to happen.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The member just doesn't like facts.

[Reverting (10:31):]

FUNDING OF HOMES FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development arising out of the catch-22 situation facing Participation House in Ottawa, a residence for handicapped adults, which is part of the program that was agreed to by the government back in 1972, but which is now blocked from getting capital funding from Wintario and Central Mortgage and Housing Corpo-

ration because the ministry or the government will not make a commitment to provide ongoing funding after 1980-81.

Will the minister make that commitment now, so that Ottawa can have this residence for handicapped adults, which is so badly needed and which is comparable to the ones now funded by the government in Markham, Hamilton and Brantford?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, through you to the honourable member, I have no knowledge of the problems of that particular Participation House. It has not been brought to my attention. I will look into it and study the details and I will respond later.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm surprised at the minister's response, in view of her responsibility for the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped. Can the minister say how this particular project is to get under way if they're being told they can't get capital funding until they have a commitment for operational funds, and they are being told that they can't get operational funds until they are built. How does this project get out of that catch-22 kind of situation? Does what the government is saying really mean that because it will guarantee funding only on a year-to-year basis it has effectively said it will veto any future such residences for handicapped adults in the province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated I'm very interested and I will look into the situation and find out what the problems are. We on this side of the House are just as interested in providing accommodation and support services for handicapped people as the members on that side. They have no monopoly on caring for people who are handicapped.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you have the answer to something once in a while?

Mr. Speaker: The minister says she has not sufficient knowledge to answer. She will take the question as notice and report back at a later date.

LIQUOR, WINE PRICES

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Is the minister familiar with this five-year-old report of the Ontario Wine Advisory Committee, whose chairman was Mr. A. Gordon Cardy and one of whose members was the Honourable John Robarts? If so, and in view of the widespread and growing support for the revision of imported wine prices, would the minister advise what consideration he has given in particular to the proposal

to set up a sliding-scale markup on imported table wines?

Hon. Mr. Drea: I'm vaguely familiar with that report. Markups, whether they are sliding scales that are 123 per cent or other markups, are not my responsibility.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary: Before the estimates of the ministry come before the justice committee, and since the Liquor Control Board of Ontario is a responsibility of the minister, would the minister have officials of the board attempt to bring the statistics in the report up to date so that the House and the public would know what the current figures are and so that we could then discuss the matter during the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Drea: I would be delighted, Mr. Speaker, but I draw to the attention of the honourable member that yesterday, for quite a period of time, the public accounts committee dealt with all of this. We can give him statistics—I can give him a statistic right now; Canadian whisky prices, even with the increases, are far less in terms of disposable income than they ever were. We can give him that. But we went through all of this yesterday.

The markup, which is really what I think he is looking at, or a sliding scale, which would be a new, more flexible form of markup, is really a policy matter that is outside the scope of the board and of the minister. What is within the scope of the board and my scope as the minister responsible here—but primarily the board—is that the wholesale price, or the price delivered to the board, whether it's a foreign or domestic product, is an accurate price.

As the honourable member knows, we have no control over foreign prices. We do have control over domestic prices. The domestic whisky and spirit industry, the Ontario wine industry and the Ontario beer industry all have to seek approval through the board for production or pass-through cost increases. But that is the limit of what the board does with prices other than to combine the wholesale price and to add on the markup.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now that the matter is clearly on the record of the House as to the Treasurer's responsibility, could I redirect to the Treasurer the question with respect to considerations that the Treasury is making with respect to the suggestions in the report?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have read the report, Mr. Speaker, and I am surprised that the House has suddenly discovered that the Treasurer sets the markup. It is not something new. It has been going on for years. I

am glad to read the headline in the *Globe* today that recognizes the responsibility rests here. It is one I do not shirk. The only thing I can point out, as we have said a number of times, is that it is cheaper to buy liquor in Ontario than anywhere else in Canada.

Mr. Martel: Did the Treasurer cut up his jacket and make a tie with it?

Mr. Germa: He murdered the bagpipes.

Mr. Warner: I'll bet it glows in the dark.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You should see his socks.

Mr. Speaker: Just ignore the interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I want the members to know that the constituent from Muskoka who made me this asked me to be sure I wore it.

Mr. Warner: He is now without his bagpipes.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is loyalty above and beyond the call of duty; no question about it.

Hon. Mr. Maeck: How many of the members for Sudbury East's constituents have made him a tie?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Certainly in the pre-budget process I read that report and gave it consideration.

There is a common misconception about normal commercial practices in the business world when people look at the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. When the price of Volkswagens goes up at cost, the price goes up at retail by the same percentage. Retailers traditionally have had markups which they apply to their costs. The idea that we should not do that because it is liquor seems to me to be rather foolish. It is a fundamental fact of normal commercial practice.

The suggestions made are interesting. They are certainly worth consideration. But they also have to be tied into the current General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations, which are fairly involved in this kind of thing. Any one move by the province right now, I believe, could leave us in a poor position in some of the agreements going on with GATT. That is why I chose for this year not to make any basic change in structure without saying it would not be something we should consider.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the Ontario wine growers claim their percentage contribution to the operating costs versus their total sales in the liquor licensing operation is greater than that paid by the importers of wine, is the minister planning to change or adjust some of the prices to make the contribution to the operating costs of the board more equitable?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I read a very interesting speech given by the president of the board in, I believe, Barrie, where he set out the hidden costs of handling, and they were quite interesting. I think the sum and substance of that speech was we netted out in about the same position with the markups Ontario had on Ontario wine and the markups we had on the foreign wines, when one took into account all the other true costs of handling that were involved. We did change the markups on Ontario wines, as the members know, in the budget by two ways; we brought some down and brought some up to an equal, uniform rate.

Mr. Makarchuk: That was to discourage the consumption of fortified wines by certain elite citizens.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No. Really, I think it was to recognize that the "pop" wines, the seven per cent wines, have become very popular. They are filling a very real demand in society and the 70 per cent rate that used to apply to them should be equalized with whatever rate we choose to select for other Ontario wines. We also had another phenomenon to take into account and that was the growth of company stores, in which the LCBO has not participated and the government now does.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary; the honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. S. Smith: Just very briefly, since the Treasurer indicates the sliding markup scale is somehow totally out of keeping with his experience of Volkswagen and normal commercial practice—

Hon. F. S. Miller: I didn't say that; that is not what I said.

Mr. S. Smith: Well, since the Treasurer has very plainly indicated he believes a straight markup is normal commercial practice and he is surprised—

Hon. F. S. Miller: You don't know anything about commercial practice.

Mr. S. Smith: The record will show, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer has just said normal commercial practice is to mark up Volkswagens by the same amount retail as they are marked up wholesale. This kind of markup is a normal commercial practice. Is the Treasurer suggesting a sliding markup is somehow an abnormal practice? Is he suggesting Mr. A. Gordon Cardy, Mr. John Robarts and Mr. Dean Muncaster, the head of Canadian Tire, didn't understand normal commercial practice when they made this report in the first place?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member from the Kitchener area has a much

better grasp of fundamentals than his leader. He at least understood my response. I shall let it rest; the member can go back and read it and I hope somebody will interpret it for him.

Interjections.

PROVINCIAL SCHOOLS DISPUTE

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister now involve himself directly and immediately in speaking to the Provincial Schools Authority, the management bargaining agent with the provincial school teachers, to ensure the final salary offer of a pitiful 2.6 per cent increase is increased—an offer which comes along with restrictive staffing cutback problems as training schools are closed, an offer which was rejected by 87 per cent of the teachers in that bargaining unit? Will the minister become involved in an attempt to avoid the strike situation which will arise early next week in our Correctional Services training school centres and our schools for the deaf, blind and retarded across this province?

Hon. Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and answer the member on Monday.

Mr. Bounsall: In taking that under notice would the minister point out to the Provincial Schools Authority the arbitration award of 6.5 per cent to Liquor Control Board of Ontario employees, which was made known only yesterday, so they will know by how much, therefore, their offer is patently ridiculous?

Hon. Mr. McCague: I am sure they are well aware of that offer.

TEACHER-BOARD DISPUTE

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. In view of the discussion this morning in this Legislature over the real concern for job opportunities and job training, and in view of the fact that I have had many calls from student councils and students going to schools under the Haldimand Board of Education expressing the concern that they would like to get back to school because they know they need their education, can the minister indicate to me what rights the students have?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I can define specific rights on behalf of students in the face of an altercation between a school board and the teachers employed by that board. However, I am aware that if the required number of educa-

tional or instructional hours has been completed by the students in certain subjects, they may be able to gain credit for that subject on that basis during the school year and may not have that portion of their educational program in jeopardy.

It is my understanding that that board has made some tentative recruiting feelers in various areas in order to try to ensure that those students who are in grade 13 will not face severe jeopardy in terms of their education. I can tell the honourable member that the Education Relations Commission is monitoring the situation very closely and that the chairman has been requested by me to let me know immediately he believes the educational program of the children is in jeopardy so that we may attempt to find some other solution.

At this point in time, it is my understanding as well that the mediator who stands ready to serve both the board and the teachers in that situation has not had his services requested up to this point. I would urge the trustees and the teachers, in the interests of the students' educational program, to make use of the mediator's services as rapidly as possible to try to develop an agreement.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Supplementary: Can these students receive diplomas or certificates indicating where they now stand so that they may apply for positions which are or may be available at plants such as the new Stelco complex in Nanticoke?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: As I said, if they have completed the required number of instructional hours with reasonable, average marks at this time in this school year, I am sure that some letter could be granted by the school board to inform prospective employers of that; but they certainly could not, I think in most instances, be granted their secondary school graduation diplomas or their honours graduation diplomas because of the fact that the entire instructional year has not as yet been completed.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary: Given that the practice in the past has been to wait six or eight weeks before these things are settled; given that we have waited until the mediators have been called in; given that a report to her ministry last September clearly showed this procedure had resulted in grade 13 students being negatively affected by it, how can we continue to go on with this procedure? When are we going to move in more quickly and say that the first and foremost concern is the good of the students?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Because of my concern about the future and the jeopardy in

which students have been placed in certain situations, as this House knows I have asked for a complete review of Bill 100 and the procedures thereunder. It is absolutely essential, I believe, that we, at this time, examine the effects of the procedures established under Bill 100 in order to ensure we are moving in the right direction in the resolution of problems.

The amount of time that has been lost by those students in Haldimand has, in actual fact, been not as great as it appears, taking into consideration the long Easter weekend, the school break period and some other things. I have specifically asked the Education Relations Commission, whose responsibility it is under the act, to inform me about the degree of jeopardy they believe those students are under. I am very much concerned about this, because I don't want any one of those students to be even slightly damaged by whatever happens in the Haldimand area at this time.

Mr. Sweeney: They went too long in the past.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: At this point, there is no fixed time established in terms of jeopardy for the educational program, and I would not anticipate that the Education Relations Commission would consider there was any fixed time. They have to monitor the situation on its own merits and make that information available to us.

GAINS PAYMENTS ERRORS

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Revenue. I wonder if the minister can comment on a statement made by one of his staff people that there are many instances of senior citizens being asked to repay huge sums of money paid out by accident under the Gains program as a result of poor co-ordination between provincial and federal authorities. Can the minister inform the House, or table with the House, how many people have received Gains payments to which they are not entitled, how much the ministry is attempting to collect that has been paid out accidentally, and what is the average amount that he is attempting to collect from each of these people who have been overpaid?

Hon. Mr. Maeck: Mr. Speaker, that particular question and most of the details for which the member is asking were on the Order Paper not very long ago. I believe it was answered.

However, those are the types of figures that I wouldn't have with me. Certainly I will get them for the member.

Mr. Philip: I wonder, then, if the minister can answer this question: Why has there not been a system developed by his ministry to automatically inform recipients in advance when they should apply for federal benefits and when they will no longer be entitled to full Gains payments? I wonder if he would look specifically into the case of a Mrs. Alice das Dores Silva, who has allowed me to use her name, whom the ministry neglected to inform of her ineligibility for full payment of Gains upon receipt of the old age pension and supplement, and who is now being asked to repay \$5,266.36 which this ministry has paid out by accident?

Mrs. Campbell: "We care."

Hon. Mr. Maeck: If the member would send me the information regarding that particular case I would be happy to look into it. But I must remind the member that the Gains program is one that is actually tied on to the guaranteed income supplement, as I am sure he is aware. It is administered by the federal government, rather than our ministry, to the greatest extent, because it is tied in to the income tax system, which again is administered by the federal government.

We have been very lenient in the past and will continue to be so in cases of actual hardship where people are asked to pay money back. If I can have a look at that particular case, the woman in question may be one who would qualify.

VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. Bradley: My question is for the Minister of Education. In view of continuing media reports of violence, vandalism and certain criminal activities taking place within the confines of some secondary school buildings in Ontario would the minister indicate to the House what action her ministry is taking to assist teachers and administrators to alleviate this problem?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, there are two problems inherent in this. First is the problem of what could be construed as violent action between teachers and students, which comes under the full responsibility of the principal of that school. The disciplinary action to be taken is the decision of the principal of that institution.

The problem of intruders into the school building is one that was of sufficient concern that a special committee was established, made up of representatives of school principals, secondary school teachers, boards of trustees and Ministry of Education representatives. That report has been submitted to

my office. I gather it was submitted just before I returned from China. It is on my desk now and I am hoping I am going to have a chance to complete reading it this week in order that we may act on some of the recommendations contained therein.

Mr. Bradley: Supplementary: Mr. Speaker: Would the minister indicate whether she feels—with a preliminary look at the report, or any information she has at the present time—she would be initiating any legislation within the Legislature to deal specifically with that problem as it relates to the Petty Trespass Act and the Education Act and how they might be strengthened to keep intruders out?

Secondly, would the minister indicate whether she feels boards of education and the ministry are giving sufficient backing to secondary school principals and vice-principals to deal with disciplinary problems that originate within the school itself?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: In answer to the first question, that's a very real possibility. As to the second question, I'm not sure I can answer that right at the moment.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Ms. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. In the light of the discontinuation of the work within his ministry in the area of energy conservation and renewable energy, can the minister tell this House if he considers the Ministry of Energy's \$5.6 million in provincial support for the development of renewable energy and conservation to be a sufficient level of support for the development and marketing of this very promising technology?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I answered a comprehensive series of questions on this very topic last week from the member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. J. Reed). We undertook the energy conservation program—which is what it was—for industry several years through the energy buses. The energy buses are continuing to service our industrial clientele. Apart from that we had some three consultants working on energy—

Ms. Gigantes: I didn't ask you what they were doing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member had studied the program, she would know that what she is talking about in terms of the Ministry of Energy's program really does not relate to the work that was being carried on in our ministry by the consultants.

As a result of our consultants' work—as I indicated the other day—further work is being

undertaken by the Ontario Research Foundation funded by our ministry to continue the energy program, as it relates to industry, to replace the work that was done earlier.

Ms. Gigantes: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister tell us, when Ontario Hydro is going to be permitted to borrow close to \$2 billion on the international money market this year for its nuclear program, whether he doesn't feel the government should be devoting more than a total of \$9.7 million, through the Ministry of Energy, for the encouragement of industry associated with energy conservation and alternative energy supply technologies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might say we are quite satisfied with the level of support we are giving industry—

Mr. Warner: You're always satisfied with mediocrity.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —in terms of energy conservation. We think the programs are excellent ones. They apparently are very well received by industry. Industry is not indicating the level of support from this government for their energy programs is falling short.

RYERSON POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact our young people are showing remarkable enthusiasm for polytechnical education, and since Ryerson's enrolment is on the increase—reversing the trend in other institutions—would the minister advise this House in precise terms what steps she is taking to ensure that Ryerson continues and has an enriched program to meet the needs of our young people?

[11:00]

Hon. Miss Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the member that Ryerson is not the only post-secondary institution enjoying an increase in enrolment.

Mrs. Campbell: I didn't say it was.

Mr. Warner: Answer the question.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: The community colleges are also moving in that direction as well and there are certain universities within the province of Ontario in which the enrolment is increasing in addition. About five weeks ago I met with the president and representatives of the board of Ryerson, who had come to discuss the funding of Ryerson specifically.

We reviewed the funding mechanism which had been established in the past as a result of agreement with the Ryerson board in 1974 that the basic income unit level for Ryerson

would be at a specific amount of 1.3. It was suggested to me that the situation had changed and that Ryerson deserved examination in terms of an enriched funding formula for BIUs. I requested of the board and the president that they develop their proposal and submit it to the Ontario Council on University Affairs, which is the procedure which is followed by all universities, and by Ryerson and the Ontario College of Art.

That meeting was either held yesterday or it's to be held next Thursday, one or the other. The proposal will be made by Mr. Pitman to OCUA at that time and then the recommendation will come to me from OCUA. We shall examine the recommendation of OCUA with real sympathy, because Ryerson does have a unique role in this province, there is no doubt about that.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary: Does the minister not realize that referring the matter to OCUA—and I'm perfectly aware of the procedures—is not going to resolve the problem when Ryerson, for example, is faced with the same formula as those with decreasing enrolments and suffers thereby? The formula is at stake for Ryerson, on the slip-year financing as well as the rest of the formula, and she cannot go on waiting for OCUA to take from one university or college to give to Ryerson.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I would remind the member that Ryerson agreed to the formula which was established at that time—

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, they did. Their Tory appointees did.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: —and they have now decided that there have been changes which require a modification of the formula. OCUA is a committee which is made up of extremely knowledgeable people who are not tardy in making their recommendations to the minister, I can assure the member of that. It has been requested of them that they do so as expeditiously as possible and I'm sure that that will happen. The meeting will occur on April 27.

Mr. Warner: The minister should get a job selling baloney.

Mr. Cooke: A supplementary: I would like to ask the minister if she really realizes how desperate the position of Ryerson is at this point when, for example, the faculty-student ratio at that institution has increased consistently over the last number of years to 16.1 to one, whereas most polytechnics, like the ones in Britain, are at eight to one? And in referring this matter to OCUA, would the minister not agree that since she has not accepted the recommendations on funding

from OCUA, and her predecessor has not, what credibility does referring this matter have, because even if OCUA agrees with Ryerson's position she will reject the recommendations anyway?

Hon. Miss Stephenson: That, of course, is entirely erroneous, because the formulae which have been developed for funding of universities have been accepted by my predecessors and I have no reason to suspect that I would do anything differently at the present time.

I believe it is important that OCUA, which has responsibility for making recommendations about Ryerson as well as about universities, has an opportunity to look at the proposals made by Ryerson. I have not seen the proposals made by Ryerson because they were not developed. I asked for the proposals to be developed so that we could examine them, and when they are presented to OCUA I'm sure that I will see a copy as well, and I shall examine them in that light too.

I would remind the member opposite that the faculty-student ratio is not the only factor which is important in the effectiveness and in the efficiency of any educational institution. There are space requirements at Ryerson—

Mr. Cooke: You just don't understand and you never will.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: —about which we have made specific recommendations recently, which the Ryerson board is looking at and which they're going to come back and talk to us about.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: She's way ahead of you fellows.

Mr. Cassidy: You make Margaret Thatcher look like a bleeding heart.

Hon. Miss Stephenson: I feel sorry for you, Michael.

BUILDING MATERIAL PRICES

Mr. Swart: I have a new question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Housing. Is the Minister of Housing concerned about the tremendous escalation in the price of materials in the construction industry? In particular, does he know the price of the type of copper tubing which is standard in house construction, type M half-inch, has gone up 38 per cent in the last six months—

An hon. member: Have you seen the price of copper lately?

Mr. Swart: —and that although it is made in Canada from Canadian copper, the price

of that tubing is set at the United States dollar level plus the import duty?

In view of the fact that housing starts are down by a third in this province this year, would the minister tell the House what steps he has taken, with the federal government or through his own government, to endeavour to stop this continuing escalation in the price of construction materials?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have the belief that the Ministry of Housing was not trying to establish or certify prices relating to the cost of materials going into the development of the housing industry.

Mr. Havrot: How can you regulate the price of copper pipe like that?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Obviously, the manufacturers of this province—indeed, of this country—are producing materials for the construction industry, regardless of whether it's copper tubing or whether it happens to be one of the very important products of house construction, which is wood. Both of them have escalated rather substantially over the last period of time.

Mr. Swart: What have you done? That's the question.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'm not here to defend the lumber industry or any of the others, but I think if we go back a few years we'll see that the lumber industry—

Mr. Cassidy: Longer.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The member should listen for a minute, because it will be information for him. The fact is that back a few years ago the lumber industry was suffering a downtrend—

Mr. Warner: He didn't ask about lumber.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —and was priced lower than it cost to produce 1,000 board feet of lumber. Today, it is at a market position which returns a profit for those industries to continue to function in various parts of Ontario. I do not, in any way, shape or form, attribute the cost of building materials to the downtrend we have in the construction industry at this time in Ontario.

Mr. Warner: Unanswered.

MOTION

PRIVATE BILLS

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Young People's Theatre, and Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the Financing of the Huronia District Hospital, be withdrawn from the standing general government committee and be referred to the administration of justice committee.

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

ELECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Leluk moved first reading of Bill 65, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill, the re-enacted section 35 of the act, enlarges the grounds upon which a person is entitled to appoint a voting proxy. Section 2, the re-enacted section 134, extends the offence for improper voting by proxy to include the inducement or soliciting of proxies and the appointment of proxies for reward or remuneration.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

(continued)

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I had asked the minister for some information with respect to the fair wage and salary scales of maintenance staff in the permanent civil service. I wonder if we could be provided with that before we get to the vote. I asked for it about three days ago.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I believe I will have the information for the member in a moment.

On vote 502, provision of accommodation program:

Hon. Mr. Henderson: There are three or four items I would like to bring to the attention of members as a result of earlier questions.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville earlier in the estimates requested information on—I thought he referred to the county jail.

Mr. B. Newman: The old county courthouse and the county jail.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's what I wanted to clear up. I have here a map of that property; the honourable member will recognize the county administrative building, the jail and the registry office as being shown on this map.

The other day I understood him to say "jail"; I was a little hesitant in answering because I didn't think the jail was part of it. Neither the jail nor the registry office is part of it; it is the county administrative building. I just want to clarify that so that there is no misunderstanding. It is the por-

tion outlined in red, as the honourable member well understands.

The honourable member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon), on Monday of this week in my estimates, brought to my attention a letter addressed, "Dear Member of the Ontario Legislative Assembly." This letter was sent by Greenwin, and the honourable member asked for my assurance that this group was not going to construct a building on government land at the corner of Bay and Wellesley, as indicated in the letter.

I would like to advise that I have had my staff investigate this matter, and the site on which Greenwin intends to construct this 19-storey high-rise residential building is 62 Wellesley Street, which was the War Amps building, located just to the rear of the Sunoco building. This land is privately owned and is on the opposite side of the street from the government's land.

We have been unable to determine when this building will be constructed, because the Greenwin company is doing a market research study on the viability of proceeding with this building. One way of completing this study was to determine the interest that the members of the Legislative Assembly might have in such a complex because of the nearness of the site to the Queen's Park area.

I trust this will alleviate any concerns the honourable member may have relative to the possibility of this ministry dealing directly.

The member also was interested to know that it wasn't the East of Bay site; it is on the opposite side of the street.

[11:15]

I was asked questions last night, and this is my statement in reply to the question re the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation by the members for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) and Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella).

On March 15, 1977, this ministry was advised that Management Board had approved the purchase of the former girls' training centre at 3044 Dufferin Street on the corner of Lawrence Avenue for use as a culture centre basically for the Italian community, to be administered by the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation. This was on the understanding that the site would be leased to the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation until such time as the association had sufficient funds to repurchase it from the government.

A lease was arranged with all the responsibility for maintenance, upkeep and taxes being assumed by the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation. This arrangement car-

ried on until Government Services was advised on November 28, 1978, that the cabinet had directed that the property be sold to the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation for the acquisition cost of \$2,607,125. An order in council approving this sale was completed on April 11, 1979, and the transfer of the deed is in its final stages. The sale to the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation was without restrictions.

I'm open for questions on that.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Chairman, I am in some ways surprised about the conditions of such a lease of the land for a certain period of time to the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation. What strikes me is that there are no conditions on the transaction. The principle which should be considered in such a transaction is that this land is going to be used for the Italian community to expand a project which will incorporate different principles from which the Italian community can benefit.

I do not want to advance a particular hypothesis about the future because nobody knows what can happen to the corporation. But, as I stated before, it strikes me that this government has got into this particular agreement without any restrictions. In other words, the option is open to the corporation after a certain period of time—I don't know how long because I don't have the information in front of me—to repay this amount of money to the government.

Because of my concern about the expansion of the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation through future projects which might take place on that site on which the government entered into this agreement with the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation, I guess that this government has the right to put certain restrictions in order that the land won't be resold to private individuals or to private companies in the event that something goes wrong within the corporation. I think that common sense dictates that the government should follow this particular route.

In view of this particular concern, I'm not sure if it is appropriate at this point in time to request all the information available about this particular transaction. The conditions, as the minister has stated, are without restrictions. I guess that the government has a duty to put certain restrictions on public funds which are given, in principle, to good community projects like the one which has been developed by the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation but I don't want to express my pessimism about the particular issue. We never know the future of the corporations.

We never know the future of a particular community project.

In view of this particular vote I am requesting your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, that as soon as we have this statistical data, if it is permissible, I would like to rediscuss this transaction. In other words, when the minister makes available the details of the transaction and other material in relation to this agreement which took place some time ago between this government and the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation, I would like to have an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this further.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I informed the honourable member last night that I would try to bring him the information. I know he requested documentation. Now the honourable member knows—

Mr. Grande: You said you were going to Xerox them and bring them here today.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: They were just not available this morning. As you know, we left here at six o'clock last night and I was back here at 10 this morning.

Let me go back over a little bit of it, Mr. Chairman. Back in March 1977 the government of Ontario, through my ministry, purchased this property. I believe it was on March 17, 1977. A few weeks earlier the Ministry of Community and Social Services became aware that a developer had an option to buy this property from the sisters. The developer had all the approvals to go ahead and develop this property, as I remember. Maybe the honourable member knows about that. I can get that document.

Mr. Lupusella: I don't. That's why I'm requesting the information.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: All right. The developer had all the approvals to go ahead with it, but, situated immediately behind this property was a home for the aged. That is where the Ministry of Community and Social Services became concerned. I am sure the honourable member knows the site. I haven't been there; I am being honest with you. The member recognizes what I say about the senior citizens' home, does he?

Mr. Lupusella: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, so that part we understand. The Ministry of Community and Social Services became concerned and felt something should be done to keep this major development from moving ahead and the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation wanted to acquire it for community uses. With this in mind, cabinet instructed the Ministry of Government Services to get an

appraisal of this property, which it did. It was appraised at \$2,675,125. That was purchased by the government.

Mr. McClellan: From whom?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: George Heenan, the developer. Maybe some of the members know him. The name doesn't ring a bell with me. Anyway, there are 6.42 acres. The property was appraised and a price agreed on between the developer and the government, as part of the package.

We purchased it on the assumption, and on agreement with the benevolent corporation, that they take over the property immediately on the day of purchase. They took it over; we had nothing more to do with it; they pay the taxes; they pay the upkeep; they do any renovation—everything. We just purchased it as a holding company, you might say, and paid for it out of provincial dollars. When they got to the point where they were ready to purchase it back—because they did have 10 years to do what they have now done; under that lease-purchase arrangement they had up to 10 years.

The suggestion that the honourable member is putting forth now would have had to have been in that lease-purchase two years ago. We don't have the option now of putting in your proposal. These terms were set out two years ago.

Mr. McClellan: There is nothing to prevent them from selling to a third party?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No, I don't believe there is. Not that I am aware of, anyway, and the present minister doesn't have authority to put that in.

Mr. Lupusella: But it can happen.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I wouldn't disagree with you. There is no—

Mr. Lupusella: That's why I'm particularly concerned.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Well, as I say, these terms were set out in the agreement signed March 17, 1977.

Mr. McClellan: The Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) is shaking his head. I wonder if he is shaking it in disbelief at the terms of the contract or whether he has a different understanding of the terms of the contract? I would be interested in knowing.

Mr. Chairman: Order. I think anyone can shake his head, if he wishes. The honourable minister?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I was just reading about the Russian-Canadian hockey game.

Mr. Lupusella: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by

making the main point that I think the doubts I had are shared by the minister as well. This piece of land can be resold to other people or private companies and that is why I have a particular concern about the whole issue.

I guess the intention of the government was to acquire or to buy this piece of land for the development of community projects from which the Italian community was going to benefit. I think that this government was completely wrong to leave this particular option. Not to put restrictions on this particular transaction, I think, was totally wrong.

Again, I am urging the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, to table all the information available in relation to the acquisition of this land—any terms of reference in relation to the transaction which took place in 1977 between this government and the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation.

Now, I am not sure myself if there are remedies that can be applied in order to put on restrictions—which I feel quite strongly about—in order to remove this open option whereby the corporation might resell this piece of land acquired by this government because it was concerned about community projects in relation to the Italian community. Again, I am not sure if there are remedies which can be applied to prevent such a particular event from taking place. In the meantime, I am really urging the minister to table all the information available to his ministry about this affair. Also, Mr. Chairman, as soon as this material becomes available, I urge you to give us approval to go back to this vote, if we are going to vote today.

[11:30]

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, as you know, when we reach one o'clock today we will only have 20 or 25 minutes left in my estimates. If there are specific questions I will do my best to answer them today in order to help the honourable members, but time will certainly run short Monday. We won't get that much time to debate them. I am ready to answer any question you might have.

Mr. Lupusella: Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the member too of standing order 48(b). The chairman has the responsibility to make certain all members can share in the allotted time. One more.

Mr. Lupusella: I am going to conclude my remarks, in view of the fact the estimates

might terminate on Monday. I do not know how many hours are left. The minister has to take into great consideration and investigate any alternative option in order that we can put a restriction on this transaction and prohibit the reselling of this particular land to private companies or to private individuals. I am urging the minister, in co-operation with the Attorney General, Solicitor General or other branches of his ministry, to make sure this particular clause is going to be implemented. I hope the minister will take my suggestion into consideration and will table the information in this House.

Mr. Chairman: Any comment, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I am talking to my staff here. I am sure I signed the deed; this deal is closing Monday. The sale is that far along the way.

Mr. McClellan: Give us the documents we are asking for.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We will have them Monday.

Mr. McClellan: You cannot get them today?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: No, we cannot get them today. We do not have available today the appropriate staff who have those documents.

Mr. Warner: Why do we not adjourn the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I mentioned to you that on April 11 an order in council went through. I will do my best to have them here for the estimates on Monday. I refer you back to the fact this sale was not arranged at this moment but was arranged in March 1977. Then, an option to lease was an option to the corporation to buy. These are not terms that were set out now; these terms were set out some two years ago. As the present minister, I do not feel like breaking the terms of that lease. I like to think I am a man of honour.

Mr. Lupusella: You are dealing with public money, \$2.6 million.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, an agreement was made two years ago. The present minister is not in a position to remove certain clauses.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Victoria-Haliburton. The member for Oakwood will be next.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: What is your point of order?

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman: At one time I was standing on my feet and you had gone as far as to mention my name. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, you would allow me two questions and no more.

Mr. Chairman: If the honourable member is not aware, I would like to inform him it is my duty to make certain every member who wishes to ask questions has the opportunity to ask questions. However, I have to do it on a rotation basis.

Mr. Grande: That is quite correct.

Mr. Chairman: I now recognize the member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Minister, yesterday afternoon the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Norton) announced the closing of the Kawartha Lakes School in Lindsay. During this announcement he did say he has made every attempt to try and find an occupant for that building. I believe they had contacted the federal government through your ministry, and no one could find a proper use at this time for the particular building.

Is the minister aware of the need for additional court facilities in the town of Lindsay, county of Victoria? In fact, the conditions there are dreadful. Are you aware of whether your ministry had looked into the feasibility of using the Kawartha Lakes School for such a purpose? If not, will you look into the feasibility of converting this school to additional court facilities for the county?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in responding to the honourable member, I was here when the announcement was made yesterday, but as you know, I was preparing myself a little bit for the estimates. When the Minister of Community and Social Services responded to a question, I believe he set out some inquiries that were made by his ministry respecting this piece of property.

Until yesterday my staff were not aware of this announcement, so they would not have been involved. But let me repeat for the honourable member what I stated earlier in my estimates: When property of this nature is referred to my ministry as surplus property of the ministry concerned, my ministry circulates this to all government ministries and agencies to see if there is any requirement for it.

Following this, if there is no requirement, it is then circulated to the local governing body to see if they have any requirement for it. Following that, if there is no interest—and I would expect that would be the stage at which the local people would make their suggestions that this would make an excellent

park or what have you—then it is put up for either public auction or public tender.

I believe the minister yesterday—I am speaking from hearsay—did give some special mention to the one in Lindsay.

Mr. Eakins: The reason I asked the question is that the minister indicated he had already contacted both federal and provincial governments and that there was no indication of need. I am wondering if this ministry is aware of the great need for additional court space in the county of Victoria?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Additional court space?

Mr. Eakins: Additional court facilities.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We're aware of it, but the Attorney General is the one who sets priorities. Until his ministry gives us the priority, we don't have the opportunity to go ahead. It is an overall package. But it will be kept in mind.

Mr. Eakins: The minister will look into the feasibility of it?

Mr. Henderson: Yes.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me apologize to you for what I did earlier.

I just have a few very simple questions. One is about this particular transaction which took place back in 1977. Did one transaction and only one transaction occur with this group? Have any other transactions of this nature occurred with other groups in other communities in Metropolitan Toronto or in Ontario? Has the Ministry of Government Services set as policy that it will do this whenever a particular benevolent corporation or a community group—a corporation on behalf of that community—comes to the minister and says, "We do not have enough funds to buy this property for the community. Would you buy it and then we would agree to buy it back from you?" Is that what the government policy is?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: To answer the member's question, firstly, I am not at this moment aware of any similar circumstances to those of this particular property. This was a unique situation.

A major developer—and I don't know who the developer is—on six and a half acres of land adjacent to the home for the aged had all the approvals, I am told. I don't have this documented, either; I was told this, I remember. He had all the approvals to proceed. Here we were up against a deadline. The benevolent corporation wanted to acquire the land. As I understood—and I told you earlier I have no guarantee it's

going to be for a community project—and cabinet understood, they wanted it for a community project. But let me restate I have no guarantee here, and I'm not sure there is one anywhere that it will go for a community project.

It was a time of emergency, and the government of Ontario purchased it to assist the benevolent corporation on a temporary basis. No others come to my mind at this moment.

Mr. Grande: In that particular case, since this is one particular transaction that occurred between the government and a benevolent corporation of one community, is the minister right now saying that if a situation occurs with perhaps the same conditions—that the piece of land is close to an old age home—the minister is going to be ready to assist that community to buy that piece of land?

I would like to find out whether this is one favour that was done at that particular time, or is it something he intends to carry on with? Second, it's very important—and I would like to impress upon the minister the seriousness of this matter; he knows as well as anybody else that in the last week at least one of the directors of that particular company was before the courts, I think it was for bribery. I don't know. Those are allegations. Obviously, the individual will go before the courts and he will be able to either extricate himself or not.

However, the situation is serious. What the member for Dovercourt was talking about is very important—that that particular piece of land remain in the hands of that community. You might or might not know that community has paid for that piece of land through gifts the community has made, through the different telethons run on a yearly basis. And the government should be protecting that piece of land for community use.

I think you have to make that commitment before that transaction or that changeover on Monday, or that particular benevolent corporation buys back the land from you. You have to give an assurance to the Italian community that that piece of land remains for community purposes and community uses. I want to stress that it is a serious matter, and the minister should begin to address it before Monday in a serious way.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'm not aware of any officers of this corporation being charged in the courts. I don't know anything about it. This particular agreement was brought about by the cabinet. Staff do not have any blanket

authority. In other words, if there's a future occasion, as the member suggested, similar to this one it would come to the attention of cabinet as a body. Staff wouldn't have the authority to go out and buy it, but the government might grant them that authority. They look at each case on an individual basis.

Again, I say to the member, the minister doesn't have the right to write anything special into this deed at this time. The terms of this particular sale were set out in a purchase option, which was a 10-year option, some two years ago. The minister doesn't have the authority to enter into it and make it into a public property, as suggested by the honourable member.

[11:45]

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell me how much property is being leased by the ministry at the Travelers Tower? I think it was mentioned in the leadoff vote by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk (Mr. Nixon). Can the minister tell me how many square feet his ministry is leasing in the Travelers Tower on University Avenue? If I recall correctly, the rate was \$7.50 per foot.

Are we going under the general vote here, Mr. Chairman? Are we doing vote 502 en masse? I guess we'll have to—

Mr. Chairman: With the time remaining, I think, we'll have to.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, because there are four more votes.

I was wondering, too, can the minister tell me the overall amount of property he has that is vacant in the Metropolitan Toronto area? Does he have that figure available?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, it would take quite a lot of research to get the details the member might want.

Mr. Ruston: I believe the minister has available each year the figures as to the percentage of vacant property.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I have two reports here. One is for Metropolitan Toronto and one is for outside Metro. I presume the member is referring to Metro; is that right?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The figures I'm going to give him are for vacant space as a percentage of our total inventory in Metro. For instance, the figure for disposal, subletting or demolition is 37,615 square feet. This represents 0.67 per cent of the total leased property in Metro. This has dropped. A month ago it was 0.69 per cent; so it has come back to 0.67 in the month. The dollar value of vacant space for the month is \$5,664.

For space allocated but not occupied, it is just a small figure, 5,680 feet, or 0.10 per

cent. A month ago that was 0.14 per cent; so it's down also. The dollar value of unoccupied space for the month is \$2,985.

For space available for allocation, the figure is 24,290 square feet, or 0.43 per cent. The previous month it was 0.23 per cent. The dollar value is \$13,230.

The space reserved and awaiting finalization of clients' requirements is 67,750 square feet; as applied to the total inventory, that is 1.21 per cent. The previous month it was 1.45 per cent. The dollar value is \$47,177.

As for the overall totals—and he would have to look at them in the four brackets as I've given them to him—the overall total space that is vacant as of this moment is 135,335 square feet. As a percentage of the total inventory in Metro, that is 2.41 per cent; a month ago it was 2.51 per cent. The total dollar value is \$69,056.

I believe that is the information that the member requested.

Mr. Ruston: I have a question with regard to the property on University Avenue, just below the new Ontario Hydro building. I think at one time the Ministry of Correctional Services used it. You said the other day the Ministry of Labour or someone was moving into it. Are they moving into the total building? Is it going to be used more or less completely? Are they going to fill it?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Is the honourable member referring to the Hydro building?

Mr. Ruston: No, no, the Ontario building.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: At the corner of Dundas and University. The Ministry of Culture and Recreation is putting its welcoming group into that building.

Mr. Ruston: What about the Travelers Tower? What percentage of that building are we leasing now? Do you have that information available?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We'll have that here in a moment. I don't have the total amount for you, but we'll get that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Was the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) trying to get the Chairman's eye. My list here has the member for Yorkview next, that was all. The member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Lupusella: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to go back to the same item I raised previously. I am seeking your advice about whether it is appropriate at this point in time to put a motion before this committee. I would like to read it for the sake of the record, and then maybe you will analyse as to whether or not the motion is appropriate.

I move this committee report to the House on Monday next that the committee recom-

mends to the government that the following course of action be initiated: that before the sale of the land at the corner of Lawrence Avenue and Dufferin Street, Toronto, Ontario, to the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation is completed, a restriction be placed in the terms of agreement that the land cannot be resold to a private corporation or individual.

Again, I would like to re-emphasize my disappointment to the minister that because the terms of the agreement between the government and the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation are going to be completed on Monday next the minister was not able to provide and make available to the members of this Legislature all the material about this particular concern. Again, I would like to emphasize I completely disagree and reprimand the minister for not tabling all the information available, in view of the fact that on Monday such an agreement is going to take place between the government and the Italian Canadian Benevolent Corporation and we won't be able to take any action to improve the terms of that agreement. I am really, really disappointed.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member, it puts the minister in a difficult position and it puts the House in a difficult position. I will attempt to get an opinion from the Attorney General.

Mr. Lupusella: It will be too late. On Monday, you are going to sign the agreement. Why don't you postpone that agreement?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will attempt to get an opinion from the Attorney General to bring to the House on Monday afternoon. I will hold up the signing of the deed until that time. Mind you, only until that time; Monday is supposed to be the closing date. We will be in here at three or 3:30 p.m. I'm going to ask the Attorney General to come in with a legal opinion I can present to you on Monday afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: May I just speak to the committee for a moment? I'm not sure whether the motion the member for Dovercourt has put forward is or is not in order, but I will take it under advisement and rule on it. If it is in order, we can have a vote on it a little later on, if that's in order with the minister. I have an idea the motion is not in order.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Is my proposal not satisfactory to the honourable member? I have agreed that the sale will be held up

until I report to the House on Monday afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: You want this motion delayed. Is that it?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I felt I was answering him without having to put it to a vote. I thought I was abiding by the motion. Am I not?

Mr. Young: Could I interject here? I think the purpose of the honourable member is achieved by the word of the minister which has been given here. I think the word of the minister is as good as gold. We are willing to stand by that.

He is going to bring back a report. The agreement or finalization of this sale is not going to be made until the minister reports to the House. I would hope at that time something can be done to safeguard this matter.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I felt my statement would clarify the request of the motion. That was the reason for my statement.

Mr. B. Newman: We have a motion before the House. I would suggest that the member withdraw the motion and reintroduce it on Monday, if he wishes.

Mr. Lupusella: On the minister's premise, I think it is appropriate for me to withdraw the motion, but again I would urge the minister to do everything possible to postpone such agreement until all legal advice is gathered in order that such clause is put in this agreement.

The minister and this government have a duty to protect public money. You are dealing with around \$3 million which you are spending from the public purse. This government has a duty to put a restriction on the agreement in order that the money be utilized for community purposes and to prevent the corporation from reselling the property to private companies or individuals.

I hope the minister will do everything possible to make sure that such a clause will be implemented.

Mr. Warner: On a point of order, a motion has been placed. It is possible to have it withdrawn, provided there is unanimous consent. Before we enter that procedure, I wish to understand quite clearly that the minister intends to report to the House on Monday next during statements with an opinion so that the information is then given prior to our resumption of these estimates in the afternoon of Monday. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member has added one suggestion. I agreed I would go

to the Attorney General and ask him or his staff to search the records to see if we have the right to impose on the deed of sale of the property that certain restrictions be put on the property. I agreed I would bring his opinion back to my estimates on Monday afternoon.

You have put one little extra point in there that the information be supplied during statements. I have to depend on the Attorney General's staff. I am in a bind to give you the undertaking that it will be here at the time for statements. I will do my best, but I can't ensure that. I have to ask another department.

You have my assurance this minister will come back with a statement from the Attorney General. There is just the one bind there. You are putting another hour or two on something that could be vital. Is that part important to you? If I have it, I will be glad to give it to you at the time for statements.

Mr. di Santo: I appreciate the position taken by the minister. I want to make quite clear that on this side we are happy with the sale of that piece of land to a non-profit organization.

[12:00]

What we as members of this Legislature are concerned with is that if the transaction goes through, the government makes sure that if, for some unforeseen reason the corporation cannot keep that centre, perhaps because of financial problems, or there is a bankruptcy and it becomes necessary to resell that land, that it not be sold to private individuals or companies but to a non-profit organization. Or, alternatively, the province puts a clause in the transaction that in such a case it will take back the land in order to give it to organizations or use it for public interest, and not for private interests. Because, I can foresee that if a private corporation or developer gets hold of that land, there would be beautiful highrise apartments built because the bylaw has been changed recently, as the minister knows.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I will request the Attorney General to look at Hansard and to get answers for you, good or bad, one way or the other.

Mr. Lupusella: They must be good.

Mr. Young: I'm sure we thank the minister for his assurance here today. I think this is a very important matter for him, for the government and for the Legislature and I'm glad that he's taking the attitude he is because that's a very healthy point of view. I hope

he comes back with the answers that we're looking for.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: I gather that the committee has agreed this motion be withdrawn and that the minister will have something further to say to this matter on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, before the members ask further questions, I have a reply to the member for Essex North about 400 University Avenue.

The Attorney General has 3,090 square feet. The rent for that particular—does the member want all the details?

Mr. Ruston: Yes, if you could read them to me.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'll read this. The Attorney General has 3,090 square feet. The rent for this is \$25,986.96. That works out to \$8.41 per square foot. Again, the Attorney General has 1,350 square feet, the rental for which is \$8,680.56. The rate for that parcel works out to \$6.43 per square foot.

The Labour ministry has 191,975 square feet. Rental is \$1,457,431.20, for a rental rate of \$7.59 per square foot.

The Ministry of Culture and Recreation has one parcel, 30,000 square feet; rental, \$244,500. I should have read out the dates that these leases run out, too, but I can go back and give them to you. This one runs out in 1981. The rental for it is \$8.15 per square foot. Culture and Recreation again, 1,500 square feet; \$154,500. This contract runs out in 1983 and the price of it is \$10.30 per square foot. Total space rented in the building, 241,415 square feet; the annual rental, \$1,891,998. The average rental is \$7.87 per square foot. It's a pretty high building.

Mr. Young: There are a couple of questions I want to ask, the first one on behalf of the member for Carleton East (Ms. Gigantes) who is tied up in the Hydro committee. She asked me to ask the minister about the Ottawa courthouse, and this is listed here in the report under major capital projects approved for design. It is sort of a long way off yet, but the member for Carleton East is very anxious that she have further information as to just what hopes there are in respect to this courthouse, which is so desperately needed in that particular city. Perhaps the minister can give the answer to that and then I can go on to a further question.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I really thought it would have been the leader of the NDP who would ask about this. It is actually in his riding where we are looking at the possibility of a courthouse.

Mr. Warner: We are all concerned about it.

Mr. Young: The young lady is better looking, you see, so I listen to her.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I really didn't think that you would recognize that.

Mr. Warner: You don't know him well enough.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I know him pretty well. Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member, I am sure that all members of the House are aware through the Ottawa papers that I visited the chairman of the National Capital Commission in Ottawa late in 1978 and proposed a site for a courthouse, which is the old Normal School site. The reason for approaching the federal government first is that it has some property to the north of our property. Ours is a triangle piece of property. We would like to trade part of the triangle and square it up to approximately four acres for a courthouse.

Mr. Warner: It will take longer than 10 years.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It's interesting that you should say that. I believe the date was December 16, but don't pin me down. It was in that week anyhow, in 1978, that I presented that proposal. About the end of February, Mr. Eric Dowd, the well-known reporter, phoned me at home—it was a Friday evening—and told me about a story in an Ottawa paper that I was being offered the Daley building, which many of you people would know. The Daley building is just east of the Chateau Laurier hotel, and I was asked if I would look into the possibility of the Daley building supplying the necessary courtroom space.

I had staff look into this possibility and when I got the full report from the staff, they pointed out several deficiencies and recommended that the Daley building would not be acceptable. You know for the courtroom atmosphere we have to have double ceiling heights and restrictions put on that particular site by the city of Ottawa and by the National Capital Commission. That letter came at the end of February. About a month ago—I could get the actual date—on a Sunday afternoon, I went to Ottawa to convince myself one way or another. I visited the Daley building. I again visited the courthouse in Ottawa. I visited the courtrooms. I visited the total facility. I spent Sunday afternoon there and Monday morning, and when I came back I wrote and rejected the Daley building and told them my original proposal was still my choice.

Mr. McClellan: You still have to square the triangle, do you?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Well, a Tory government can do a lot of things.

Mr. Young: I am sure the member for Carleton East will read Hansard with a great deal of interest, if not with a great deal of satisfaction, at this moment. However, there's hope.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, we heard a great deal about decentralization of departments throughout the province; we were going to sort of put a little bomb under Toronto and blow the departments out in all directions. That has happened, to some extent at least. In the latest ministry annual report I read this on page 19: "Major planning was initiated for office buildings to accommodate the Ministry of Health in Kingston and the Ministry of Revenue in Oshawa." But in looking over this report to which I have just referred, Design and Construction Program 1979-80, I don't see any indication of that kind of planning going on; it may be there, or it may be beyond the stage where it would appear in this document. Perhaps the minister can bring us up to date as to what is happening in this process of decentralization.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Was it Kingston the member was especially interested in? I was trying to dig out my documents, and I missed part of his request. Was he asking about the overall decentralization or about Kingston?

Mr. Young: Perhaps the minister could deal specifically with the two examples I used and then tell us more about what is going on in the whole field.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Which two?

Mr. Young: The Ministry of Health to Kingston and the Ministry of Revenue to Oshawa.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The relocation of the head office of the Ministry of Revenue, announced last April, is progressing satisfactorily. A 1.7-acre site in downtown Oshawa has been purchased, and the development of the design and the detailed plant requirements and definition established have been completed.

This building is in our lease-purchase program. The location of this building is the west portion of the block bounded by King Street, Simcoe Street South, Athol Street West and Centre Street South. We expect there will be 1,700 people there. The estimated construction cost of this building is \$22.5 million.

The project for the Ministry of Health will be located on a three-acre site in downtown Kingston which has been purchased

for \$765,000. It is located at the junction of Wellington Street and Place d'Arme, three blocks north of Princess Street. The Ministry of Health is currently finalizing its requirements and when these are received design work will proceed.

Mr. Young: So you have the land in Kingston?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes.

Mr. Young: And some hope of further progress in Oshawa?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We have to get the final figure; are we putting 1,000 there, 1,200, 800? The original idea was that there would be about 900. Until we get the final figure from the Ministry of Health, we can't tell our architects and engineers to design such a building.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, does the minister want to elaborate on the whole philosophy of decentralization, or is that something he doesn't want to bother with at the present time? I don't think we need to spend too much time on it; we have these two illustrations of what is happening.

[12:15]

Hon. Mr. Henderson: As the member knows, it's the government's hope to decentralize. These are the only two major proposals with which my ministry has been involved. On other aspects I would be talking in the dark about things in which I do not think you are really interested at this time. If there are specifics, yes, we will answer them; but I think it is just a waste of time for me to start wandering all over.

Mr. Young: That is the answer I wanted. No progress has been made except in these two particular instances.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Wait a minute, Mr. Chairman, there have been lesser amounts.

Mr. Young: But when the time comes for the move the minister knows about it.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes.

Mr. Ruston: Point of order, Mr. Chairman: I think we have about an hour and a half left. I wonder if we could wind up vote 502 and go on to one of the other votes today?

Vote 502 agreed to.

On vote 503, upkeep of accommodation program; item 1, program administration:

Mr. McClellan: I had an issue I wanted to raise with the minister under this vote. I have raised it with the Ministry of Government Services every year since I was elected in 1975, and I usually raise it as well with the Ministry of Labour because a

lot of my constituents are directly affected. The issue, of course, is the government's policy and practice of contracting out the cleaning services for the office buildings, particularly here at Queen's Park.

Just to refresh the minister's memory, these contracts used to be let out for tender without any fair-wage provisions, so that the contracts were awarded at the minimum wage level and that is what the contractors would offer as wages. In 1975 it happened a group of cleaners at one of these companies obtained union certification and managed to bargain their wages up above the minimum wage. When the contract came up for renewal, the company lost the contract to somebody who was prepared to pay the minimum wage. Subsequent to that, and under a lot of pressure both from within the House and outside in the communities, the government instituted a fair-wage provision for its tendering practices. I asked at the beginning of these estimates if the minister would be so kind as to give me the current fair-wage schedule, which he did and I have it before me.

I want to point something out to the minister. The fair-wage rate, for light-duty cleaners in particular in Metropolitan Toronto, is only 30 cents above the minimum wage, \$3.30 an hour. The heavy-duty cleaner fair wage for Metropolitan Toronto is \$4.05 an hour. Firstly, I do not know how anybody can categorize \$3.30 as a fair wage in Metropolitan Toronto. It is not a fair wage, it is an unfair wage.

I make the point that when we look at the wage scale paid to cleaning staff who are civil servants, a light-duty cleaner receives for normal duties \$4.56 an hour, \$1.26 an hour more than your so-called fair-wage scale. A heavy-duty cleaner receives \$5.32 an hour, whereas your so-called fair-wage scale is set at the rate of \$4.05 per hour; again there is over a dollar an hour difference.

That suggests to me a very clear rationale for the government's practice of contracting out cleaning services here at the office buildings where we work, and where the majority of the ministry officials and civil servants work in Toronto. The rationale is to cut the wages of the cleaners; it is as simple as that.

I happen to represent a constituency in west Toronto where a great many people, mostly new Canadians, work in the cleaning industry. I am saying again, but I think for the first time since you assumed the Ministry of Government Services portfolio, that I find this practice intolerable. I regard it as exploitative. I regard it as an exploitation of people whom you and I, and your ministry

officials and my staff, all of the people who work for the government of Ontario, depend on to provide the cleanliness of the work space in which we do our business. I think we can do a little better than what you are offering.

As a matter of policy, I would prefer if the government would bring essential cleaning staff on to full civil service status. I think ultimately that is the only fair way to deal with it. I don't expect the government to change its practice of contracting out, although I think it is a very regrettable thing that you do contract out essential cleaning services. These are jobs that have to be done every single day of the week. There is no reason why they shouldn't be done by people who have the full protection of civil service status so they can get decent pay and decent working conditions for the very essential work they do.

If you are not prepared to do that, surely at the very least you have the decency to establish a fair-wage scale which bears some relation to the wage rates that are paid to civil service cleaning staff and maintenance staff. How can you possibly justify such incredible differentials, differentials of up to 25 per cent in their wages? That is a ripoff, that's exploitation; there is no other way to describe it.

I want to ask the minister what kind of fair employment practice provisions are put into the tenders on these contracts? I suspect very little in the way of reference to fair employment practices goes into the contract tenders, and very little in the way of minimum-benefit provisions goes into your contracts by way of condition of award.

We go through this exercise year after year, and the discrepancies continue between your so-called fair-wage scale and the civil service salaries that are paid to cleaners on staff. I would like to know when you intend to get around to ending this kind of discrimination, this kind of exploitation of essential personnel here in our own buildings. I invite the minister to respond to this.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The minister brings out several points in his remarks. I said the minister instead of the member.

Mr. Young: The future minister.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Firstly, I am sure the member is aware that the Civil Service Commission sets the wages of all government staff. The fair wage is set by the Ministry of Labour, my staff are not involved in that.

I can't give the member all the answers he would like because I don't have access to that information. They do have a process they

go through, they have a factor that they work from. They average up wages of different branches of industry, local government and what have you to come up with a rate. That information should come from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Elgie).

Mr. McClellan: Can I just respond to that? That's precisely the problem, the cleaning industry is a minimum-wage industry. The cleaning industry operates on the basis of a pool of new Canadian workers who are relatively unskilled and who don't have many other job opportunities. The going rate of pay in the cleaning industry is the minimum wage.

The only exceptions to the prevailing wage pattern in the cleaning industry are within the public sector, at the municipal, provincial or federal levels, where there is the protection of collective bargaining at all three levels.

If the minister tells me that he is going to set a fair-wage scale on the basis of prevailing patterns in the industry—no thank you; no thank you very much; keep it. The minister is just talking about the minimum wage or slightly more than the minimum wage.

I get exercised about this because there are literally thousands of constituents in my riding—and in the riding of my colleague the member for Dovercourt (Mr. Lupusella) and in the riding of my colleague the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande)—who are working in the cleaning industry and who are trying to support their families and raise their children on these totally inadequate salaries. Many of them are living below the poverty line.

I'm asking the Minister of Government Services to try and understand that; try to understand that we're doing real harm to people with unfair fair-wage scales. We're really hurting people. To make it worse, we're hurting people who look after our offices. Our offices are being cleaned on the basis of exploitation, our very offices here at Queen's Park. Surely that ought to be unacceptable to any government?

I ask the Minister of Government Services to talk to his colleague, the Minister of Labour. I make this appeal every year to this ministry, and to the Minister of Labour whose regressive policies you are implementing.

Don't tell me this wage scale is based on anything other than an exploitative pattern of remuneration, because it isn't. The minister must base his fair-wage scale on the prevailing pattern of wage settlements within

the public sector in the maintenance field. That's the only way he can develop a fair-wage scale that's fair.

I'm asking him to look at this seriously, to speak to his colleague the Minister of Labour and tell him that he personally doesn't think it's fair that the people who are cleaning the offices of our public officials and civil servants should be paid such lousy wages.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour, as the member suggests, does set the fair-wage scale. Regarding my suggestion that the different brackets were taken into consideration, I was speaking to the minimum wage, all these are taken into consideration.

I personally was not involved in the debates that led to setting the fair-wage scale. I was not involved.

Mr. McClellan: You are now.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: My former statement took into account the minimum wage. I was speaking to both, and maybe I didn't clarify it. I was not involved in the debates that led up to the fair-wage scale. I would suggest that the member bring this to the attention of the Minister of Labour during his estimates.

Mr. McClellan: Oh I fully intend to; but I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, to look at this matter seriously. I think there's a real injustice here, in these very buildings.

Does the minister think \$3.30 is a fair wage for cleaning these offices? Does he think that \$4.05 an hour is a fair wage in Metropolitan Toronto for a heavy-duty cleaner? Does he really think that himself, personally, as Lorne Henderson? Does he think that's a fair wage?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, it's not up to the Minister of Government Services to decide. That is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Warner: Get rid of the odious contracting out. You can do that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will let him respond to those questions.

Mr. McClellan: That's the response I've had every year since 1975; it's always the same response and it's as unacceptable from this minister as it was from all his predecessors. He is involved in a practice of exploiting cleaning staff.

[12:30]

If I were you I would want to sit down with the Minister of Labour so that we could, together, develop a wage scale that was really

fair. That is to say a fair-wage scale that could provide to the people who are providing essential cleaning services a salary on which they can live and support their families.

I don't think that's unreasonable; but the minister, as all of his predecessors, like Pontius Pilate has washed his hands of the matter and said: "It's somebody else's responsibility." Everybody in the government takes the same attitude so that it's nobody's responsibility. I guess it's just a kind of cosmic force that descends on people that results in them getting exploitative wages.

I'll pursue it with the Minister of Labour and I'll be back to pursue it again next year, whether you're here or some other minister is here.

Mr. Hodgson: You won't be here.

Mr. McClellan: I'll be here, don't you worry about that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I want to say to the member he did not pursue it last year with this ministry.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Are we through with vote 503? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to ask one simple question of the minister and that is concerning the provision for parking for the handicapped at all government-operated buildings. Are you designating locations as close as possible to the entrance to the buildings for the handicapped, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'm sure the member knows this government is doing everything possible to assist the handicapped. We are assisting in the parking wherever possible. If the member has specific areas in mind I will attempt to answer him, but our overall policy is to try and assist the handicapped in parking in a place suitable to them.

Mr. B. Newman: May I suggest, then, that in the Windsor facility with which I'm familiar, the area right next to the entrance to the building, just off the parking lot, be specifically designated for handicapped only. At least let's show our concern visibly, even if the spot may not be used to the full. The handicapped coming in, or being brought in by someone else should know, there is a location at which they may park the vehicle and not have to manipulate any long distance when they're visiting any one of the province of Ontario offices. I'm not referring to banks now.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Not referring to what?

Mr. B. Newman: To a banking facility, you operate certain banking facilities.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, the member's recommendation will be brought to the attention of the people who are managing our buildings in the Windsor area. If something of this nature can be worked out we will certainly do our best.

Mr. B. Newman: It's easy to work out, Mr. Minister. All you have to do is tell them: "Look, there are going to be one or two locations, even if they aren't used to the full and are vacant at times." There is no need for me to explain anything, Mr. Minister. You know the difficulty they have and I know you're concerned, as is everyone else in the House, but let's visibly show our concern.

Vote 503 agreed to.

On vote 504, supply and services program; item 1, program administration:

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, this vote has about 16 individual items in it; but in supply and services do you have any policy with regard to buying Canadian? Is there any policy as to considering whether a product is manufactured in Canada or by a Canadian company? Do you have any criteria as far as the amount of difference you might pay if it is manufactured outside of Canada, or if it's manufactured in Canada or Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, we do have a differential. Let's say the tender price of the item is \$100—if we have it in small figures it's easier to explain—if it is made in Ontario with some foreign content, let's say it was Dick Ruston's company—has he got many companies?

Mr. Ruston: Afraid not.

Mr. B. Newman: There are a lot of Rustons who are well-to-do, but not this one.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Not this one, eh? He's a politician. However, the Ruston company puts in a tender from the Windsor area and its tender is \$100. We get another tender from a company outside of Canada. We add 10 per cent to the Canadian content. We will raise your price 10 per cent on the Canadian content.

Only half of your price of \$100 might be Canadian content. If \$50 of it was Canadian content, we would add 10 per cent to that. That would bring your tender up to \$105. If it was 100 per cent Canadian content we would add 10 per cent to that, which would bring it then to \$110. The differential for Canadian content is 10 per cent. Have I explained it fully enough, or would you like a further explanation?

Mr. Ruston: I was looking at the supply and administration branch under the special products section with regard to a tender by

Purolator Courier Limited. I have the figures here on the tender of Purolator Courier of October 26, 1977, for \$329,382, but I have information—and I'm sure you have the letter too—from Swift Sure Courier Service Limited, a Canadian Courier. They are questioning, of course, whether it's an American company. I would like to know what the difference was in the tender on that type of an operation as well. Would it be possible to obtain that information?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'm not sure I got the question. I was preparing myself for the next question and I missed something. Name the company again.

Mr. Ruston: Purolator Courier, on October 26, 1977, had a tender, which apparently was accepted, for \$329,382. I was wondering if you could tell me the amount of the tenders of some of the other companies at that same time?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We will get that for you Monday. Do you want the other companies that tendered on that?

Mr. Ruston: It was tender number 3111.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Okay. We will have that at the opening of estimates on Monday.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on a matter of protocol. I find it interesting that in looking through Hansard the last time anything concerning the flying of flags was dealt with was by John Robarts on May 4, 1965. There may have been more recent statements of policy on that since then, but I could not find any. At that time, Mr. Robarts said the Canadian flag would take precedence over the Ontario flag, at least in flying on parliament buildings and government buildings.

There was an emotional incident that took place at Humber College in my riding a couple of weeks ago when the president of the college received a new Ontario flag and took down the Canadian flag to fly the Ontario flag. Some of the professors started using words like "separatism" and a number of other hostile adjectives against the government for this action. They became quite angry. I understand the next day the Ontario flag was quickly removed and the Canadian flag once more flies high over Humber College.

It does bring out an interesting point. Flags are a symbol and symbols are important to people, particularly at this time when we are concerned about Confederation. I wonder if the ministry has a policy with regard to government buildings. Does the Canadian flag take precedence, and in a case

such as happened at Humber College where there is only one flagpole, can you assure us the Canadian flag will fly rather than the Ontario flag?

I have supplied the minister with notice of my question and I am sure he has an answer.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am trying to think. On the right of the honourable member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) is the flag of Canada. The provincial flag flies in front of this building. We have it right up there. That is our position. We fly both flags on all provincial buildings. The flag of Canada on the right takes precedence; on the left of it is the flag of Ontario.

My response to the question of the community colleges, is that we know they are funded by the province and what-have-you, but they are really not provincial buildings. Let me restate the position. All provincial buildings under my jurisdiction fly two flags, the flag of Canada and the flag of Ontario. If one is going to be flown, they will both be flown; but the flag of Canada takes precedence on the right.

Let me go one step further—and I thank the honourable member for sending me advance notice of this question—recently the Ministry of Education sent two flags to all the colleges and universities through my protocol service. They sent a flag of Canada and a flag of Ontario. I am certainly concerned that the flag of Canada would be replaced by the flag of Ontario. I am as interested in one Canada as anybody. The flag of Canada is still our main flag.

The honourable member read from something written in 1965. If memory serves me correctly, on February 2, 1967, we may have attended a flag-raising ceremony for the flag of Ontario out in front of this building—is that date correct?

Mr. Young: Some time or other.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We didn't have a flag of Ontario in 1965. I am trying to think back some 10 or 12 years. I think it was February 2, 1967, we officially dedicated the flag of Ontario.

Mr. Young: We nearly froze.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We nearly froze; that's right, you were there.

Mr. Philip: The position was fairly clearly stated by John Robarts. Perhaps I should have sent this to the minister along with the press clipping. He said: "So far as this government is concerned, the national flag takes the position of precedence when flown over other flags. The policy of government is to continue to fly such flags, including

the Canadian flag, over provincial buildings as the occasion requires and custom and usage may determine."

Somewhere in this he mentions a provincial flag. It is the only position I could find concerning the precedence of the national flag over the provincial or other flags. I wonder if the minister would simply communicate with his colleague, the Minister of Education (Miss Stephenson), since he is the minister responsible for protocol, and suggest to that minister that on college buildings where there is only one flagpole, the Canadian flag be flown until such time as perhaps two flagpoles may be put up. I would be perfectly happy to see both flags flying, I just resent the idea of the Canadian flag being taken down and the Ontario flag being put up. Would he speak to the Ministry of Education about that?

[12:45]

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I'll be very happy to bring this to the attention of the minister. In fact I will send her a personal letter. I'll enclose a copy of this press clipping you have given us and I'll enclose a copy of the Hansard. But again, I look to my colleague across the way. Did we have something like the flag of St. George previous to 1967 that was an unofficial flag we looked at? There's something runs around in my mind.

Mr. Young: There were a lot of flags looked at at that time, but I've forgotten—

Hon. Mr. Henderson: There was no flag, but did we not use that saying—that slogan?

Mr. Philip: If I may, Mr. Chairman, it's the last point I'll make on this. I have found the section where the Honourable John Robarts, noting there was a provincial flag, said, "On the grounds in front of the Parliament Buildings a second flagpole will be erected; the Canadian flag will fly from a pole on the right and the provincial flag will be flown from a pole on the left." I assume that was the provincial flag-raising ceremony that both the minister and the member for Yorkview were referring to.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to go back to an issue my colleague, the member for Essex North, raised about tendering. He asked which of the several tenders one is going to accept—a tender by a company that is American or one Canadian. The city of Windsor council is confronted with that. It was nice to hear the minister say that if there were a 10 per cent differential and the content were 100 per cent American, you would have a 10 per

cent differential in the price. In other words, if a Canadian-content item is within a 10 per cent range—it could be 10 per cent more expensive than the American—you would give preferential treatment to the Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes. That's policy of the government; we do that.

Mr. B. Newman: This sets a guideline for municipalities now, Mr. Minister. They would know the province uses this type of policy and they themselves could follow it. In a border town like ours, Americans may tender a little more for items we are going to purchase than in other municipalities. But you've set the guideline and I'll inform council there is a provincial guideline now and they could follow just what you're doing. Thank you.

Ms. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, my question is a followup on the Canadian content questions that have been asked, but I think this comes under legislative services in this vote. It relates to the program which was put into effect a couple of years ago to allow members to have two reproductions of art work as part of the furnishings for their offices. I think this was a very fine program, so that members' offices had something more than electoral maps and certificates of their election in them. But the design of the program bothered me. We were supplied with a book called *Fine Art Reproductions*, published by the New York Graphics Society, from which to order the reproductions for our offices. This book contained about 400 old and modern masters but it contained only one Canadian painting.

We had a select committee on economic and cultural nationalism which reported in 1975 that it was necessary to have a Canadian bias in our cultural support. I'll just quote you one phrase from their report: "Canadian culture is at a severe disadvantage because of the enormous promotional resources deployed behind marketing and disseminating foreign cultural products."

The report went on to say: "It is not a question of nationalism versus internationalism, but very much more a question of being selective among possibilities." I protested the fact we were offered a catalogue with only one Canadian painting. Subsequently, the ministry did supply us with a selection of Canadian reproductions and I was able to choose two very good Canadian reproductions for my office, one by David Jean, who is a well-known Canadian artist who happens to live in my riding, and one by Mr. Carlos Marchiori, who did a painting of what's

known as the Flatiron Building in Toronto, a very outstanding landmark.

I would like to ask the minister: If this program is continuing, can he not make it a program which has a bias in favour of Canadian reproductions so we can assist Canadian artists in the way the report of the select committee suggested and make sure government money is spent on supporting Canadian art?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, in response to the honourable member, there are no books of this nature made in Canada. The one you saw was the one Canadian product and it is the available book. There are no books in Canada. My staff have approached the artists, and have requested they do just what you are requesting of me, but as of this moment, they have not come up with a book. Your proposal is well taken but the artists haven't responded to our request. I would only further add the honourable member had a better opportunity than me. Nobody gave me an opportunity to choose my art. The honourable member is very lucky.

Ms. Bryden: Subsequently, when I asked for Canadian reproductions, I was provided with a portfolio of about 40 reproductions that were available for sale through various agencies. I think that could be made available instead of a book. I think the reason there's no book in the market is a lot smaller in this country, but we can make Canadian reproductions available to the members.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, our own staff may have put that together for the honourable member, but there's no commercially available book. We would like it as much as the member would.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell me how many civil servants are furnished with credit cards for gasoline purposes? He may recall an article in the *Toronto Star* of August 13, 1978. According to this article, there were 10,000 and the cost of gasoline was \$28 million in 1977. Can the minister tell us if it can all be verified as being used for business purposes only. What is your policy on that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Chairman, to answer for all government would be very difficult for me. To answer for our department, all drivers driving government vehicles have credit cards. I don't know whether that is enough of an answer, but it is an off-the-cuff answer that all drivers driving government-owned cars have credit cards.

Mr. Ruston: Would the credit cards not be issued through your ministry for all ministries?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Yes, they are issued through our ministry but the allocation is made up by the other ministries. For instance, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications or the Ministry of Education sends us a list of the people who are to get them. We don't decide that.

Mr. Ruston: Does the minister have the total number of credit cards issued?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: We will get that for you by Monday. We don't have it here.

Mr. Ruston: This article concerns me a little bit because we are handling a great deal of money. I realize that if a person is driving a government car—and naturally that's the easiest way to handle it—and that car is used for purposes other than government business, which happens in some cases, there is a charge back to the individual who is using it. But if the minister can get me that information, I would appreciate it.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, if I might just say a word about Mr. Laws, who is ill, is that on a number of occasions I have talked to him and asked him for assistance. I want to say that I do appreciate the amount of work he has done in the government service. I do hope he has a speedy recovery from his illness and we are very concerned about him at this time.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions on a matter that is, I suppose, of immediate importance to all of us in the Legislature—at least to those who drive and park in the members' parking lot. I cannot find a breakdown of how much is spent on supervision of the parking lot. I am talking about the commissionaires and so forth. I will ask a series of questions and then perhaps the minister can just answer them all together.

I understand that a number of commissionaires have, in some way, been punished by their supervisors by being docked hours, or that kind of penalty, for "not performing their duties" or for not being at a specific place at a specific time. I am wondering if there is some kind of management problem among the commissionaires? Can the minister give us a breakdown of how much is spent on supervision, that is, in management or quasi-management types of posts with regard to the supervisors, as compared to salaries paid to the commissionaires themselves? Exactly what are the responsibilities of the people who supervise the commissionaires? What is the ratio of management to employees in this case? Can you answer some of those questions?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Laws, who was just referred to by the member for Essex North, is the supervisor over this building. To the best of my knowledge, the case of one employee who was disciplined reached the attention of the minister. The minister supported the decision of the supervisor in that. There were reasons and I supported the supervisor fully in the action he took. Beyond that, if there was some other local incident, we don't have it here in our records.

Mr. Philip: I am not taking a position on one side or the other. I just had the feeling

there was some kind of conflict between one or more of the employees and the supervisor. I wonder, perhaps, if the minister can simply write me a note on it; or find the answers and we can discuss it informally.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's one that will go to the minister, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Philip: I appreciate that. Thank you.

On motion by Hon. Mr. Henderson, the committee of supply reported certain resolutions.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 20, 1979

Job creation, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Laughren, Mr. di Santo	1149
Lead levels, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. S. Smith	1150
Apprenticeship programs, questions of Mr. Elgie and Miss Stephenson: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Cooke, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Sweeney	1151
Funding of homes for handicapped, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Cassidy	1154
Liquor, wine prices, questions of Mr. Drea and Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. S. Smith	1155
Provincial schools dispute, question of Mr. McCague: Mr. Bounsall	1157
Teacher-board dispute, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. Sweeney	1157
Gains payments errors, questions of Mr. Maeck: Mr. Philip	1158
Violence in schools, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mr. Bradley	1158
Energy management program, questions of Mr. Grossman: Ms. Gigantes	1159
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, questions of Miss Stephenson: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Cooke	1159
Building material prices, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Swart	1160
Motion re private bills, Mr. Welch, agreed to	1161
Election Amendment Act, Mr. Leluk, first reading	1161
Estimates, Ministry of Government Services, continued, Mr. Henderson	1161
Adjournment	1177

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C.; Minister of Housing (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L.; Minister of Northern Affairs (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M.; Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bradley J. (St. Catharines L)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cooke, D. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Drea, Hon. F.; Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Scarborough Centre PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Edighoffer, H.; Chairman (Perth L)
Elgie, Hon. R.; Minister of Labour (York East PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, Hon. L.; Minister of Industry and Tourism (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Havrot, E. (Timiskaming PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C.; Minister of Government Services, Chairman of Cabinet (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lupusella, A. (Dovercourt NDP)
MacBeth, J. P.; Deputy Chairman (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, Hon. L.; Minister of Revenue (Parry Sound PC)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, Hon. G.; Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McMurtry, Hon. R.; Attorney General; Solicitor General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S.; Treasurer, Minister of Economics (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Smith, S.; Leader of the Opposition (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B.; Minister of Education (York Mills PC)
Stokes, Hon. J. E.; Speaker (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland-Thorold NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Turner, J. (Peterborough PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R.; Provincial Secretary for Justice; Deputy Premier (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L.; Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Scarborough North PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

